

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
1	July 1, 2016 July 5, 2016 July 6, 2016	Project website email	<p>Where are the Source Test Parameters and Limits for May, 2016? I see the November results but nothing for May. Shouldn't those results be posted on the Emissions page, whether passed or failed? We're now into July and no posting. We depend on timely and transparent result posting. Thanks.</p> <p>Thank you, but now only the May Source Test Parameters are listed (glad to see they are there). Where are the October 2015 source test parameters - will they be listed as well, or are they deleted once the next ones are available?</p> <p>It would be very helpful to see them listed or be able to go back to other testing dates as you can with the hourly emissions data.</p> <p>Will it be possible to show all stack test results, instead of just the most recent ones?</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Thank you for your reply. It would be very helpful to have all results available to the public.</p>	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Thanks you for your interest in the Durham York Energy Centre. Please be advised that the most recent stack test results from May 2016 are now available on the website.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Project Team</p> <p>Good morning [REDACTED] The October 2015 results will be posted. We have a solution in place with IT that we are testing out. As soon as that is complete we will have the older results posted. The goal is to have all results available in search option.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Project Team</p>	July 5, 2016 July 6, 2016	LW
2	July 18, 2016	Project web email	When do you expect to have boiler 1 back on line? Thanks	<p>Good Morning [REDACTED]</p> <p>Thank you for your email regarding the Durham York Energy Centre.</p> <p>The phase one scope of work was detailed in the Abatement Plan, which was prepared by Covanta, and currently being reviewed by the MOECC-Technical Group.</p> <p>The phase one technical report is a part of the ongoing investigation and diagnostics of the boiler #1 dioxins and furans exceedance. Once the MOECC is satisfied with the status of the phase one activities, and that all points of clarification are adequately addressed, a decision on the start-up of boiler #1 is anticipated. At this point, the Regions cannot anticipate what the timeline will be for the restart of boiler #1.</p>	July 21, 2016	DL

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>The Abatement Plan phase two investigation and diagnostics will include further testing, inspections and monitoring of several operating parameters which will provide additional insight into the conditions that created the dioxins and furans exceedance. The fulfillment of the abatement plan will only be achieved with the successful completion of a new source test.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Project Team</p>		
3	July 19, 2016	Project web email	<p>There seems to be an oily substance on the surface of my above ground pool. Could that be from the EFW emissions? I live in north east Bowmanville. We have a special sponge that absorbs oil or scum in the pool skimmer and it is covered in a black oily substance and we can see oil on the surface of the water. In past years we never saw this on/in our pool. There is no new construction in our area, established subdivision.</p> <p>With all the write ups in the local newspapers about the EFW facility not passing emissions tests it makes me wonder what is in our air shed now that we have a garbage incinerator in Clarington.</p> <p>Is there any danger to our health?</p> <p>I have a small vegetable garden and I am now concerned about what might have fallen from the sky onto my garden.</p> <p>Thanks for taking time to answer my questions.</p>	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>Please be advised that your questions have been received and are currently being addressed by the DYEC project team. Once prepared, we will provide you with a detailed response to your questions.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Project Team</p> <p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>This email is in response to your email sent to the Durham York Energy Centre on Tuesday, July 19, 2016.</p> <p>Human health and the environment are primary concerns for both Durham and York Regions. As such, the Regions have undertaken a series of detailed studies on air emissions, health, traffic, noise, ground and surface water to assess any potential effects from the DYEC to ensure that residents and the environment are protected. Results of the Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment studies in the Environmental Assessment concluded that the DYEC would not lead to any adverse health risks to the public or environment.</p>	<p>July 21, 2016</p> <p>July 22, 2016</p>	DL

