
Appendix 3

Comment/Response Tables



TABLE 1
RESPONSES TO COMMENTING AGENCIES AND MUNICIPAL STAFF COMMENTS
ON PREFERRED “ALTERNATIVE METHOD” OF IMPLEMENTING THE UNDERTAKING

| SESSION 1: AREA SCREENING | |
|--|--|
| QUESTION 1-1: DO YOU AGREE THAT THE PROPOSED EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA LISTED ABOVE REPRESENT A SUFFICIENTLY COMPREHENSIVE LIST FOR THE PURPOSE OF IDENTIFYING POLICY AREAS, FEATURES AND LAND USES CONSIDERED UNSUITABLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RESIDUAL WASTE PROCESSING FACILITY? DO YOU THINK THERE ARE OTHERS? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criteria seem reasonable (City of Oshawa). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No Response Required |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parks and Recreational land should have same setback as Natural Heritage Features. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaken at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single family home in an industrial area should be excluded if industrial site meets other criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Circumstances where a single-family home may exist within a developed industrial area will be reviewed on a case by case basis at the evaluation of the “short-list” of alternative sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality criteria – the siting process needs to look at existing and future estimates of air quality in the area being considered. Some areas may have less capacity to assimilate (or dilute) the increased discharge of air contaminants associated with the proposed facility. As part of the overall goal of minimizing impacts on human health, we suggest the facility should not be sited immediately upwind (i.e. within a few km) of major | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of the siting process, site specific ambient air quality data will be collected and analyzed to determine the potential cumulative impact to the existing airshed as a result of the siting of the proposed facility. This data will also be utilized in the completion of site specific human health and ecological risk assessment which will assess the potential impacts to neighbouring receptors and the suitability of siting this facility at a proposed location. |



| | |
|--|---|
| <p>population centers (existing or proposed).</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide definition of types of Woodlands and identify which ones are excluded. Note that TRCA prefers protection of all woodlands. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All woodlands, as defined in Municipal, Region, Provincial, and Federal legislation will be screened from further consideration at Step 2 in the siting process. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Heritage Systems and Environmental Protection Areas identified in Official Plans and Secondary Plans. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Natural Heritage Systems and Environmental Protection Areas identified in Official Plans and Secondary Plans will be screened from further consideration as part of Step 2 in the siting process. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider “Asian Long Horned Beetle Zone” in consultation with the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. Note that certain materials are not allowed to exit this zone. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organic material generated with an “Asian Long Horned Beetle Zone” will be managed as per the established protocol that has been approved by the Canadian Food Inspection Agency. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are golf courses considered a recreational use? A 300m buffer from golf courses may not be necessary. For example, Halton Region’s landfill site may host a EFW which would be situated across from a Clublink golf course which indicates these uses can co-exist in close proximity. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Golf Courses are considered a recreational land use in both Regional Official Plan documents. • The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaken at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pickering Regional Airport Site and its regulated areas. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Pickering Regional Airport site is regulated under Transport Canada Guidelines. As part of the Area Screening process, consideration will be given to Transport Canada requirements as they relate to Federally regulated airports. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regard should be given to local official plans. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both Regional and Local Official Plan documents will be considered during the evaluation of “Alternative Methods”. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designations such as the Mixed Use designation in City’s Official Plan that also permit residential. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed Use land use designations will be considered on a site specific/use specific basis and will ensure that the intent of the siting process (ie. Trying to find the most preferred site) is followed. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archaeological areas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration will be given to “Potential Impact on Archaeological |



| | |
|---|---|
| | Resources, Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes” during the evaluation of the “short-list” of alternative sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major utilities: hydro corridors, natural gas pipelines, etc | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of hydro corridors, natural gas pipelines, etc. will be considered on a site-specific and feature specific basis during the evaluation of alternative sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected transportation corridors i.e. Highway 407, future road allowances. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of protected transportation corridors and future road allowances will be considered on a site-specific and feature specific basis during the evaluation of alternative sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Regional Council are willing to take a run at the Greenbelt Plan for additional developable area, I am surprised that they are not willing to a take a run at it for other uses that might be appropriate in the Greenbelt (such as this one). Maybe that should not be an eliminating criteria but rather a discussion with MMAH about where to site such facilities and still meet all the criteria of the PPS (2005). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As per the PPS (2005), the facility should not be sited in a prestige employment area, or any employment area if it does not meet the number of workers/acre target. One of the criteria of the PPS was to protect employment lands and with the low ratio of workers this facility will have and the potential negative impact for marketing of the prestige lands, this should be considered in the siting criteria. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although this facility will likely not meeting the number of workers/area targets laid out in some prestige employment area designations, this facility, due to its ability to generate low cost energy has the ability to attract other new facilities that would meet these requirements. As such, the ability of the facility to be sited in a prestige employment area will be considered on a site by site basis and in consultation with Regional and local area municipality planning departments. |
| QUESTION 1-2: DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED 120 AND 300 METRE “BUFFERS” FOR IDENTIFIED FEATURES AND LAND USES? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300 metres is good however, if there are not adequate sites generated by this criteria it can be reduced somewhat. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please provide scientific explanation behind the numbers and we | |



