

Wednesday, October 3, 2007
2:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.
Garnet B Rickard Recreation Centre
2440 King St W
Bowmanville

Presentation began at 9:00 p.m.

Angelos Bacopoulos welcomed all. As you know we have gone through a number of information sessions, tonight we are looking at the preferred site recommended by our consultants.

Please ask questions at the mike, or if you prefer, you can write a question on a prepared form which will be read out and answered tonight or answered at a later date in writing. A transcript of this meeting will be on the website.

The following were here today and may still be here:

Roger Anderson, Chairman, Region of Durham
Cliff Curtis, Commissioner, Works, Region of Durham
Mayor Jim Abernethy, Municipality of Clarington
Regional Councillor Charlie Trim
Regional Councillor Mary Novak
Regional Councillor Howie Herrema
Local Councillor Ron Hooper, Municipality of Clarington
Local Councillor Gord Robinson, Municipality of Clarington
Local Councillor Adrian Foster, Municipality of Clarington
Local Councillor Willie Woo, Municipality of Clarington

A welcome and introduction to the Facilitator and Guest Panelists was provided by Angelos Bacopoulos, Project Manager

He introduced the panel:

Chris Winsor, Hill & Knowlton – Facilitator
Jim McKay, Jacques Whitford – Senior Planner, 9 years waste management experience
David Merriman, GENIVAR - Technical Lead, 25 years waste management experience
David Payne, GENIVAR - Project Management, 35 years experience
Greg Crooks, Jacques Whitford – Air Quality Service Director, 18 years experience
Kathleen Easton, Jacques Whitford – Environmental Scientist, water quality, ecology, 3 years experience
Steve Plaice, Jacques Whitford – Waste Management Service Director, 19 years experience
Ilya Sher, URS – Traffic, transportation technology, 11 years experience
Dr. Lesbia Smith – Medical Doctor, Environmental Public Health, 32 years experience
Ruwan Jayasinghe, Jacques Whitford – Toxicologist, 6 years experience

Mirka Januszkiewicz, Region of Durham - Director, Waste Management, 20 years experience in waste management

A presentation on the Consultants' recommendation of a preferred site for an Energy from Waste facility was provided by Jim McKay.

Jim ran through all the steps that this project has undergone to date.

60 information sessions have been held to date. Information has been and will continue to be constantly available and updated on the project website.

Reports supporting the Consultants' recommended site have been prepared on:

- Air quality impacts
- Water quality impacts
- Ecological impacts
- Current and proposed land use study
- Archaeological study
- Traffic impacts
- Capital costs and operational maintenance costs
- Infrastructure
- Approvals and Agreements

Clarrington 01 is the Consultant's Recommended Preferred Site.

The different approvals and requirements including how long will it take and the costs associated with it were outlined.

Copies of the reports are available on the website and at the local libraries, CDs are available upon request.

The next Public Information Sessions (PIS) will be held in Courtice on October 9th and in Newmarket on October 23rd.

Public polling regarding views on Energy from Waste will be done in November.

The closing period for comments on this document is October 28th to allow time to incorporate the comments received into the document to give to Council in December, however submissions will still be considered after October 28th.

[Comment added later: The deadline for receiving public comments regarding this document has been extended until December 10, 2007.]

The request for vendor qualifications (RFQ) closes on Oct 11th. Qualified vendors will be identified and they will be eligible to respond to the request for proposals (RFP) to be issued in the first quarter of 2008.

The Regions will not submit the DRAFT EA document until they have the specific technology information near the end of next year.

We will be submitting all EA documents and EPA documents to the MOE by the end of 2008 so that they can start their review.

Presentation ended at: 9:30 p.m.

Question and Answer Period, facilitated by: Chris Winsor, Hill & Knowlton

Chris Winsor introduced himself; he is an independent facilitator and has no role with this aspect of the project; therefore, he is neither for or against this project.

Chris promoted an atmosphere of mutual respect and openness. He ensures that anyone who has a question will get a chance to have it answered. Everyone here tonight has a right to ask a question and have it answered.

He asked that a question be no more than a two-minute time frame. In addition to being brief, he requested that questions be based on facts, as opposed to speculation or rumour. He noted that the PIS was being recorded, and that a transcript would be available to all on the project website. A questioner will be given one follow up question. Please give panelists time to respond.

Facilitator: Can we agree that we do not tolerate loud, abusive language or behaviour? I need your permission that if a person has asked a question and received an answer, I would like to ask them to sit down or move to the back of the line to ask another question. Lastly, I would like to bring this meeting to a close as close to 11:00 p.m. as possible.

If you do not have your questions answered tonight, please leave your cards with your questions with us or email them to us or call in.

Please ask for a card to write down your question if you don't want to ask it yourself and put it in the recycling box.

Please give us your name and where you are from.

Thank you.

Questions and Answers

QUESTION #1: Why was air monitoring data from Cobourg used when the site chosen is in Courtice?

Answer provided by Greg Crooks: The reason we chose Cobourg was that it was the closest station to the short-listed sites that tracked the required wind information.

Question 1b: Why were Oshawa and Bowmanville chosen when the site is in Courtice?

Answer provided by Greg Crooks: These are existing meteorological stations that collect data that we felt to be most representative of the conditions at the short-listed sites. The site-specific data that we will continue collecting over the next few months will confirm or disprove that.