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>In Operations, the DYEC follows strict monitoring and compliance requirements identified and mandated by our Environmental Compliance Approval. Ambient air monitoring and soil monitoring results indicate that the facility is consistently well below emissions standards and present no adverse environmental or human health effects. Therefore, the operation of the DYEC does not pose any significant risk to your health by eating vegetables from your garden and is unlikely to cause any adverse effects on the water in your pool.</p> <p>Ambient Air Monitoring:</p> <p>Off-site, Ambient air (surrounding air quality) monitoring is conducted at four different locations located upwind, downwind and inside the property line and will be monitored for a minimum of three consecutive years from commencement of operations. Results are reported back to the Region through bi-weekly, quarterly and annual reports. Quarterly and annual reports are submitted to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC).</p> <p>Soil Monitoring:</p> <p>Three soil monitoring location are linked to the ambient air monitoring locations and are sampled once per year for the first three years of operation, and every three years thereafter. Results of the soil sampling are submitted to the MOECC within one month of completion of each soil testing event.</p> <p>In accordance with our operating conditions, all documents required to be submitted to the MOECC are available on the facility website. Please visit www.durhamyorkwaste.ca for more information and to review reports at your leisure. The Region's Health Department receive copies of all monitoring results and are members of the EFW Advisory Committee</p>		

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				(EFWAC) so they are kept current with the facility operation and emissions. Please feel free to let us know if you have further questions. Regards, Project Team		
4	July 20, 2016	Project web email	I see that a 'power outage' caused a glitch in daily reporting on the burner. No numbers for Thursday, Saturday or Sunday, but for whatever reason, Friday is shown! This seems rather suspect. Did the power outage cause or create any additional problems in the control room? Did this outage cause any problems in operations other than the website?	Good Afternoon [REDACTED], Thank you for your email regarding the Durham York Energy Centre. A power outage occurred during the evening of Friday, July 15, 2016 during a routine test of the Regional Headquarters back-up diesel generator. As a result of this outage and subsequent surge, the server that connects the data files to the website for the DYEC was damaged and had to be re-entered to allow the data to be posted. No data was lost and all data is now available on the website. The power outage at the Regional Headquarters building had no effect on the operations at the DYEC. Regards, Project Team	July 20, 2016	DL
5	July 19, 2016	Project web email	Hello Durham/York Waste, My office has a lot of bound notebooks which we would like incinerated in order to maintain confidentiality of the documents, which although have no value, we would like that they be destroyed. We have been looking for a pay for incineration option. Would you be able to provide such a service? They are old lab notebooks which are bound, and have inserts of film, thermal paper from instrument documentation, etc. so shredding them is not feasible as they are	Good Afternoon, Thank you for your email regarding the Durham York Energy Centre. The Durham York Energy Centre is Durham Region's primary long-term disposal option for waste and only processes the household waste remaining after Durham and York Regions' aggressive composting, recycling and reuse programs.	July 20, 2016	DL

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>contractors.</p> <p>2. By definition under Regulation 347 – General, Waste Management, Fly Ash is considered hazardous unless the operator can prove otherwise through a process known as “leachate toxicity testing”. The Fly Ash produced at the DYEC is treated and tested onsite, and is confirmed to be non-hazardous, prior to disposal in landfill. Our facility Ash Testing Plan can be found at the following link: https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/Assets/Documents/FacilityManagement/Ash/Ash_Sampling_and_Testing_Protocol.pdf</p> <p>3. Last year the facility processed 100,792 tonnes of waste. From the waste processed, approximately 9,317 tonnes of fly ash was produced. The weight of the fly ash that is sent away for disposal includes three main components, besides fly ash: (1) cement, (2) pozzolan, and (3) water. We mix these reagents with the fly ash to micro-encapsulate the material, essentially turning the hazardous fly ash into an inert cement-like material. This accounts for much of the weight of the fly ash that is shipped for disposal.</p> <p>4. Fly Ash produced at the DYEC is disposed of in a regular, non-hazardous landfill. As per the Ash Testing Plan, residual material is regularly tested to ensure it meets the leachate toxicity testing requirements.</p> <p>5. The facility has a contract for the disposal of residual materials produced at the DYEC. The contract details cannot be shared publicly. The price per tonne for the disposal of fly ash does include transportation, however the cost per tonne cannot be shared publicly.</p> <p>If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us again.</p>		