| | |
|---|--|
| <p>will provide further comments.</p> | <p>Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaking at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request that any flexibility in the 120m buffer applied to Natural Heritage Features through the screening step be vetted through TRCA staff. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaking at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites. • Consultation on the application of buffers will be undertaking with authorities responsible for the protection/administration of the subject areas. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **Regional Official Plan policy 11.3.9 states that “Industrial activities characterized by fumes, vibration and noise shall be confined to sites that are well-removed and buffered from Living Areas”. It does not address the size of buffer required. The buffer size from residential, institutional and parks and recreational lands should be based on science and mitigation techniques, not public perception. (** indicates referenced elsewhere) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaking at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **Regarding Natural Heritage features, refer to Provincial Policy Statement sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.4. Development is permitted in some Natural Heritage Features (woodlands, valleylands, wildlife habitat and ANSIs) as long as there are no negative impacts on the natural feature or its ecological function. You are currently going beyond the requirements of the PPS by screening out these Natural Heritage Features, plus the 120 metre buffer. The 120m buffer may be a significant constraint to the siting process. It is possible to remove the 120m buffer and solely use the Natural Heritage feature. The impact on the feature and its function | |



| | |
|---|--|
| <p>could be considered at either the Long list or Short list evaluation stage.</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • **Review the Natural Heritage Reference Manual (MNR, 1999). Examples include wetlands – 120m, ANSIs – 50m, and Woodlands – 50m. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 300m buffers are too great, Suggest using 200m buffer. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separation distance is more appropriately addressed through an environmental study in consultation with the Conservation Authority and local municipality. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification needed - Is buffer measured from residual waste facility or property boundary? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application of a buffer would be from the facility structure outwards. This would allow a larger site to fare better than a smaller site due to the potential for on-site buffers. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are all buffers 300 m except for natural heritage? Why is there no buffer for other planning areas such as the Oak Ridges Moraine, Greenbelt, and agricultural lands? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ***Buffer siting criteria should not be used at the regional scale. Rather each site should be addressed on its own and not with a blanket. Depending on the other separations (rail-line, hydro corridor, major roadway etc) it may be irrelevant to have a 300 metres to residential. Likewise for the 120 metres to natural heritage features, since EIS’s can often address the issues. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaken at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites. |
| <p>QUESTION 1-3: ARE THERE ANY SPECIFIC DATA SOURCES, THAT YOU WOULD RECOMMEND FOR USE IN APPLYING THE EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA, WHICH MAY NOT BE READILY APPARENT/ AVAILABLE TO THE DURHAM/YORK STUDY TEAM?</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power distribution lines. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proximity to power distribution lines will be assessed as part of the evaluation of “long-list” and “short-list” of sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species and Species at Risk – contact MNR or search Federal Species at Risk | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) has been consulted at each major milestone in the project where input from agencies and |



| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Act (SARA) legislation on web.</p> | <p>stakeholders has been solicited. Data with respect to Significant Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species and Species at Risk will be requested from the appropriate authority at the appropriate time in the study.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetlands – consult www.mnr.gov.on.ca • There are different types of wetlands to be identified and potentially excluded. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Provincially significant wetlands (PSW’s) B) Locally Significant Wetlands (LSW’s) • should be confirmed with the Ministry of Natural Resources in Aurora at 905-713-7400 or website above. C) Areas greater than 0.5 ha classified under TRCA’s Ecological Land Classification (ELC) should be confirmed with TRCA. Initially, general information can be provided and more specific as the Long List has been identified. D) there may be additional wetlands determined through field investigations conducted with TRCA staff in association with this undertaking. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) has been consulted at each major milestone in the project where input from agencies and stakeholders has been solicited. Data with respect to Significant Habitat of Endangered and Threatened Species and Species at Risk will be requested from the appropriate authority at the appropriate time in the study. • At the appropriate stage in the process, areas classified under TRCA’s Ecological Land Classification (ELC) will be confirmed with TRCA with respect proximity to potential sites. • As part of the detailed evaluation of the “short-list” of alternative sites, in-field evaluations will be required to assess potential impacts to natural features, including wetlands. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wellhead Protection Areas Infiltration Areas – contact Region of York – Regional Hydrogeologist. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consideration of Wellhead Protection Areas Infiltration Areas will be undertaken on a site-specific basis. The consideration will include consultation with appropriate parties including York Region hydrogeologists. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater Discharge/Recharge Areas – Contact Steve Holysh at steveholysh@hrca.on.ca, York Peel Durham Toronto (YPDT), 905-336-1158 x246, Conservation Authority Moraine Coalition (CAMC), Ground Water Studies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The consideration of Groundwater Discharge/Recharge Areas will be undertaken on a site-specific basis. The consideration will include consultation with appropriate commenting agencies. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Hazard Lands. TRCA can provide “general” mapping of the Regulation Areas for the entire York and Durham | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designated Hazard lands will initially be considered through the use of Regional and Area Municipal Official Plan “Hazard land” designations. |



