

| Criterion | | Yes | No | Additional Information |
|--|---|-----|----|---|
| 1.0 Surface Water and Groundwater | | | | |
| 1.1 | Cause negative effects on surface water quality, quantities or flow? | | X | No change to surface water from existing conditions are anticipated because of the proposed increase in capacity to 160,000 tonnes. |
| 1.2 | Cause negative effects on groundwater quality, quantity or movement? | | X | No change to groundwater conditions are anticipated because of the project. |
| 1.3 | Cause significant sedimentation or soil erosion or shoreline or riverbank erosion on or offsite? | | X | No sedimentation, soil erosion or shoreline or riverbank erosion are anticipated because of the project. |
| 1.4 | Cause negative effects of surface or groundwater from accidental spills or releases to the environment? | | X | No increased risk of spills or accidental releases to surface or groundwater are anticipated because of this project. Total haulage distance of wastes is reduced in comparison to disposal during bypass conditions. |
| 2.0 Land | | | | |
| 2.1 | Cause negative effects on residential, commercial, institutional or other sensitive land uses within 500 metres from the site boundary? | | X | No negative effects are anticipated because of the change in permitted processing capacity. |
| 2.2 | Not be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, provincial land use or resource management plans? | | X | The DYEC is in a designated employment area and the land use continues to be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement as revised in 2014. The MECP's "Reducing Litter and Waste in Our Communities: Discussion Paper" identifies thermal treatment in the form of energy from waste as a potential opportunity to recover the value of resources in waste. |
| 2.3 | Be inconsistent with municipal land use policies, plans and zoning bylaws (including municipal setbacks)? | | X | No changes to land use are proposed as part of the throughout increase. |
| 2.4 | Use lands not zoned as industrial, heavy industrial or waste disposal? | | X | The Social/Culture Assessment Technical Study completed in 2009 confirmed the lands are zoned employment/light industrial areas which is compatible with the DYEC activity. |
| 2.5 | Use hazard lands or unstable lands subject to erosion? | | X | No changes to land use are proposed as part of the throughout increase. |
| 2.6 | Cause negative effects related to the remediation of contaminated land? | | X | Not applicable |

| Criterion | | Yes | No | Additional Information |
|--------------------------------|--|-----|----|---|
| 3.0 Air and noise | | | | |
| 3.1 | Cause negative effects on air quality due to emissions (for parameter such as temperature, thermal treatment exhaust flue gas volume, NO2, SO2, O2, opacity, HCl, TSP, or other contaminants)? | X | | The potential for environmental effects on air quality exists because of stack emissions. The profile and dispersion characteristics of the stack may change because of the increase in facility throughput. |
| 3.2 | Cause negative effects from the emission of GHG (CO2, CO and methane)? | | X | Additional CO and CO2 emissions at the facility are expected with increase waste tonnage to 160,000. However, these additional carbon emissions will be less than the emissions that would result if the same tonnage were transported and disposed of elsewhere, including methane generation in landfills as is currently occurring. |
| 3.3 | Cause negative effects from the emission of dust or odour? | | X | Waste will continue to be off-loaded in a closed building under negative air pressure. There is minimal dust from truck traffic and odour as trucks drive around the exterior of the site. Any odour is like that from a garbage truck on a residential street. All driving surfaces are paved minimizing dust creation from all vehicles at the site. |
| 3.4 | Cause negative effects from the emission of noise? | | X | No noticeable increase in noise from additional truck traffic or additional volume of waste processed. |
| 3.5 | Cause light pollution from trucks or other operational activities at the site? | | X | No additional lighting will be placed on site. |
| 4.0 Natural Environment | | | | |
| 4.1 | Cause negative effects on rare or threatened or endangered species of flora or fauna or their habitat? | | X | The 2009 Natural Environment Assessment for the original Environmental Assessment established mitigation measures to ensure that facility construction and operations do not have unacceptable adverse impacts on wildlife. These mitigation measures remain in effect and will not be impacted by the proposed increase in waste tonnage to 160,000 tonnes per year. |
| 4.2 | Cause negative effects on protected natural areas such as, ANSIs, ESAs or other significant natural areas? | | X | No changes on protected natural areas such as ANSIs ESAs or other significant natural areas are anticipated as the result of the project. |
| 4.3 | Cause negative effects on designated wetlands? | | X | No net effects are anticipated with the increase in waste tonnage to 160,000 tonnes per year. |
| 4.4 | Cause negative effects on wildlife habitat, populations, corridors or movement? | | X | No negative effects on wildlife habitat, populations, corridors or movements are anticipated because of the project. |