QUESTION #2: Question to Jim McKay: In your presentation, you talked about community priorities, please expand. My concern is about the timing of this presentation. I have attended a number of these sessions in the Region of Durham. This is the latest a formal presentation has ever taken place. Members of Clarington Council and the Mayor were informed, we requested a 7:00 p.m. start so that young families who are concerned about this project could attend. Who chose a 9:00 p.m. start and what is the rationale?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: I am responsible. I directed the Consultants to start at 9:00 p.m. I have met with a lot of residents, people who are working in Toronto or working in the west end. They want to have dinner with their families and then come here for the meeting. The presentation was shown all day from 2:00 p.m., so that people who work shifts could also join us. The presentation at the meeting on Tuesday, October 9th will start at 8:00 p.m. because we heard that 9:00 p.m. was too late.

[Comment added later: This was later amended to a 7:00 p.m. start of the live presentation.]

Question 2b: I also think the community needs to know that there was an error in the advertisement. It still said 8:00 p.m. and corrections were not made. We feel that you need to listen to what the community and the people want. Was this a committee decision or did you decide on your own?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: I decided on my own.

QUESTION #3: My concerns are to articulate health concerns. The report that MacViro prepared for Hamilton indicated that the particulate emissions would be 2.5

microns. What is the percentage of 2.5 microns and below which represents nanoparticles? Why are the values different?

Answer provided by Dave Merriman: This issue deals with regulatory requirements and particle sizes. There are regulations dealing with particle sizes less than 2.5 microns. There are specific regulations with regards to contaminants. Whatever technology is selected, it will meet those requirements. You mentioned Niagara, some of that data has been updated and technologies have improved since that study was done. We have asked the vendors for specific emissions data. We will meet or exceed the requirements of Guideline A-7. We will have a better idea of what the technology can achieve, beyond the requirements of A-7, when we receive the responses to our Request for Qualifications (RFQ).

Question 3b: What percentage of particles 2.5 microns in size will the pollution control equipment take out before they are released as air emissions?

Answer provided by Dave Merriman: I will not have that specific information until we have selected a vendor and a specific emission control technology.

Question 3c: A-7 are guidelines. They are not as rigid as emission guidelines in the US and the UK, however, people in this room need to know that your mythical building, whether it's a mass burn facility or not, will release emissions and they need to know what the emissions will be. The Medical Officer of Health in Halton already suggested that there will be concerns.

Answer provided by Chris Winsor, Facilitator: That information is not available at this time.

QUESTION #4: Asked for a show of hands against it. My question is to Mr. Jim McKay. The poll you will conduct in Clarington, if everyone says no to the facility, will you stop and leave?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: Regardless of this poll, we will provide Region of Durham Council with the data and they will decide what the next step will be.

Comment 4b: My question is, is the decision up to us, the community, do we have the say? We pay the taxes. The politicians need to listen to us. If the facility shouldn't be here, it shouldn't be here.

QUESTION #5: Our biggest initiative is cancer prevention and that is why I am involved in this. This is my question. I do believe that 35 years of reducing waste is the best way to steer us to the precautionary principal. I really believe that industry needs to

take on more responsibility. Can you guarantee that cancer rates will not increase with the installation of this incinerator?

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: The regulatory requirements take into consideration the additional cancer risk. This is a regulatory process that uses calculations that are used in the same process all over the world, including the US and Europe to forecast risks from emissions. Those calculations are regulated and ensure that there is not an increase of more than one in one million additional incidents of cancer. There should not be an increased risk; that is the guarantee you have from the operation of this facility.

Comment 5b: The increase will not be more than one in one million. You have not even picked a technology yet, we don't know the emission contents so there's no guarantee. The answer is vague.

QUESTION #6: Question to Dr. Smith: I noticed that you rewrote a paragraph on residual waste free of plastic. It was originally noted that it would be prudent to ensure that the waste stream to the facility would be free of plastics so that they weren't being burned. It should be noted that nanoparticles are a concern.

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: Dioxins are produced from incineration regardless of what is burned. Limiting plastics is not a pre-requisite of this technology.

Question 6b) No one said the plastics are the source of nanoparticles, they are a product of combustion. The problem is dioxins are produced in waste facilities. Is it safe to burn plastics or flame retardants? Can we remove hazardous products and plastics so that no nanoparticles are created? Is there any way that everything can be removed so that nothing hazardous is burned? Is the technology there to remove dioxins? Your paragraph makes it seem okay to burn plastics.

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: This is a technical issue that is beyond my area of expertise, I will have my colleagues answer.

Answer provided by David Merriman: Research shows that more plastics equals more dioxins being produced in the raw flue gas but there is no increase in the overall emissions after the flue gas cleaning technology is used. The technology chosen should have emissions that are less than the regulatory limit. With respect to particle size, dioxins range from larger sized particles to small ultrafine particles, down to even smaller gas molecules. The vast majority are removed in the flue gas cleaning process.

Question 6c: Is the technology there to remove the nanoparticles that carry the dioxins? You made it look okay to burn plastics. There is a lot that goes into municipal waste. Can we remove the nanoparticles?

Answer provided by David Merriman: More plastics do not mean more pollution. There is no increase in the gases coming out after the flue gas treatment. You do not get more dioxins; the new technology may have less emissions. We will address that issue further, once we know the technology. With regards to the particle size, the total emissions detected include particles and gases. The ultra fine particles are included in the total quantities of dioxins emitted and these values were fed into the Generic Health Risk Assessment.

