

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
1	October 4, 2016 12:57 PM	Project team web mail	<p>Good afternoon:</p> <p>On page 2 of Report 2016-INFO-25 – in the Sept. 30th CIP, it states on page 2, Sec. 3.4 that various inspections and cleaning were performed on Boiler 2 during a planned outage on August 30th. I note that Boiler 2 resumed operation on August 31st.</p> <p>Since 16:00 hours on Friday Sept. 30th, Boiler 2 has been offline continuously until the present time, Tuesday Oct. 4th 12:55 hours. What is the reason for the current Boiler 2 outage and what is the anticipated duration of this outage?</p> <p>Thank you in advance for an early reply.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Durham York Energy Centre.</p> <p>Your inquiry dated October 4th has been received. The project team will follow up with a response once your inquiry has been assessed.</p> <p>Regards, Project Team</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Durham York Energy Centre.</p> <p>Throughout the year there are two planned outages – one major and one minor for each boiler, lasting approximately 15 days and 5 days respectively. These main outages are typically planned at 6 month intervals with the major outage planned around low waste volumes in the February/March time frame. These outages allow the operator to inspect/clean/maintain and plan further maintenance on critical parts to ensure minimal unscheduled or emergency outages. They also allow detailed measurements/inspections to be taken that will identify the amount of preventative maintenance and repairs to be planned and undertaken in the major Feb/March outage.</p> <p>Additionally, throughout the year other shorter outages ranging from a few hours to a few days are scheduled to perform regular inspections/preventative maintenance as required. Emergency or unplanned outages may also occur randomly throughout the year. The project agreement allows for up to 10% of the year or 36 days per boiler for such outages, therefore requiring the boilers to be available a</p>	<p>October 4, 2016 1:43 PM</p> <p>October 4, 2016 4:07 PM</p>	<p>LW</p> <p>LW</p>

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>minimum of 90% of the year.</p> <p>The August 30th outage was a one day preventative maintenance/cleaning outage. Boiler 2 had been running since its major outage in March.</p> <p>The current outage, September 30th to October 5th is the planned minor (~5 day) fall outage. This outage is a full boiler cleaning/inspection/maintenance process and will provide data for the major outage next February/March.</p> <p>Thank you for your inquiry.</p> <p>Project Team</p>		
2	October 5, 2016	Durham Committee of the Whole	Delegate appeared before Committee to discuss DYEC ECA Exceedance Notification Protocol.	Staff was asked to look at the interim solution to advise Council and the public of any exceedances prior to the confirmation from the accredited laboratory; and that the timelines be accelerated to ensure that Council and the public are informed beyond regular business hours in the case of any issues.		
3	October 5, 2016	Durham Committee of the Whole	Delegate appeared before Committee to discuss DYEC Diagnostic Source Testing presentation by Covanta that was given at the September 21, 2016 EFW-WMAC Committee meeting.	Staff was asked to provide a response back to questions and that a copy of their responses be provided to the Committee.		
4	October 5, 2016	Durham Committee of the Whole	Delegate appeared before Committee to discuss the September 2016 Airzone report and questioned why the EFW-WMAC Committee was not made aware of the conclusions in the report.	No further action required by staff.		
5	October 5, 2016	Durham Committee of the Whole	Delegate appeared before Committee with respect to the Abatement Plan Information that was provided at the September 21, 2016 EFW-WMAC meeting.	No further action required by staff.		
6	October 6, 2016 8:17 AM	Project team web mail	<p>Some information was provided around Covanta's diagnostic testing at the Sept. 21st EFW WMAC.</p> <p>I have the following questions related to diagnostic testing, some also posed in my delegation to Durham's Committee of the Whole:</p> <p>a) did Covanta complete the diagnostic stack testing they, and Durham staff in their Abatement Plan update, indicated was planned for the weeks of Sept. 19th and 26th</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Durham York Energy Centre. Please note your email dated October 6, 2016 was received and is 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>	October 6, 2016 9:34 AM	DL

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
			<p>and was it for both boilers? b) if testing was done when would the results be available to the public –note draft results are to be provided to MoECC as per the Abatement Plan Evaluation Matrix document c) if diagnostic testing did NOT take place as planned when would it be expected to take place and again, would it be for both boilers? d) was/will Air Zone (be) present for ALL test dates/events and if yes, when would their report be expected? e) was/will Amesa (be) collecting data concurrently during all diagnostic stack tests.</p> <p>Also, the staff response to citizen delegations made on June 29th regarding the problems Covanta is having around Amesa, staff responses in the September 30th “Council information Package , states: <i>“The procedure for validating the AMESA at DYEC needs to be followed to its conclusion, the collection of 12 comparative samples using consistent methods, before the efficacy of the system can be determined.”</i></p> <p>I cannot understand what that means and what time lines that statement contemplates. Please provide an explanation and where that advice came from e.g. Durham’s consultant, Amesa manufacturer, incinerator operator using Amesa or other. Please supply or advise where the related documents to this advice could be found.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Project Team</p> <p>Good afternoon, The Project team has responded to the questions per your email dated October 6, 2016 in red below.</p> <p>Some information was provided around Covanta’s diagnostic testing at the Sept. 21st EFW WMAC.</p> <p>I have the following questions related to diagnostic testing, some also posed in my delegation to Durham’s Committee of the Whole:</p> <p>a) did Covanta complete the diagnostic stack testing they, and Durham staff in their Abatement Plan update, indicated was planned for the weeks of Sept. 19th and 26th and was it for both boilers?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>b) if testing was done when would the results be available to the public –note draft results are to be provided to MoECC as per the Abatement Plan Evaluation Matrix document .</p> <p><i>It will take a minimum 2 – 3 weeks to get the expedited lab results and prepare the report.</i></p> <p>c) if diagnostic testing did NOT take place as planned when would it be expected to take place and again, would it be for both boilers?</p> <p><i>Not applicable</i></p>	<p>October 17, 2016 3:52 PM</p>	<p>LW/GB</p>