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				Regards, Project Team		
7	July 27, 2016	Project web email	Can you please inform me where normal waste deliveries scheduled for June 21 and 22 were stored, what was the amount, and have such inventories since been delivered and disposed of at the DYEC?	<p>Dear, [REDACTED],</p> <p>Thank you for your inquiry regarding municipal solid waste received at the Durham York Energy Centre (DYEC) on June 21 and 22, 2106. All waste received at the DYEC is brought into the tipping hall and stored in the waste storage bunker.</p> <p>Due to the ongoing outage of Unit 1, we did not receive any waste at the facility on June 21 or June 22, 2016. During this two-day period waste was by-passed to other destinations for processing. Covanta Niagara, NY received 82, 72 tonnes and Walker Environmental in Thorold, ON received 860.04 tonnes.</p> <p>Condition (8) (a) of our Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) requires that we process waste within six (6) days from its receipt at the site. With one unit down, we are only able to process waste at fifty percent of our normal operating capacity. To manage the level of waste in the storage bunker, and to remain in compliance with our ECA, we are sometimes required to bypass waste to other facilities for processing. Waste bypassed to other facilities is processed at those facilities, and does not return to the DYEC for processing.</p> <p>Should you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>	July 27, 2016	JB

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
Total Project Team Inquiries this month (project web email/telephone):				7		
Total Covanta Inquiries this month:				0		
Total Council/ Committee Inquiries this month:				0		
Total Durham Call Centre Inquiries this month (separate attachment):				0		
Total Inquiries from York this month:				0		
Total Inquiries from previous months:				9		
Total Inquiries in 2016:				16		

Complaints						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
1	July 17, 2016	Project web email	<p>On Thursday, July 14, and again on Saturday, July 16 (today), the Emissions Data page on the durhamyorkwaste.ca website says "CEMS data currently unavailable. Please try again later or email us at: info@durhamyorkwaste.ca."</p> <p>Normally, the page will disclose (for each boiler) compliance and operational data, and if no data then we will see "Boiler offline", or IDA (Insufficient Data Available) or CAL (Analyzer in calibration test) or ERR (Calibration error) - with no emissions numbers/data in those boxes, but numbers in the rest.</p> <p>Thursday, Saturday and today, Sunday, there is nothing at all. Are both boilers offline? Is Boiler #2 on or off line? Is it running at all, and if so, why are there no numbers? There is nothing giving an explanation on the website, and I believe that reporting of these numbers is <u>required</u> under the ECA. This is part of "transparency".</p> <p>Due to the facility track record to date, since even prior to commissioning, there is reason for concern, and I have questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Why is there no emissions data at all for July 14 and July 16 with the message "CEMS data currently unavailable."</u> This is something I haven't seen since the months leading to Acceptance Testing, which began September 28th. <u>Why are there so many hours with IDA or CAL or ERR on different days, even with Boiler 2?</u> This is not new. <u>What exactly does IDA mean? WHY is there Insufficient Data Available so often? What are causes for IDA?</u> <u>Why are numbers for NOx so close to the limit</u>, especially with the highly touted (by Covanta) VLN (very low NOx) system (see July 9, 2016 for example)? <u>Does the VLN system cause other problems</u>, such as high CO and higher 	<p>Good Afternoon [REDACTED],</p> <p>Thank you for your email regarding the Durham York Energy Centre (DYEC). Please be advised that your questions have been received and are currently being addressed by the DYEC project team. Once prepared, we will provide you with a detailed response to your questions.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>DYEC Project Team</p> <p>Good Morning [REDACTED],</p> <p>Thank you for your email regarding the Durham York Energy Centre (DYEC) dated July 17, 2016. A response to each of your questions has been provided below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why is there no emissions data at all for July 14 and July 16 with the message "CEMS data currently unavailable? A power outage occurred during the evening of Friday, July 15, 2016 during a routine test of the Regional Headquarters' back-up diesel generator. As a result of this outage and subsequent surge, the server that connects the data files to the website for the DYEC was damaged and had to be repaired to allow the data to be re-posted. No data was lost and all data is now available on the website. The power outage at the Regional Headquarters building had no effect on the operations at the DYEC – the data from the DYEC is sent to Headquarters and handled through our corporate IT system for posting on the Regional website. <p>In addition, Covanta experienced several network issues in July that interrupted data transmission. When this occurs the website displays the "CEMS data currently unavailable</p>	<p>July 19, 2016</p> <p>August 10, 2016</p>	DL/LW