| Criterion | | Yes | No | Additional Information |
|---------------------------|---|-----|----|--|
| 4.5 | Cause negative effects on fish or their habitat, spawning, movement or environmental conditions (e.g. water temp, turbidity)? | | X | The 2009 Natural Environment Assessment for the original Environmental Assessment determined there were no permanent watercourses on site and no significant net effects on aquatic species were anticipated. No changes to the assessment are anticipated because of the project. |
| 4.6 | Cause negative effects on locally important or valued ecosystems or vegetation? | | X | No negative impacts on locally important or valued ecosystems or vegetation are anticipated because of the project. |
| 4.7 | Increase bird hazards within the area that could impact surrounding land uses (e.g. airports)? | | X | No increase to bird hazards within the area are anticipated because of the project. |
| 5.0 Resources | | | | |
| 5.1 | Result in practices inconsistent with waste studies and/or waste diversion targets (e.g., result in final disposal of materials subject to diversion programs)? | | X | Facility operates in accordance with the EA/ECA. All tonnage received is post diversion materials. The additional requested tonnage is still subject to waste diversion requirements. Additional capacity is not expected to decrease diversion as the waste is already being generated – but is currently by-passed to another waste disposal facility. |
| 5.2 | Result in generation of energy that cannot be captured and utilized? | | X | Additional tonnage will result in additional energy generation that will be sold to the provincial grid or used for parasitic load power. |
| 5.3 | Be located a distance from required infrastructure? | | X | Facility sited at an appropriate distance from waste sources with access to supporting infrastructure. No location issues are anticipated for the project. |
| 5.4 | Cause negative effects on the use of Canada Land Inventory Class 1-3, specialty crop or locally significant agricultural lands? | | X | Site is located within an energy business park adjacent to Class 1 agricultural lands. No changes to land use are proposed to accommodate the processing increase. |
| 5.5 | Cause negative effects on existing agricultural production? | | X | No impacts on existing agricultural production are anticipated as the result of the throughput increase. |
| 6.0 Socio-Economic | | | | |
| 6.1 | Cause negative effects on neighborhood or community character? | | X | The Social Cultural Assessment Technical Study completed in 2009 concluded the facility would have minimal to no overall net effects on the community character of the area. No change to community character anticipated as the result of the processing capacity expansion. |
| 6.2 | Result in aesthetic impacts (e.g. visual and litter impacts)? | | X | No changes to the facility structure or visual impacts are associated with the project. No additional litter is likely to result from the processing expansion. |
| 6.3 | Cause negative effects on local businesses, institutions or public facilities? | | X | No impacts to local businesses, institutions or public facilities are anticipated as part of the processing increase. |

| Criterion | | Yes | No | Additional Information |
|-----------|--|-----|----|---|
| 6.4 | Cause negative effects on recreation, cottaging or tourism? | | X | No impacts to recreation or tourism are anticipated as the result of a processing increase. |
| 6.5 | Cause negative effects related to increases in the demands on community services and infrastructure? | | X | No changes or negative impacts related to demands on community services or infrastructure are anticipated because of the capacity increase. |
| 6.6 | Cause negative effects on the economic base of a municipality or community? | | X | The Economic Assessment Technical Study Report completed in 2009 determined the facility would have a net positive impact on the economic base of the community. The proposed increase in throughput to 160,000 tonnes will have no impact on the local economic base. Increased capacity increases DYEC efficiency and electrical and metal revenue. Cost savings are anticipated as the result of reducing the need for waste bypass. |
| 6.7 | Cause negative effects on local employment and labour supply? | | X | No change in local employment is anticipated with the increased tonnage. |
| 6.8 | Cause negative effects related to traffic? | | X | Approximately two additional vehicles per day will visit the site because of the increase in waste tonnage. This level of traffic already occurs during periods when the facility is operating at full capacity. No negative effects are anticipated because of the throughput increase. |
| 6.9 | Be located within 8km of an aerodome/airport reference point? | X | | There is a heliport located at the Bowmanville Hospital, although air ambulance service is currently suspended to the facility, it is anticipated that a relocated facility will be established in the future. However, as no exterior changes are being made to the existing facility, and all waste handling will continue to occur indoors, no impacts are anticipated. |
| 6.10 | Interfere with flight paths due to the construction of facilities with height (stacks)? | | X | No increase in stack height and no buildings are being constructed with the increased capacity. |
| 6.11 | Cause negative effects on public health and safety? | | X | The Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment completed in 2009 determined that overall the chemical emissions from the facility would not lead to any adverse health risks to residents, farmers or other receptors at the 140,000 tonnes per year operating scenario and minimal risk during upset conditions at the 400,000 tonne per year operating scenario. Additional modelling will be completed in the next stage of the screening process to confirm that no negative impacts will result from the tonnage increase to 160,000 tonnes per year. |

| Criterion | | Yes | No | Additional Information |
|---------------------------------|---|-----|----|---|
| 7.0 Heritage and Culture | | | | |
| 7.1 | Cause negative effects on heritage buildings, structures or sites, archaeological sites or areas of archaeological importance, or cultural heritage landscapes? | | X | The increased processing if approved will occur within the existing structure on site, no changes to land, or new construction will occur because of the project. No impacts to cultural, heritage or archaeological sites are anticipated. |
| 7.2 | Cause negative effects on scenic or aesthetically pleasing landscapes or views? | | X | The increased processing if approved will occur within the existing structure on site, no changes to land, or new construction will occur because of the project. No impacts to visual appearance of the area are anticipated. |
| 8.0 Aboriginal | | | | |
| 8.1 | Cause negative effects on land, resources, traditional activities or other interests of Aboriginal communities? | | X | No impacts to land, resources, traditional activities or other interest of Indigenous communities are anticipated as the result of the increased processing capacity to 160,000 tonnes. Consultation and engagement with Indigenous communities will occur to determine if any concerns related to the project exist. |
| 9.0 Other | | | | |
| 9.1 | Result in the creation of non-hazardous waste materials requiring disposal? | | X | No additional waste materials are generated because of the project. The facility will continue to process collected wastes prior to their disposal, with any residuals being sent to landfill for disposal. |
| 9.2 | Result in the creation of hazardous waste materials requiring disposal? | | X | There will continue to be minimal creation of hazardous waste because of the facility operations. Bottom and treated fly ash are both managed as nonhazardous wastes. |
| 9.3 | Cause any other negative environmental effects not covered by the criteria outlined above? | | X | No other effects have been identified. |