Question 6d: Can they be removed?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The technology removes the broad range of contaminants across the whole spectrum

Question 6d: The equipment can remove all particles, even dioxins?

Answer provided by David Merriman: No.

QUESTION #7: We may not die of the disease, we will be carriers. We will be unwilling hosts. The number of schools within that radius, we mention a small sample size but there are a lot of people affected. How can the report say that there will be a minimal affect on the population when there is a large number of people affected?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: Based on work and studies done, including the generic risk assessment, any schools that are far enough away will not be affected. What we are doing now is a site-specific risk assessment. We will carry on the work done in the generic health risk assessment and will advise what the actual risks will be, over the next year, using specific information about the technology and knowing the site.

Question 7b: You will find out the exact number, what is sufficient for you to "kill" this project? After the site specific assessment, what would make this a no go?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: I cannot give you a number. We do not make the decisions on the specific site. It is the final decision of the Regional Council and the Province who makes the regulations.

QUESTION #8: This meeting has a lot of not in my backyard flavour. East Gwillimbury (EG) is also a site that was considered during the process to select the site. The East Gwillimbury site is smaller than the Courtice site. How big can this monster get? Will it be oversized for Durham and York's waste and be so big that we will need waste from other municipalities?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The Terms of Reference approved by the Minister of the Environment specifies that the facility is for waste from York and Durham Regions and other non GTA municipalities. It is based on achieving over 60% diversion. The facility size is being designed to accommodate waste from Durham and York. The initial capacity is only 150,000 tonnes per year, the maximum size is 400,000 tonnes per year. We know the size of the thermal treatment equipment and the flue gas cleaning equipment, based on existing facilities of the same size. We came up with the size of the building, the size of roads, etc. based on experience with other facilities that process similar quantities of waste.

Question 8b: Can you give us a number of tonnes of carbon dioxide that we will put into the atmosphere when others are talking about climate change?

Answer provided by David Merriman: An EFW facility will put less greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere than hauling to a remote landfill. Those estimates are in a document on the project website. Please put your concerns/questions in writing, we will reply to you with a specific amount.

Question 8c: What is the more efficient facility in terms of energy? I would suspect EFW is dirtier than coal?

Answer provided by David Merriman: If we look at air emissions per kilowatt hour, Energy from Waste technology is cleaner with respect to greenhouse gas emissions, but it has other traces of contaminants. For greenhouse gases that cause global warming, acid gases and smog precursors, it is cleaner than coal.

QUESTION #9: My children go to school in Courtice. Many studies have been done, many issues analyzed, including environmental issues, air quality, etc. Has any study been done to consider the impact that having this in our backyard will have on property values?

Answer provided by David Merriman: No specific studies have been done to date. There is a facility that processes Peel Regions's waste and it has had no effect on surrounding property values and we do not expect that it will be an issue here either.

Question 9b: Why wasn't it considered?

Answer provided by David Merriman: It is our position that it will not have an effect.

QUESTION #10: There are questions with regards to the EFW facility being close to nuclear facilities. In Europe issues have arisen.

Answer provided by Jim McKay: We are not aware of any conflict as a result of this site being close to the nuclear facility. We would like to receive more specific information from you on this.

QUESTION #11: When you choose the technology, this site may not work. There are a number of technologies that could surface during the RFP process, why chose a site first?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The site is large enough to accommodate any type of technology. We believe any of those technologies can be accommodated.

Question 11b: What is the public involvement in the RFP evaluation?

Answer provided by David Merriman: It is a Request for Qualifications (RFQ), not a Request for Proposals (RFP). Evaluation criteria are published in the RFQ document. We will apply the evaluation criteria to the submissions that come in and we will be recommending vendors that meet those established criteria. There is no proposed public consultation with regards to the technology procurement process beyond the standard public Committee and Council decision making process.

QUESTION #12: How did you arrive at the conclusion that the Clarington 01 site is an advantage with regards to environmental effects? You know that of all the waste treatments thermal treatment has the greatest impact on air sheds. A petition has been signed by 60 area doctors. 43 Durham doctors signed the petition against incineration. We are concerned about air quality. Table 4.1 from the Air Quality Report shows that Clarington 01 is identified as neutral. We have St. Mary's Cement, Highway 401, pollution from industries and the lake effect. The impact on air quality is the greatest effect. It was not given an appropriate rating. The overall conclusion was that Clarington 01 is neutral, this is ridiculous. The studies should have been public before you chose a site. Not taking into account the truck traffic and air quality, how do you arrive at a neutral rating? Did you consider adding truck emissions into the assessment?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: The disadvantage applied to Clarington 01 was due to the lake effect and being close to Highway 401. The disadvantage is offset by the fact that it has the shortest travel distances to the site, the total distance traveled relevant to the other sites and less total emissions than other sites.

Question 12b: You are looking at that site, the trucks will be going to that site, this is a big disadvantage. You cannot take the disadvantage and add it to the advantages and make it neutral. That does not make sense. You do not know where the trucks are coming from. Peterborough, Northumberland or York, they might add more tonnage. The East Gwillimbury site would make more sense.