| | |
|--|---|
| <p>jurisdiction initially which includes flood prone, erosion prone areas, and regulation line mapping and floodplain mapping when the long list has been identified.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the appropriate stage in the process, the TRCA will be provided an opportunity to review and comment on the mapping of hazard lands. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservation Areas. Also contact other conservation areas in study area – Lake Simcoe Region Conservation Authority, Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority and Conservation Ontario to ensure all Conservation Authorities have been contacted for information. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All conservation authorities having jurisdiction in Durham and York Regions have been consulted at each major milestone in the project where input from agencies and stakeholders has been solicited. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRCA’s Natural Heritage System. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TRCA will be consulted to identify additional data sources that may not already be available to the proponent. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmentally Significant Areas. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TRCA owned property. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEED certification of the proposed facility. Contact: Andrew Bowerbank, TRCA 416-661-6600 to discuss the opportunities to design the proposed facility in regard to LEED standards. Ask for a copy of this document to follow in the design “The Living City-Supporting Green Building Design Initiatives Across the Greater Toronto Region, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design”. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LEED certification or any other type of applicable environmental certificate will be investigated as part of the Request for Proposals stage to identify the preferred Technology Vendor. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Resources. Contact the Ministry of Culture and commit to completing a heritage investigation prior to confirming the final site selection. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration will be given to “Potential Impact on Archaeological Resources, Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes” during the evaluation of the “short-list” of alternative sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Schedule B1 to Amendment No. 114 of the Durham Region Official Plan - identifies the location of the Key Natural Heritage Features and Hydrologic Features in the Region. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration will be given to Schedule B1 to Amendment No. 114 of the Durham Region Official Plan. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contact Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to get supporting documentation for Central Pickering Development Plan that has already been prepared. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comment. |



| QUESTION 1-4: DO YOU HAVE COMMENTS REGARDING THE NEED FOR SOME DEGREE OF FLEXIBILITY IN THE MAPPING OF CERTAIN EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA? ARE THERE OTHER INSTANCES WHERE THIS FLEXIBILITY IN APPROACH AT THE AREA SCREENING STEP WOULD BE REASONABLE? | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration could be given for some types of institutional uses ie: Church. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration will be given to institutional uses as defined in Regional and Area Municipal Official Plans. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Filter Flexibility through TRCA staff. • This flexibility in approach at area screening is not reasonable at this time. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaken at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites. • Consultation on the application of buffers will be undertaken with authorities responsible for the protection/administration of the subject areas. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing the criteria after you have taken it to the public will be difficult and may result in people questioning the entire EA process, and could cause poor public perception of the process. You need to ensure the criteria are appropriate before finalized and released to the public. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognizing that only sites within urban areas are under consideration, there should be some flexibility when dealing with natural features that are not designated in an Official Plan or zoned open space. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural Features not designated in an Official Plan or zoned open space will be given consideration on a site specific basis. |



SESSION 2: SITE SIZE DETERMINATION

QUESTION 2-1: DO YOU AGREE WITH THE RATIONALE PROPOSED FOR THE DETERMINATION OF THE PREFERRED AND MINIMUM SITE SIZES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED SET-BACK REQUIREMENTS?

| | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No concerns at this time. (2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response Required |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If have setback of 50m & building of 150m need 250m site width. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Response Required |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site should have transfer station for organics for local haulers – generally use 2-stream trucks: Garbage/Organics. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The siting process currently underway is to identify a site suitable for a Thermal Processing facility. The addition of a transfer station at that site to manage organic material is outside the scope of this EA study. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No, setbacks should be based on mitigation requirements for neighbours, not on some random number. For example, a large setback may not be needed if the facility is adjacent to a similar industrial use. The requirements of the technology and possible site configuration and any features of the site, may also need to be considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaken at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area Municipal Zoning Laws should be reviewed for identifying setback requirements. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The references to application of a buffer around particular land use designations is being removed at the area screening level, due to significant input from agencies that this buffer distance is more appropriately applied on a site specific, feature specific basis. Therefore consideration of buffers and buffer distances will be undertaken at the detailed evaluation of the short-list of sites. • During the short-list site evaluation, consideration will be given to Area Municipal Zoning requirements. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • *Recommend 12 ha or greater to allow for greater flexibility for expansion as well as secondary facilities such as the production of a solid recovered fuel; or electrical generation from the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment Noted. No Response Required. |