Complaints						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
			<p>Dioxin/Furan production?</p> <p>6. <u>Why is emissions data not reportable during "upset conditions"?</u> Why does MoECC not require it, and since the data is collected, and why do the Owners not require or request it? Production of dioxins and furans during upset conditions are expected to rapidly increase outside a window of good-combustion conditions, such as start-up and shut-down, even when using auxiliary fuels to bring the facility to operational temperature. This seems to be happening very frequently at the DYEC, and remember, toxic pollutants such as dioxins and furans, mercury, chromium, and others are persistent, bio accumulative, and toxic chemicals. Since they are persistent and bio accumulative, ALL emissions are important and we are exposed to ALL emissions, not only during times of relatively steady-state, relatively normal conditions. Whether reported or not, those toxic pollutants are still bio accumulating in the soil, in our food stock, in our bodies. The particulate and dioxins/furans carried by PM are still breathable, as are other airborne pollutants.</p> <p>7. Emissions during start up and shutdown are also likely to be different in nature from those during regular burning of waste. There are process variations during normal operation, which is why constant monitoring and CEMS units are so important. <u>What is the status of the LTSS for dioxins/furans?</u> We need to have more, not less, monitoring.</p> <p>8. <u>Where is the list of dates of start-up/shut-downs</u> or upset conditions which have occurred at the DYEC since start-up, requested some time ago? <u>Will it be available soon?</u></p> <p>I am sending this email to info@durhamyorkwaste.ca as a formal inquiry/complaint, in order to receive answers to these questions. I am also sending to MoECC as there are questions relating to their oversight and requirements of the Abatement Plan under review as well.</p> <p>I have included Regional Council so that you may be aware of what is going on at the facility, as the Region is the majority owner and has certain responsibilities to the residents of Durham, and Clarington in particular. I realize that some of you have</p>	<p>message" because it has not received data to display. No data was lost during this period and a re-posting process is being completed for the days in question.</p> <p>2. Why are there so many hours with IDA or CAL or ERR on different days, even with Boiler 2? Continuous emissions monitoring system (CEMS) equipment requires regular calibration and maintenance. These activities result in CAL, IDA or ERR codes posted to the website. All CEMS equipment goes through a daily calibration test whereby each CEMS unit is put through a test against a standard calibration gas to ensure the CEM unit is still within the accuracy range required by the MOECC. When a unit is in calibration mode (noted as CAL on the website) it is offline while it is purged, cleaned, tested and brought back online. This can take 10 to 30 minutes depending on the unit. If a CEMS fails calibration (noted as ERR on the website) then a technician must inspect, trouble shoot and repair the unit. This is followed by another calibration to ensure the CEMS is ready for service. According to MOECC standards, the CEMS device must collect data for at least 50 % of the averaging period for the average to be valid. For example, if the CEMS for carbon monoxide fails calibration and the repair and recalibration takes 3 hours then it has taken more than 50% of the 4 hour averaging period required for reliable measurement. In this case, the IDA (insufficient data available) code will appear and no reading is posted until 50% of the averaging period, e.g. 2 hours of valid data have been collected. Emission parameters with shorter averaging periods are more affected by downtime. A parameter with a 24-hour averaging period will generally not display a CAL code because the typical calibration cycle is too short to invalidate a 24-hour averaging period.</p> <p>3. What exactly does IDA mean? WHY is there Insufficient Data Available so often? What are causes for IDA?</p>		