Answer provided by Jim McKay: We know where the flow will be. We do know exactly how many trucks there will be, where they will be coming from, how big they will be. We know the trucks flowing through transfer stations today, they will still be used. Some of the local trucks will go directly to the facility and through Clarington to the Transfer Station. We know that if York sends more tonnes, the overall impact will still be a disadvantage to the York site if we send all Durham waste to York.

QUESTION #13: My home is within the circle. (Resident read an article "The region's consultant has named the Clarington 01 site near 401/Courtice Road to handle trash....."). It has not gone to Council yet. I printed a job description from the Durham website which indicated they were looking for a Waste Manager. How could you post this before you chose a site? There is no reason for a manager to be employed now if he does not know what he is managing.

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: The Manager's position has been created to do many different functions, primarily to oversee the five landfills within the Region of Durham.

Question 13b: You say that the shortest distance is to Clarington. If you take the East Gwillimbury site, it was protested by the Mayor and they have said that they won't have it. They have Highway 404, three quarters of the garbage comes from them. It's easier for them to go north than to bring it along the 401 to us and to Clarington. Clarington has very little garbage. They have very high diversion rates. How is it the shortest haul from the other dump to our dump when you know the Mayor and Council said no and Newmarket is there, East Gwillimbury is there. They are all wealthy and don't want the dump. I would like to know why you think they can bring all of the garbage from East Gwillimbury to Courtice.

Answer provided by David Merriman: We showed in the detailed study that most of York's waste would come along the 407 and 401. There is a detailed amount of tonnages and if we take all the tonnages and number of kms traveled, the lowest distance is to Clarington 01. The calculations are in the study.

QUESTION #14: I recently visited the Brampton Energy from Waste facility. The facility is only tested yearly for dioxins. I'm concerned that there is no pre-sort. When material is on the curb, it is taken to the tipping floor and then incinerated. What if someone puts out batteries or other hazardous materials? How are you going to prevent this?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The raw garbage may not be pre-processed. The contaminants will be removed through the flue gas cleaning process. It will likely be a condition of approval that certain contaminants will need to be monitored continuously. The concentrations of dioxins are minute. You need to accumulate enough material in

order to detect it. As such, we cannot put a dioxin meter in the stack to continuously monitor their concentrations.

Question 14b: I do not know who to direct my question to. I do not think Brampton should be doing this. The stuff that is coming out of the stack is being burnt. Who do I talk to?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: I agree with you. I have visited facilities in Europe where they have Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) facilities, they separate waste. We can talk further about this after the meeting. We have HHW depots in Durham, special events to encourage residents to bring their hazardous waste materials to the depots and not put them in the garbage.

QUESTION #15: With regards to continuous monitoring, we have seen photos of an EFW facility in Europe. They have continuous dioxin monitoring; we can go on the website and see the results. In Canada, we have facilities in BC and Ontario which are not continuously monitored for dioxins. We should demand continuous monitoring. Will continuous monitoring be part of the RFQ?

Answer provided by David Merriman: You need to sample for a considerable amount of time to yield measurable amounts. We will take this issue into consideration when preparing the RFP.

QUESTION #16: Since most of us live near St Mary's and it is known for smog, why is living near a cement factory not on your list as a disadvantage?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: This would be a disadvantage for the Clarington 04 site, not the Clarington 01 site. We only indicated the advantages and disadvantages for the Clarington 01 and East Gwillimbury sites.

QUESTION #17: Out of all these incinerators developed in Europe, how many are developed on the shores of the source of their drinking water?

Answer provided by David Merriman: Many of these facilities are located on the shores of the lakes and rivers where they use the water for cooling which is cost effective. Many of them are located on rivers or water bodies but I do not have specific details.

Question 17b: They are on fresh water bodies? Or salt water bodies?

Answer provided by David Merriman: Both.

QUESTION #18: Is it the intention to use public funds to fund public consultation and when the facility is built, will it be private or will we pay?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The plan is that the Municipality will own the facility.

QUESTION #19: Clarington had a peer review done on the site selection process. Steven Rowe identified several flaws in selecting sites. If you were to go back and correct all the flaws, would the short list of sites be different? Would there still be sites in Oshawa and Whitby?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: That is what the peer review should do. A number of Steven Rowe's comments were based on misunderstandings which have since been cleared up. If we went back, I don't know without actually going back if the original list of sites would have been longer.

QUESTION #20: The ads for next week's Public Information Session in Orono Times are different than the ads elsewhere. Please confirm the start time of next week's PIS.

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: The next session is on Tuesday, October 9th from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. The formal presentation will begin at 8 p.m.

[Comment added later: This was later amended to 7:00 p.m.]

Question 20b: Reading the peer review that Steven Rowe did, Item 2.2 says that the preferred vendors joining the EA process is important. When was the decision made to separate the site selection process from the technology process and by whom?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: The decision was made about a year ago by the project team.

Question 20c: Why separate the two to fully determine the emissions impact? The RFQ is coming far after the site selection was already addressed. I do not understand the decision to separate the two. You would need both in order to fully understand the impacts of the facility.

Answer provided by Jim McKay: We agree with you and that is why we are not submitting the EA document until we have made the decision on the vendor and know the technology, before we make the submission to the Ministry of the Environment.

Question 20d: What will you be able to provide to the MOE in terms of information from which they could accurately assess this study?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: We are not submitting the EA document to the MOE yet. We are preparing the document, so they can see what the EA will look like and they can start to provide comments. We will make the document available to the MOE, there is no official submission.