| | |
|--|--|
| thermal treatment of MSW | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Site size must also take into account parking, traffic flow, storm water management requirements (i.e. ponds), landscaping/screening and storage. Site size configuration may also be impacted/constrained by topography and elevation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site size will include the installation of all necessary on-site infrastructure, including parking, etc. Yes, site configuration must take into account topography and elevation. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You need to be able to identify sites that also might provide the necessary area but are 150m in width, as there could be adequate off-site buffers. The more sites you can identify in the long-list the more credible your short list will be. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Noted. No Response Required. |
| QUESTION 2-2: DO YOU CONSIDER THE RATIONALE TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDATION THAT THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS FOCUS ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF A SINGLE SITE TO ACCOMMODATE THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE SYSTEM TO BE REASONABLE? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, this is reasonable. (2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments Noted. No Response Required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree, but important to maintain sufficient property for vehicle storage, expansion. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments Noted. No Response Required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial purchase price for larger property will be cheaper than requirement to purchase at later date | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comments Noted. No Response Required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The haul route argument could be debated. There may be a larger impact to the transportation network of 100 trucks accessing the site vs. only 50 trucks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comment. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depends on the business case for various sized facilities. There are waste transfer sites throughout the urban area that are generally accepted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thank you for your comment. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes but should not be automatically preconceived that the single site needs to be centrally located geographically within York/Durham to reduce haul distances for both municipalities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no preconception that a single site would be centrally located geographically within Durham/York. The location of the sites will be determined in accordance with the Approved EA Terms of Reference. |



SESSION 3: THE “LONG-LIST” OF SITES

QUESTION 3-1: DO YOU AGREE WITH THE PRIORITY PLACED ON THE IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLICLY-OWNED, THE “WILLING SELLER” SITES IN THE STEP-WISE METHODOLOGY TO IDENTIFY “LONG LIST” SITES?

| | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, TRCA agrees with this priority. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment Noted. No Response Required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No priority is necessary. All publicly owned lands and “willing seller” sites should equally be considered. In addition, instead of identifying all publicly-owned lands, a more realistic approach would be to identify publicly owned and available land. Not all publicly owned land is necessarily appropriate or available for this type of use i.e. the public body owning the site also be a willing seller if the current ownership is not York or Durham. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments Noted. No Response Required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If facility is to be publicly owned should include additional priority for purchase of suitable property or worst case expropriation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, generally from a financial point of view but this criteria should not necessarily override a ‘better site’ based on all other criteria | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, priority should base on appropriately located publicly owned land and willing sellers with appropriate OP designation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment Noted. No Response Required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Municipality of Clarington during the preparation of the terms of reference indicated that we do not agree with the identification of publicly-owned sites in the first instance. We continue to hold this opinion. The Regions could be missing out on very feasible sites by setting this as an over-riding criteria. (1) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the intention of the proponents to identify proceed with the identification of both publicly owned and privately available sites to ensure a sufficient range of properties are identified for further consideration. |



| | |
|---|--|
| <p>QUESTION 3-2: DO YOU AGREE THAT THE PROPOSED “LONG-LIST” EVALUATION CRITERIA LISTED ABOVE REPRESENT A SUFFICIENTLY COMPREHENSIVE LIST FOR THE PURPOSE OF IDENTIFYING MAJOR ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES ASSOCIATED WITH “LONG-LIST” SITES TO BE USED TO REDUCE THE “LONG-LIST” OF SITES TO A “SHORT-LIST” FOR DETAILED COMPARATIVE EVALUATION? DO YOU THINK THERE ARE OTHERS? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?</p> | |
| <p>Proximity to Required Infrastructure</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to include transmission lines for power generated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proximity to power distribution lines will be assessed as part of the evaluation of “long-list” and “short-list” of sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree (City of Pickering) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment Noted. No Response Required. |
| <p>Site Accessibility</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize haul distance from major series highway or rail line | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relative distance of the haul route will be considered as part of the comparative siting evaluation process. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should also consider the hierarchy of roads being used to access the site (ie. Type A, B, or C or a collector) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once a “Short-List” of sites has been identified, a preliminary traffic impact assessment will be conducted that will examine the different types of roads along the haul route and their ability to sustain additional truck traffic. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Sites in proximity to Highway 407, a tolled road, should also be considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. |
| <p>Potential Impact of the Haul Route</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. Sites that have the effect of creating traffic congestion at interchanges/intersections should be less preferred. In addition, the facility may affect roadway users (e.g. local traffic, commuters, buses, emergency vehicles, etc.) during the operation of the facility. Assume roadway type includes surface (i.e. asphalt/gravel) and designation classification. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. |