Complaints						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
			<p>little or no interest in details of what goes on at the facility now and would prefer not to ask or hear questions and concerns relating to the incinerator, and just want to 'move on'. However, Durham residents have questions and concerns, and recent events at the incinerator serve only to increase our concern and our questions.</p> <p>Staff promised weekly updates to council, which then should have been available to the two EFW committees. Besides the members of EFWAC (the Provincially mandated committee, of which I am a member), and members of EFW-WMAC (the host community Durham-Clarington committee), there are many residents who are asking questions and who have very valid concerns.</p> <p>I realize some members of council would prefer to just "move on", but these ongoing problems we are seeing at the facility are only becoming more serious and more frequent - and more expensive - and the public has a right to be concerned and to ask questions. I think you may be surprised that many questions are coming from people outside of Clarington, across the Region and beyond, as well as from those in Clarington.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these matters.</p>	<p>IDA means insufficient data as noted in the response above. As specified in the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA), compliance the emission limits are determined based on a 24 hour rolling average, with the exception of carbon monoxide (4 hour rolling average), opacity (2 hour rolling average and 6 minute rolling average) and furnace temperature and oxygen (hourly average). Depending on the amount of time a boiler or CEMS unit is offline, it may affect the averaging period required for reporting. In accordance with standard MOECC requirements, a reading of IDA (insufficient data) will occur if less than 50% of data from the averaging period is available. The ECA requires that the CEMS units be online and collecting accurate data at least 90% of the time that the boilers are in operation in each calendar quarter during the first year of operation and 95% of the time thereafter. (This excludes temperature measurements, which require 95% availability starting in the first year.) The DYEC has met and exceeded these requirements on a continuous basis.</p> <p>4. Why are numbers for NOx so close to the limit, especially with the highly touted (by Covanta) VLN (very low NOx) system (see July 9, 2016 for example)? The DYEC ECA limits the emissions of Nitrogen oxides (NOx) to 121 mg/Rm3 over a 24 hour averaging period in accordance with Covanta's contractual guarantees. The provincial standard for NOx emissions from waste incinerators, as embodied in Guideline A-7 is 198 mg/Rm3. Therefore, although actual NOx emissions are close to the ECA limits, they are typically less than 60% of the provincial standard. Covanta is able to keep NOx emissions at these industry leading levels because of the combination of VLN and Selective Non-Catalytic Reduction (SNCR) systems.</p> <p>5. Does the VLN system cause other problems, such as high CO and higher Dioxin/Furan production? The VLN system is an integral part of a proven overall combustion control system as designed by Martin, GmbH. A</p>		

Complaints						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>review of recent test data supplied by Martin GmbH, for a reference facility in Germany demonstrated the performance of the VLN system for NOx and dioxins and furans (D/F).</p> <p>Measurement of D/F at the inlet to the air pollution control system during diagnostic testing demonstrated that combustion controls including VLN do not appear to be adversely impacting D/F levels. Covanta is proposing to expand this database by performing additional sampling during the Phase II evaluation process at this inlet location and refine combustion set points to optimize the combustion control system. As further evidence that the VLN and combustion control system are not contributing to D/F is the fact that Unit #2 has demonstrated low D/F emissions with the VLN system in operation.</p> <p>By design, the VLN system injects gas recirculated from the lower furnace (which is relatively high in oxygen) into the upper furnace, completing all combustion, and creating additional areas of turbulence resulting in a more thorough mixing of the flue gas, reducing any stratification and zones of poor combustion.</p> <p>6. Why is emissions data not reportable during "upset conditions"? Why does MOECC not require it, and since the data is collected, and why do the Owners not require or request it? Emissions data is reported in accordance with the MOECC guidelines. The intent of the ECA is to ensure that during normal operating conditions, which accounts for the vast majority of the year, the facility is in compliance. Start-up, shut-down and malfunctions typically account for less than 5% of annual operations and are short transition periods required get into and out of normal operations.</p> <p>7. Emissions during start up and shutdown are also likely to be different in nature from those during regular burning of</p>		

Complaints						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>waste. There are process variations during normal operation, which is why constant monitoring and CEMS units are so important. What is the status of the LTSS for dioxins/furans? We need to have more, not less, monitoring.</p> <p>The relationship between LTSS results and stack test results is established by developing a correlation between tests conducted simultaneously using both methods. LTSS samples were collected during the initial stack testing campaign in October 2015 and the voluntary stack test completed in May 2016. The data collected during these simultaneous tests is currently insufficient to establish a reliable correlation between the two methods.</p> <p>The DYEC project team is currently working with MOECC Technical Services to assess LTSS performance. This work will continue during future stack tests until sufficient data has been collected. LTSS samples continue to be collected monthly as required by the Environmental Compliance Approval.</p> <p>8. Where is the list of dates of start-up/shut-downs or upset conditions which have occurred at the DYEC since start-up, requested some time ago? Will it be available soon?</p> <p>The Regions' technical consultant, HDR, has prepared a memo documenting start-up and shutdown events since start of commissioning. This memo will be provided under separate cover after submission to Regional Council.</p> <p>If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact us again.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Project Team</p>		

Complaints						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
Total Project Team Complaints this month (project web email/telephone):				1		
Total Covanta Complaints this month:				0		
Total Council/ Committee Complaints this month:				0		
Total Durham Call Centre Complaints this month (separate attachment):				0		
Total Complaints from York this month:				0		
Total Complaints from previous months:				21		
Total Complaints in 2016:				22		