Question 20e: If it is preliminary and not specific information and cannot be assessed, why submit it to the MOE?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: No, the MOE is not making a decision. We are not formally submitting this to the MOE, we are making this draft document available to the public, including the MOE. If they want to review it, it will be available.

Comment from Dave Merriman: The technologies are all thermal technologies, and they will all essentially have the same effect.

QUESTION #21: Can you tell me that this facility will affect the environment less than burying waste?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The proposed facility will have fewer impacts on greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming and will produce less acid gases.

QUESTION #22: I have a question about Table 4.1 of the Water Quality Report. The Clarington 01 site is near Lake Ontario and our drinking water. Have water quality impacts been considered for Clarington 01?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The study was based on the flow of surface water off site. More detailed data will be collected and the analysis performed will consider this issue further.

QUESTION #23: (Asked that anyone interested check the website www.Durhamenvironmentwatch.org for information on incineration). What efforts has the Region of Durham taken to divert household hazardous waste and what waste reduction resources are in place? Does this include lobbying the province and federal governments?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: All Durham residents can take their household hazardous materials to our transfer stations at no charge. The closest for Clarington residents would be the Oshawa Transfer Station, which is also open on Saturdays. The Region is promoting special events, promoting diversion, and has an

aggressive blue box program. The Region is now asking residents of Clarington to put garbage out every two weeks; that program will begin shortly. The Region's diversion rates are growing, we have an average of 53% diversion from landfills and this number is growing.

QUESTION #24: A previous speaker mentioned that the time of the meeting was inconvenient. The time of the Council meetings is at 10:00 in the morning when most people are not available. The media, I can't say I'm not impressed by what I read. The job that is posted for Manager is not only for the landfills. It says manage and coordinate an EFW project. I wonder if we are being taken for a ride and if the decision has been made to go ahead. I feel that I am being taken for a ride in this process.

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: Council has not made a decision. The matter is going to Council in December. The job posting for the Manager for the Region of Durham consists of many components. The main part of the job is to manage five old landfill sites within the Region of Durham and one which is still open. We have a lot of perpetual care issues with the landfill and want to ensure it will not pose a concern to the environment. I wanted to ensure that all the experience we may require in the future is incorporated, so that if we move forward with this project, this person will also be responsible for the Energy from Waste facility.

QUESTION #25: When some of you talk about landfills, you talk about old landfills, you don't talk about new stabilized landfills. What incentive will there be for Durham residents to recycle and reuse when we will need to bring other garbage from other areas to feed the monster?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: We all have the incentive to do the right thing. Not everyone recycles but we are trying to promote this. My efforts are to make people put garbage bags out and make it easier to put out their blue boxes.

Answer also provided by David Merriman: We did look at stabilized landfill, which still has odours and gas emissions. Representatives of Council toured Europe and viewed these stabilized landfills and it was not chosen as the preferred technology.

QUESTION #26: With regards to the October 9th meeting, the time allotted for Questions and Answers will obviously not be enough, as you can see tonight. Will you give us more time for Questions and Answers?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: I think if we start the questions and answers at 8:00 p.m., this will be enough time.

Question 26b: This is far too late. Start the presentation earlier, give people more time to ask questions. It should be unlimited time. It's the health of this community. To be short changed on time is unacceptable.

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: Okay, we will start the live presentation at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 9th.

The Facilitator reminded everyone that it was 11:30 p.m.

QUESTION #27: I garden and I eat out of my garden and people are starting to grow and buy food more locally. Was there any consideration given to the trend of growing food locally and possible agricultural impacts?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: The impact on local food sources was modeled through the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment.

Question 27b: Were First Nations people modeled at this location?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: Yes. We modeled this at a generic level. We will put the site specific details into the models. They were all modeled at a reasonable worst case scenario.

QUESTION #28: My concern is about real estate values. There was an incinerator at the end of Cherry Street in Toronto. Food industries only moved in after the facility was closed. There will be effects on property values.

Answer provided by David Merriman: We do not foresee any adverse effects on property values as a result of the proposed facility.

Angelos Bacopoulos thanked all for attending and reminded all that there will be another Public Information Session on October 9th from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., with a live presentation beginning at 7:00 p.m. The session will be held at the Faith United Church, 1778 Nash Road in Courtice. Another PIS will be held on October 23rd in Newmarket.

This session ended at 11:45 p.m.

QUESTIONS THAT WERE NOT ASKED DURING THE Q&A PERIOD ON OCTOBER 3, 2007

- 1) Environment Canada official records for the nearest site indicate general meteorological information. Winds prevail from southwest to west throughout the year, placing a heavily populated area in the path of the emissions. This is not a good idea. Breezes can also cause local concentrations of emissions, an inland site (10-15 miles north of Lake Ontario) would be away from high population areas, considering the prevailing west to east wind circulation. This does not bode well for emissions dispersal at site 01 (also 02-04?)

Answer: Local climate conditions will be taken into consideration when the site-specific dispersion modelling is done.

- 2) Please poll more than 300 people in your October phone poll. This is an important decision that is being made. More Clarington citizens should be polled. The public should have their say on something that will affect their health, the future citizens' health and that will affect air quality levels in Clarington. Thank you for recording my comment.