| | |
|---|---|
| Property Size | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree, However larger sites are preferred (see earlier comment on Question 2-1*) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment |
| Land use Compatibility | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official Plan Conformity should be long list criteria. Zoning can be done on short list. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree, however, given the nature of the use and the potential impact of truck traffic to and from the facility, the use should be directed to general employment areas where other heavy industrial users are concentrated. In addition, synergies between the facility with potential EFW production including heat waste and large users of electricity such as General Motors require consideration. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The synergies between the proposed facility and potential endusers of the energy generated will be investigated on a site specific basis. This facility is being constructed for the management of long-term residual wastes. The generation of energy is a beneficial by-product of thermal treatment process, however, the intent of the EA process is to ultimately identify a preferred site that is suitable for the establishment of a waste management facility. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general compatibility of surrounding land uses with the development of an industrial land use (i.e. a thermal treatment facility) (medium-low priority) should be a higher priority, such as the ability to provide heat to other industries and also that the facility does not negatively impact (perception) and marketability of the industrial park. Must meet the criteria for employee ratios. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. The ability of the facility to meet the criteria for employee ratios (ie. Number of employees per area of land) will be investigated on a site-specific basis. Because of the opportunity to generate low cost energy, these types of facilities, may have the advantage to attract new high employee to land area ratio facilities to the surrounding lands. |
| Availability of Site | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree, see earlier comment on Question 3-1.(marked with *) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. |
| Proximity to Unregulated Airports | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree, see earlier comment on Question 1-1. (marked with *) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. |



| | |
|---|--|
| Other | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to meet 2010 timeframe. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although the ability to meet the 2010 operational timeline is important, the EA process will not sacrifice thoroughness or detail in its evaluations to meet this timeline. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial – an initial financial analysis on local and regional economies should be prepared. For example, the facility’s impact to meet/enhance a municipality’s economic and employment objectives require consideration. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These types of financial considerations will be undertaken at the request of the host municipality, once the proposed site has been determined. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official Plan Conformity – both upper and lower tier. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conformity with Official Plans, both at the Regional level and local Municipal level, will be investigated once a “Short-list” of sites has been identified. |
| Additional Comments | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydro transmission should be a criteria. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proximity to power distribution lines will be assessed as part of the evaluation of “long-list” and “short-list” of sites. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It seems that because of tight time-frames, opportunities in north Oshawa won’t make the long list or short list because infrastructure (i.e. highway and services) are not available. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential opportunities in north Oshawa will be considered if they meet the proposed evaluation criteria. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under “potential impact of the haul route”, what is meant by “distance to main waste generation source(s)?” Will material arrive at the facility by garbage truck or via transfer station tractor-trailers? Distance shouldn’t just be linear, but weighted by volume of waste. Also, the relatively greater increase in waste from York Region’s higher population when compared to Durham Region should be factored into the analysis of impacts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distance to the main waste generation source(s) refers to the total distance waste will have to travel in order to reach the facility. • It is likely that waste will arrive by both local waste collection vehicle and transfer vehicle, depending on the location of waste generation and the travel distance to the facility versus an existing transfer station. • Distance will be weighted according to the volume of waste and the distance that waste must travel. • Projected population growth by municipality will be factored into the overall waste travel calculations. |



SESSION 4: EVALUATION OF “SHORT-LIST” SITES

QUESTION 4-1: DO YOU AGREE THAT THE PROPOSED “SHORT-LIST” EVALUATION CATEGORIES, CRITERIA AND INDICATORS LISTED BELOW REPRESENT A SUFFICIENTLY COMPREHENSIVE LIST FOR THE PURPOSE OF IDENTIFYING MAJOR ADVANTAGES ASSOCIATED WITH “SHORT-LIST” SITES TO BE USED IN THE IDENTIFICATION OF THE PREFERRED SITE? DO YOU THINK THERE ARE OTHERS? IF SO, WHAT ARE THEY?

Criteria

1. Public Health & Safety and Natural Environment

Air Quality

Water Quality

- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about Aquifer Vulnerability Areas and Wellhead Protection Areas? You may wish to refer to Section 2 and Table E5 for the Amendment 114 to the Regional Official Plan (Official Plan Review), which was approved by Regional Council on Sept. 13th. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for your comment. This information will be investigated. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third indicator should address water quantity as well, as it is discussed in the rationale. Groundwater is not listed as an indicator – what about potential impacts on aquifers and wells? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact to groundwater will include an assessment of potential impact to local aquifers and wells. |