Answer: Established polling techniques will be used and a sufficient sample size will be selected to yield the desired level of accuracy.

- 2a) If there are air quality issues with the Clarington 01 proposed site, will another site be chosen?

Answer: Air quality is just one of the factors used in selecting a site for the proposed facility. If the facility cannot be shown to be safe, it will not be developed.

- 2b) Is there any other solution other than incineration? For example, placing our garbage in another landfill site or other waste removal/management options?

Answer: Alternative waste management options for residual waste were considered as part of the "Alternatives To" for the Environmental Assessment (EA). These alternatives were examined and discussed with the public through an extensive consultation process. The result of this process was the selection of thermal treatment as the preferred technology for the management of Durham/York's residual waste. The process for arriving at this decision is outlined in the document titled "Evaluation of "Alternatives to" and Identification of the Preferred Residual Processing System". This report is located on the project

website at: <http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/Final-Report-May30-06-no-e-signatures.pdf>.

As stated in Section ES-2 “Methodology for Evaluation of Alternative Systems” in the above mention report, “in determining the scope of alternative systems to be evaluated, the focus was on covering the range of options to recover resources, both materials and energy, from the residual waste stream rather than all possible combinations of the alternative approaches available for consideration. Resource recovery options included recovery of recyclable materials for sale to market, energy from biogas and energy from the thermal treatment of wastes or solid recovered fuel. The intent of the Study is to identify a preferred long-term alternative that maximizes the recovery of resources and minimizes the reliance on landfill as a primary method of disposal.”

Also stated in Section ES-2 “Methodology for Evaluation of Alternative Systems” in the above mention report, “landfill facilities will be assumed to continue to play a role for the disposal of certain materials that cannot be otherwise processed or diverted. A landfill only system, whereby a new landfill site capable of managing all waste that remains after at-source diversion would not meet the purpose of the undertaking, and thus was not considered in this study.”

It should be noted that the term “thermal treatment” is not restricted to incineration. It includes combustion, gasification, pyrolysis and plasma gasification. During the upcoming procurement process, there will be a request for qualifications from vendors of different technologies, following which the preferred technology and vendor will be selected.

- 2c) If toxic air emissions are produced by incinerators, why is this form of thermal/energy from waste technology even being considered?

Answer: There are a small amount of emissions from energy from waste facilities, however studies show that these emissions are at low enough concentrations to be safe. The preferred technology vendor will be selected during the procurement process and must be shown to emit emissions that meet or exceed the A-7 guidelines and other regulatory requirements. In order to be selected, the proposed technology must meet these requirements. If not, the facility will not be developed.

- 2d) For the sake of Clarington children, please consider air quality levels (from both the incinerator and the highway).

Answer: Air emissions from both the proposed facility and the highway will be considered in the site-specific studies.

- 3) What are the two species of concern at the Clarington site that were mentioned by Jim but not named?

Answer: The two species of concern are the Bushy Cinquefoil and an unidentified sensitive species.

- 4a) The Clarington 01 site was determined to be the shortest travel distance. Is this true for waste from York Region?

Answer: Yes, this is true. It is the shortest distance considering the amount of waste being transported.

- 4b) To Dr. Lesbia Smith, you admitted that you are not an expert in the technology aspects. Why are you concluding in your report that dioxins be “dealt with in the emissions control technology” and that “limiting plastics” is not a pre-requisite of the incineration technology?

Answer: Emission control technology removes the vast majority of dioxins from the emissions. Burning plastics in other modern incinerators has not proved to be a problem.

- 5) Why do you require an incineration of waste facility, which creates pollution and why build it so close to residential subdivisions? I strongly oppose these locations. Comment only.

Answer: Durham and York Regions are currently proceeding with an Environmental Assessment (EA) process that has led to these decisions. As mentioned above, alternative waste management options for residual waste were considered as part of the “Alternatives To” for the EA. The result of this process was the selection of thermal treatment as the preferred technology for the management of Durham/York’s residual waste.

- 6) What about the public? There is no access to Lake Ontario, no access from Lakeview Park Oshawa to Cobourg? Where is the quality of life?

Answer: There has been and will continue to be ample opportunity for public involvement in the Environmental Assessment process. Over 60 public meetings have been held to date in Durham and York Regions. Additional public meetings will be held as new information becomes available and future decisions are made.

The proposed location, north of the rail corridor, does not block access to the lake. The proposed facility is not expected to have any impact on the quality of life.

- 7) I have three young girls who play soccer on the fields that are beside the “danger” circle. Will they be completely safe to continue to do so or will I have to pull them out of soccer?

Answer: The Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment indicated that it would be safe to build and operate the proposed facility. The specific issue that you raise will be considered further as part of the site-specific health and ecological risk assessment to be conducted after a preferred site and technology vendor are selected.

- 8) The Consultant showed a slide stating that there were no woodlots on the York site but then went on to state that a possible disadvantage of the site was consideration for the red shouldered hawks which were present. This is only a woodland species as far as breeding nesting and food gathering. This is not only misinformation but I feel it is designed to attempt to create the impression that important matters such as this are being considered.

Answer: Although no habitat exists on-site, the necessary habitat is present on neighbouring sites, and the species is known to exist in the area.

- 9a) Why would we trust a process that includes Hill and Knowlton staff since Hill and Knowlton propagated the lie in the past that babies were taken out of incubators by Iraqi troops. The CBC program Fifth Estate proved this and won an Emmy Award for it.

Answer: Categorically, Hill and Knowlton did not fabricate information during the Gulf War to influence public opinion in favour of US intervention against Iraq.

- 9b) Hill and Knowlton is a public relations firm who will provide the message their client pays for, despite the suggestion of being unbiased.

Answer: The sole role of the Hill and Knowlton consultant was to provide professional facilitation services for the public meeting(s) here specified, in accordance with the universally recognized best practices of facilitation, including, and demonstrably, remaining impartial to the outcome of the project or topics discussed.

- 9c) Hill and Knowlton is directly responsible for causing the US to get involved in the first Gulf War under false pretences.

Answer: Categorically, Hill and Knowlton did not fabricate information during the Gulf War to influence public opinion in favour of US intervention against Iraq.

- 9d) How is a public affairs representative different from a public relations firm?

Answer: Many people use these terms interchangeably, however, strictly speaking, a public affairs practitioner works with clients who want to communicate with governments, and a public relations representative works with clients who want to communicate with the public.

- 9e) Why did your moderator make jokes re: Earth, Wind and Fire references if he was supposedly unbiased?

Answer: The reference was in regard to a questioner who had greatly exceeded the agreed upon timeframe and number of questions agreed upon (agreement sought and obtained by the facilitator from the public in attendance prior to the commencement of the Q&A portion of the session). After the questioner had asked numerous questions about air quality, reading from a long list she then announced she had a series of questions about a totally different subject area. In an attempt to use humour to diffuse tension, the facilitator said "I can imagine that you have many questions about Earth, Wind and Fire too (after Water, the remaining of the classical four elements) and then gently reminded her of the rules the group had agreed upon and invited her to cede the microphone to another waiting individual and then rejoin the line, where she was free to ask her next series of questions.

- 10) Since we live beside St. Mary's Cement/ Blue Circle and it is a well known fact that cement factories are the number one cause of smog, why is this fact not considered a known disadvantage or a potential disadvantage? The wind does not stay within your 5 km boundary, does it?

Answer: The presence of other sources of air emissions such as St. Mary's Cement will be considered in the site-specific air modelling to be undertaken following the selection of the preferred site and technology vendor.

- 11) Since it has already been established that St. Mary's/Blue Circle pollutes, how will you guarantee that the moisture released by the new plant into the air won't mix with the particulate pollution from St. Mary's? If it does mix how will you

prevent St. Mary's pollution from falling on us now that it has been mixed with your emissions?

Answer: The presence of other sources of air emissions such as St. Mary's Cement will be considered in the site-specific air modelling to be undertaken following the selection of the preferred site and technology vendor.

- 12) Since we have a vested interest in this project as residents and taxpayers, why can't we have a referendum on the site? I ask this question since the Zurich plant has been mentioned and Zurich uses direct democracy to make some decisions. If the citizens of Zurich had the opportunity to vote on it, why can't we?

Answer: Decisions will be made by Regional Council who are responsible for the delivery of required infrastructure such as the proposed facility.

The Zurich plant was developed in accordance with the procedure and requirements of that jurisdiction. The proposed facility will be developed in accordance with the requirements of the Province of Ontario and Durham and York Regions.

- 13) Why is York even being asked what they think about the site since the site is not in York? How is their input different than if we were asked if we should continue to dump our garbage in Michigan?

Answer: York Region remains an equal partner with Durham in the Environmental Assessment (EA) (i.e. site selection) portion of this study and therefore has retained its decision-making power during the EA process. York Region is participating in the project to obtain the disposal capacity it needs in the short-term and to ensure it has the option of acquiring additional capacity in the future if necessary to meet demand. It is recognized that residual waste management planning and implementation is a lengthy process. York's participation in this long-term planning project benefits the entire Region by ensuring the availability of a residual waste management solution well into the future.

- 14) Why can't we cross reference your studies with previous health studies that have been completed that show our area is a health problem hot spot? Since it is a health hot spot why would we add to the existing load even if the studies that you are using that use today's knowledge show it will have a neutral impact? What if future studies prove that there is a negative impact?

Answer: A risk assessment is a mathematical-based exercise to determine potential health risk; therefore the health-based studies referred to would not be

directly comparable, unless they were also a risk assessment. The results of our study however would be best cross-referenced to two previously published risk assessments, one by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and one by Cantox Environmental Inc. (now Intrinsic Environmental Inc.).

In 1999, the MOE published a report entitled "*Environmental Risks of Municipal Non-Hazardous Waste Landfilling and Incineration*" (MOE, 1999). This report concluded that no significant human or ecological effects would be likely in a typical suburban community located near an incinerator. In addition, Cantox Environmental Inc conducted a human health risk assessment on the proposed expansion of the KMS Peel, Inc. Brampton, Energy-From-Waste Facility (Cantox, 2000). This facility is a 150,000 tonne per year (t/y) municipal solid waste thermal treatment EFW facility currently operating in the Region of Peel. Overall, the report concluded that there would unlikely be any significant health effects of residents in the local area

If the Durham and York Councils decide to go ahead with this project, a site-specific human health and ecological risk assessment will need to be conducted. Note, based on the generic risk assessment already completed, there is no unacceptable health or ecological impact to the area from the proposed project.