Environmentally Sensitive Areas

Vegetation

Other

- | | |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise/Vibration – impact of sound/vibration on adjacent properties during operation of facility requires consideration. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of sound/vibration on adjacent properties during construction and operation of the facility will be considered as part of the “short-list” evaluation process. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Net Gain – facility should be designed to achieve LEED Certification, and create a net gain to natural, economic and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEED certification or any other type of applicable environmental certificate will be investigated as part of the Request for Proposals stage to identify the preferred Technology Vendor. |



| | |
|---|--|
| social environments. | |
| 2. Social and Cultural Environment | |
| Land Use | |
| Residential Areas | |
| Institutional Areas | |
| Archaeological & Cultural Areas | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ministry of Culture recommends that at a minimum, that a full archaeological, built heritage and cultural heritage landscape assessment be undertaken of all sites on the short list once that short list has been completed. The best practice would be to undertake such assessment at an earlier point prior to making the level of investment required to develop the short list. However, we recognize that cost factors may on balance force the decision to undertake the cultural heritage assessments at the short list stage. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proponents committed to the Ministry of Culture during preparation of the EA Terms of Reference that Stage 1 archaeological assessments would be completed on the “Short-List” of alternative sites. Once a preferred site is identified, if deemed necessary, further studies will be completed. |
| Traffic | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest revising indicator to read: “Existing and projected volume of traffic along haul route in relation to the functional class of the Arterial Road (ie Type A,B, or C) and adjacent land uses”. The rationale provided is a bit of an oversimplification. Traffic impacts should not only be assessed based on an increase in volume, but whether or not the road was designed to accommodate such volume and the types of adjacent land uses (i.e. an industrial area or a mix of commercial/residential). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Once a “Short-List” of sites has been identified, a preliminary traffic impact assessment will be conducted that will examine the different types of roads along the haul route and their ability to sustain additional truck traffic. A landuse assessment will also be undertaken to determine landuses around the “Short-List” of sites as well as along the proposed haul routes. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Goods Movement Network has been included in Durham’s Amendment 114 to the Regional Official Plan. As such, the rationale for this could be updated once appeal period expires. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Noted. This comment will be reviewed with Durham Region planning staff at the appropriate time. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to major arterial road network and 400 series highway | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proximity to a major arterial road network and 400 series |



| | |
|---|--|
| <p>including 407 are encouraged. The potential to alter existing traffic operations requires consideration. Criteria for type of roadway should also include classification and no. of lanes/lane width.</p> | <p>highway will be considered as part of the “Long-list” evaluation process. Once a “Short-List” of sites has been identified, a preliminary traffic impact assessment will be conducted that will examine the different types of roads along the haul route and their ability to sustain additional truck traffic.</p> |
| <p>Other</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal impacts – impact of facility on local businesses requires consideration. Such a facility may also detract from the desirability of surrounding lands as a location for prestige employment uses. • Anticipated influences, both positive and negative on perceptions of the community as place to live, work or do business require consideration. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These types of financial considerations will be undertaken at the request of the host municipality, once the proposed site has been determined. |
| <p><u>3. Economic/Financial</u></p> | |
| <p>Capital costs</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site development costs include Development Charges, Site Plan application fees, and building permit fees. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site development costs will include development charges, site plan application fees and building permits. |
| <p>Operation and Maintenance Costs</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ongoing impact of truck traffic to and from the facility on local roads requires monitoring. Mitigation of potential impacts may be required (i.e. road improvements, etc). Host benefit agreement may be required. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact of truck traffic, both inbound to the facility and outbound from the facility, on the haul routes will be assessed as part of the evaluation of alternative sites. • The proponents recognize the need for a host community agreement to be in place to assist in the mitigation of potential impacts. |
| <p>Other</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipal Impacts – Impact of facility on adjacent and surrounding property values require consideration as well as impact on local economy. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proponents recognize the need for a host community agreement to be in place to assist in the mitigation of potential impacts. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistency with Municipal Economic Development Objectives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proponents recognize the need for a host community |



| | |
|---|--|
| <p>– generally a waste facility is perceived as an undesirable use. Therefore, the impact of facility in achieving local economic development objectives must be considered.</p> | <p>agreement to be in place to assist in the mitigation of potential impacts.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on marketability of adjacent lands – perception or reduction in prestige status could be significant and should be considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proponents recognize the need for a host community agreement to be in place to assist in the mitigation of potential impacts. |
| 4. Technical Suitability | |
| Compatibility with Existing Infrastructure | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to fire stations, fire hydrants and other emergency services such as EMS requires consideration. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proximity to required infrastructure will take into account proximity to emergency services. |
| Design and Operations | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Must meet all applicable laws such as the Building code, Fire code etc. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The facility will meet all applicable governing legislation including the building code and fire code of the host community. |
| Other | |
| 5. Legal | |
| Complexity of Required Approvals | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of local Official Plan and zoning by-law to determine conformity is required earlier in the site selection process. Other municipal approvals required, such as Site Plan and Building Permit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A review of Regional and Local Municipal Official Plans will be undertaken at Step 2 to assist in the application of screening criteria. Site Plan and Building Permit considerations will be considered following the identification of the preferred site. |
| Complexity of Required Agreements | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local municipal agreements i.e. host benefit agreement may also be required. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proponents recognize the need for a host community agreement to be in place to assist in the mitigation of potential impacts. |
| Other | |
| QUESTION 4-2: ARE THERE ANY AGENCY / STAKEHOLDER SPECIFIC ITEMS / ISSUES WITH RESPECT TO FACILITY SITING THAT WE SHOULD BE CONSIDERING THAT HAVE NOT BEEN DISCUSSED HERE TODAY? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major industrial operations will be given an opportunity to offer up |



| | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major Industrial operations. | <p>a site through the “willing seller” site identification process.</p> |
| <p>ADDITIONAL COMMENTS: BASED ON TODAY’S DISCUSSION, CAN YOU THINK OF ANY OTHER ISSUES, WHICH NEED TO BE CONSIDERED, OR DO YOU HAVE ANY OTHER COMMENTS RELATED TO THE DURHAM/YORK RESIDUAL WASTE STUDY IN GENERAL?</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there are other workshops, provide a list of questions to be answered (repeated from workbook) on the last several pages in order to answer digitally. Wouldn’t have to send in whole document. • Titles/Pages – number and title all the slides for the next presentation. This will help the reviewers in their commenting process. • The two Residual Waste Study Flow Charts that indicate the two alternatives are very helpful. Always include these flow charts when explaining the alternatives. Action Required: label the two flow charts as follows: Alternative 1) Thermal Treatment (TT) (mass incineration) of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) remaining after diversion with recovery of material from the process ash and char and Alternative 2) Mechanical Treatment, Optional Biological Treatment, then Thermal treatment (mass incineration) of a Solid Recovered Fuel with recovery of material from process ash and char. Label the two corresponding example pictures associated with the two alternative titles. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments Noted. No Response Required. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include another opportunity for “Consultation” with the TRCA staff to obtain more detailed mapping information after the long list of potential sites has been identified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with Agencies and Stakeholders will not take place until a “short-list” of alternative sites has been identified. At that time TRCA will be provided all relevant information for review and comment. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add this title to the slide “Exclusionary Criteria”. Potential migration of contaminants during facility operation from the waste material handling through the more permeable surface soils | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment Noted. No Response Required. |



| | |
|---|--|
| to the water table may impact the existing groundwater quality. | |
|---|--|

TABLE 2

INCORPORATION OF COMMENTS/FEEDBACK RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSIONS ON THE
FACILITY SITING METHODOLOGY AND CRITERIA

| COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| <p>ATTENDEES ASKED MANY QUESTIONS THROUGHOUT THE PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSIONS ON FACILITY SITING METHODOLOGY AND CRITERIA. THE FOLLOWING WERE THEIR QUESTIONS/CONCERNS:</p> | |
| <p><u>Human and Ecological Health</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will health risk and impact assessment studies be done concurrently? • Ontario air emission Guideline A-7 compared to European guidelines. • Type of air pollution control system to be used in facility. • How does facility handle flame retardants and PCBs? • Is ash hazardous? How will it be handled? (3) • Wastewater concern. (4) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. • All guidelines are around the same level. • Decision has not yet been made. • Incineration process breaks down and destroys chemicals. • Bottom ash is not hazardous and generally requires landfill disposal. It may be used as landfill cover or possibly in construction applications. The fly ash and residue from the air pollution control (APC) system is hazardous as it contains metals originally contained in the input waste. This material will require disposal in a special landfill such as the Clean Harbour facility in Sarnia. • Amount of wastewater depends on type of air pollution control system (dry versus wet system). Dry systems can be |



| COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|---|---|
| | <p>designed to have “zero” waste water discharge. If system is wet, wastewater will be treated to meet sewer use by-laws.</p> |
| <p><u>Transportation and Emissions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advantageous to ship waste by boat • Facility could be built to accept waste by rail. (2) • Number of trucks required to transport waste to facility. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not cost-effective. • Not considered in the Study. • A 250,000 tonne per year facility would receive about 1,000 tonnes per day. Assuming waste was delivered in 30 tonne transfer trailers, this would generate about 33 trucks per day. If waste from the local area were delivered in 10 tonne packer trucks then the number of trucks would increase. In general, less than 60 trucks per day are expected. |
| <p><u>Facility Location and Size</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pickering sites (i.e. Brock) seem like a likely candidate. (3) • Site should be built at former landfill site. • Facility should be located in urban centre. • Will properties close to or outside Durham or York be considered (i.e., Wesleyville)? • Build facility in an industrial bank and use heat for other new industries surrounding facility. • Will site have to be close to electrical grid? (2) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites have yet to be evaluated. • Comment noted. • Comment noted. • The search for sites will not include sites located outside of the Study Area. Willing sellers that have sites that are outside of the Study Area with approved Terms of Reference can submit their site. • Hasn’t been considered yet. • A site close to the grid is preferred from this perspective |



| COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The maximum site area should only be considered to accommodate growth. • Landfills should be dug up and burned in incinerators. Facility should be sized larger to accommodate this extra tonnage. • What is lifespan of plant and the ability to retrofit? • Multiple units should be used in case one unit fails another can be used. (2) • If available sites are zoned industrial/rural within the Greenbelt area, will they be considered? • Minimum distance from site to Greenbelt zone. | <p>because a transmission line will be required to connect the facility to the grid.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population growth has been accounted for in the minimum site area requirement. • Mining landfills is not part of this Study. • Planning on 20-30 years. The key to a longer lifespan is ongoing maintenance. Facilities can be upgraded in the future. • A minimum of 2 units will be considered. • In general, sites within the Greenbelt will not be considered unless land use designations allowing the facility to be developed on the subject lands were in place prior to the creation of the Greenbelt. • This is part of establishing siting criteria. |
| <p><u>Legal/Approvals</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will Regions be engaging into a competitive bidding process before EAA approval? • Will Regions enter into binding contracts with technology vendors before EAA approval? • Will Regions enter into binding contracts with technology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. • Vendors are required for detailed technical specifications as part of the EPA and EAA approvals. • Yes, technical information from the successful vendor will be required to complete the Site Specific Health Risk |



| COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| <p>vendors before a Health Risk Assessment is completed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be a competitive bidding process for processing technology or will the contracts be sole sourced? (2) • Will Study require joint EPA/EAA approval? (2) • Are public comments addressed and made available to the public? • Responsibility for hazardous waste disposal / cleanup. • Can Regions provide a list of all companies involved in this project for conflict of interest purposes? • EA process seems too long, is this normal timeline? (2) • Is provincial government on side with the project? • Will there be public comment on the different types of available technologies? | <p>Assessment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process will be competitive. • Both EAA and EA approval will be required. • Legally, all public comments must be addressed. Public consultation reports are available on the Study website. • Depends on implementation model. • No, vendors of the potential facility have not been identified as yet. • EA process is being expedited because of Michigan border closing. Moving through approvals more quickly than normal. • Yes, municipalities have made commitments to reach the goal for 2010. • The preferred technology (thermal treatment) has already been selected and public input was addressed at that time. |



| COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Ownership and Users of Facility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns that GTA municipalities (including Toronto) would want to use facility. (5) Facility operated privately can take waste from anywhere. Handling institutional, commercial and industrial (IC&I) waste. (2) Public or private ownership? (2) <p><u>Stewardship and Consumer Responsibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large quantities of plastics are required to feed thermal facility so there will be less incentive for recycling. (3) Producers need to start taking responsibility for their materials. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The approved Terms of Reference (approved by the Minister of the Environment) states that users of the facility are limited to Durham and York Regions and possibly municipalities to the east of Durham Region (other GTA municipalities not included). Certificate of Approval and the Terms of Reference approved by the Minister of Environment will not allow that. It is planned that the facility will primarily receive residual waste from the residential sector although the approved Terms of Reference also provide for it to receive a small amount of IC&I waste. Advantages and disadvantages to both ownership options are being studied now. Facility is designed for 40% residual waste and 60% diversion in the first years. Planning for 75% diversion in the later years. Regions acknowledge this but must plan to manage what residents put at the curb. |
| <p><u>Other</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since Durham has the sewer for the joint water sewer project, the facility should be in York to share the burden. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions on the joint study were made by elected officials from both Regions. Since each Region produces a small |



| COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| <p>Disappointed that this is a joint project. (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost distribution between Durham and York • Why is System 2a referred to as the preferred technology if System 2b is still being considered? Why are there 2 alternatives still being considered? (2) • Is plasma gasification being considered? (2) • Residual waste from plasma gasification? • Is data to be used from Hamilton incinerator? • Why hasn't an EFW been built in the last 15 years? • Why hasn't the generation of electricity been mentioned so far in this Study? • How much electricity will be produced? How can it be used? (4) | <p>quantity of waste, by joining together each achieve economies of scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning costs are being shared equally between Durham and York. Potential facility costs will likely be shared in proportion to the use of the facility. • System 2B may offer additional benefits compared to System 2A. A final decision on a specific technology vendor will be made as part of the RFP process. • All technologies will be considered however, technologies must be proven since this is a large investment that the citizens will be paying for. • Residual waste from plasma gasification is a glass-like substance that may be used in construction applications. • Hamilton technology is 20 years old now. Considering only state-of-the-art technology only. • EFW is more expensive than landfill and additional disposal capacity has been available in the United States. • During the preferred technology selection the recovery of energy was an important criterion. During the technology vendor selection the amount of and type energy generation will be evaluated. • 250,000 tonnes per year will produce approximately 19 MW. Produces enough to run the facility plus sell to the grid. Could |



| COMMENT | RESPONSE |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More time should be given for public comment.• Why isn't there public consultation on the long-list? (2)• Public should be able to comment on facility and pollution control technology. | <p>substitute for natural gas in paper mills. Europe uses for district heating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comment noted.• This step was deemed not to be necessary given the social impacts associated with the siting process and the compact timeframe required for the completion of the project.• Comment noted. |