If a site-specific risk assessment were to find a negative impact from the site and to the surrounding community, it would be flagged and mitigative measures would have to be put in place to remove any unacceptable risk resulting from the facility. If an unacceptable risk cannot be removed as a result of the proposed facility, then the MOE will not approve the operation of the facility.

If the facility is built and future studies prove that there is a negative impact on the community, then at that time the municipal, regional and the provincial governments will have to make a decision whether to modify the facility and keep it open or to close it.

References:

MOE (Ontario Ministry of the Environment), 1999. Environmental Risk of Municipal Non-Hazardous Waste Landfilling and Incineration. Standard development branch, Environmental sciences and standards division. Ontario. ISBN 0-7778-8959-5

Cantox, 2000. Human Health Risk Assessment for the Proposed Expansion of the KMS Peel , Inc. Brampton, Energy-From-Waste Facility. Cantox Environmental Inc., Mississauga, ON.

- 15a) What are the guidelines for the European Air Emissions? They seem to be missing off the documentation showing air emissions from state of the art

facilities with comparison of Guideline A-7 values. Why were the European guidelines not indicated as this is where the Councillors traveled to view the facilities?

Answer: A summary of the European Union (EU) air emission limits along with the corresponding Ontario and US limits is provided in the "Facts and Info" section of the project website and is located at:
http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/study/refrence/Emission_Limits_Comparison_July-7-06_and_EFW.pdf.

15b) If any of the speakers tonight lived within 5 km east of the preferred site, would you think it was a good location?

Answer: Yes, we would.

16a) Will the garbage be sorted before incineration?

Answer: It is possible that the waste will be sorted before thermal treatment, however it will depend on the specific technology selected through the procurement process. Regardless of the technology selected, the primary emphasis will be on educating people to sort and manage their waste correctly through the proper use of the Blue Bin, Green Bin and Household Hazardous Waste programs.

16b) Should the EFW facility be voted down by local and regional Councils, will the next step be for the Provincial/Federal government to be responsible for determining where the garbage should go?

Answer: Durham Region, rather than the local council, has the responsibility for managing the Region's solid waste. If the proposed facility is not developed then Durham Region will have to find another way of managing its waste.

17a) I have an environmental disease from overuse of antibiotics as a child. I have spent thousands of dollars to get back to health. I have sensitivities. How far away should I move? How many miles?

Answer: Based on the current generic human health and ecological risk assessment, receptors (i.e., residents, animals, etc) directly positioned at the maximum point of impingement (i.e., approximately 300 metres from the facility) have no unacceptable health risks and therefore there is no need for a resident to

move away from this facility. This will be confirmed in the upcoming site-specific studies.

- 17b) Has a study been done to show the number of people who are in poor health now and how this will affect them, including the elderly, children, pregnant women and babies?

Answer: Currently we are unaware of any public health study being conducted in either Durham or York Regions.

- 18a) I commute from Courtice to Toronto. With the added truck traffic, are there plans to add lanes to the 401 from Oshawa to Ajax?

Answer: The additional truck traffic associated with the proposed facility is very small in relation to the overall quantity of traffic on Highway 401. As such, there are no plans to add additional lanes.

- 18b) I live in the Bloor/Prestonvale area. My daughter attends Dr. MacGuillvray Public School. I'm worried about air quality in my neighbourhood especially with winds flowing from the incinerator. How can you guarantee that air quality will be safe? What is considered safe?

With regards to agriculture areas, how much impact will there be on local crops?

Will emissions be absorbed into Lake Ontario? Will it be creating toxic water?

Answer: These concerns, including potential impacts on local air quality, local crops and surface water, will be addressed through the site-specific health risk assessment. The facility will not be developed if it poses an unacceptable risk.

- 19) I am extremely concerned that respected scientists and environmental groups such as the David Suzuki Foundation are firmly opposed to incineration. Would you please give me your comments?

Answer: Most environmentalists would like our society to collectively change our consumption patterns so that garbage is no longer created. This is a noble objective but it does not appear to be happening currently. Waste material generation rates have not been decreasing in recent years. Durham Region does not have the ability to change societal consumption patterns but it has been lobbying, along with other stakeholders, to effect such change. Durham Region has the responsibility of managing the waste that residents generate and thermal

treatment was selected as the preferred method of doing this. That being said, Durham and York Regions currently have very aggressive diversion programs in place, and have ongoing plans for future programs, which will help to reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility. Zero Waste initiatives including recycling, composting and diversion of household hazardous waste have been investigated as part of this project. The Regions will continue to invest in, encourage and promote these diversion programs. At source household hazardous waste and special waste programs are currently being developed and will also be promoted in the hopes of increasing public involvement. Efforts to expand and improve these programs by Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO) are presently ongoing. Extended producer responsibility and more stringent packaging laws are also important issues that may be looked into further in the future, however they were not included in the scope of this project.

- 20) Considering that tours were taken in Europe, would they approve of this site being so close to the nuclear plant? Not US standards.

Answer: Based on the experience of the Project Team, we see no reason why they would not approve such a location for an energy from waste facility.

- 21) Is it the intention of our municipal government to provide public funds to finance the consultation process and the building of this facility and then hand it over to a private for profit company and trust that profit will take a back seat to the concerns expressed by our citizens?

Answer: Plans are for the public sector to own the facility and for the private sector to operate it in accordance with the governance provided by the public sector.