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>d) was/will Air Zone (be) present for ALL test dates/events and if yes, when would their report be expected?</p> <p><i>AirZone was present for the diagnostic testing and will be in attendance later this month during the official source testing. Their report will not be available until all the tests/lab results and reports on the diagnostic and source test are complete - likely December or January.</i></p> <p>e) was/will Amesa (be) collecting data concurrently during all diagnostic stack tests.</p> <p><i>AMESA cartridges were in place during the recent diagnostic testing per normal monthly collection practices.</i></p> <p>Also, the staff response to citizen delegations made on June 29th regarding the problems Covanta is having around Amesa, staff responses in the September 30th "Council information Package", states: "The procedure for validating the AMESA at DYEC needs to be followed to its conclusion, the collection of 12 comparative samples using consistent methods, before the efficacy of the system can be determined."</p> <p>I cannot understand what that means and what time lines that statement contemplates. Please provide an explanation and where that advice came from e.g. Durham's consultant, Amesa manufacturer, incinerator operator using Amesa or other. Please supply or advise where the related documents to this advice could be found.</p> <p><i>ECA Condition 7 (3) requires the use of the AMESA cartridge system. Additionally, Section 5.7 of the Air Emissions Monitoring Plan indicates a process is to be established to test the AMESA system in comparison to the source test and see if a correlation can be developed. During stack testing specific AMESA dioxin and furan sampling will run concurrent with the</i></p>		

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>stack testing. The procedure for validating the AMESA requires the collection of a minimum of 12 comparative samples collected concurrently during source testing with new AMESA cartridges for each dioxin/furan source test. Following the upcoming compliance source test we expect to have the last of the 12 samples collected to assist in the determination of the efficacy of the system. The results of the comparative tests will be assessed to determine if there is a correlation between the AMESA results and the results obtained simultaneously with the standard compliance stack test method.</p> <p>The AMESA testing methodology outlined above was discussed with the MOECC and submitted for formal approval as part of the pre-test plans submitted in accordance with Schedule E of the Environmental Compliance Approval. The pre-test plans outlining the methodology and related MOECC correspondence are available on the project website in section 3.4 through the following link : https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/Assets/Documents/MonitoringPlansReports/AirEmissionMonitoring/Plan/Pre-test_Plan_for_Source_Testing.pdf</p> <p>Regards, Project Team</p>		
7	October 07, 2016 5:14 PM	Project team web mail	<p>Reading last week's news release about Ontario suspending the Energy-from-Waste Standard Offer Program reminded me that the Power Purchase Agreement for the DYEC has still not been posted on the DYEC website, or if it has, I can't locate it.</p> <p>Other information has been posted around this issue but not the actual PPA.</p> <p>Would you please direct me to a link where it is posted for everyone or send me a copy electronically? It has been requested numerous times but I don't believe it has been made available.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the Durham York Energy Centre. Please note your email dated October 7, 2016 was received and is currently being addressed by the DYEC project team. Once prepared, we will provide you with a detailed response to your questions.</p> <p>Regards, Project Team</p>	October 11, 2016 8:56 AM	LW

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
			I will appreciate your expeditious assistance on this.	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Your message was forwarded on to our Legal department for a response. The reason that the Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) has not been posted to the website or made publically available is because there is a confidentiality statement in the agreement and a specific clause in the agreement which is acknowledged and identified as confidential information. If there is anything further we can help you with please let us know.</p> <p>Regards, Project Team</p>	October 25, 2016 10:46 AM	LW
8	October 11, 2016 11:06 PM		<p>Good evening Mayor Foster, Councillor Woo and Councillor Neal,</p> <p>I understand from the below News Release that there was a fire today at the Covanta operated incinerator in Courtice.</p> <p>Please ask questions at tomorrow's Regional Council meeting in order to get information regarding this fire - I am specifically interested in whether the boilers were shut down, who will be responsible for costs associated with this fire, what was the cause of the fire and whether the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change has been notified. Also, will this fire affect timing for the next stack tests?</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration. I await your response.</p>	<p>Question was dealt with at Council October 12, 2016.</p> <p>No further action required by staff.</p>		
9	October 20, 2016 7:33 PM	Project team web mail	<p>While I do appreciate notifications of updates posted on the durhamyorkwaste website, is there a reason that it takes so long to put these updates on the website, or notify those registered to receive the updates?</p> <p>This update received October 20, but was posted on Durham Region's website on October 11.</p> <p>This notification is less important than perhaps some others, as it was posted on the Durham Region website which I check fairly frequently these days well over a week</p>	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Durham York Energy Centre.</p> <p>In response to your email dated October 20, 2016, we have checked the notification update times through our IT department. An adjustment to the coding for the automatic updates has been made.</p>	October 21, 2016 11:41 AM	LW

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
			ago. But other notifications seem to take a very long time to be uploaded and made available to the public - some could be considered "time sensitive". Thank you for the continued notifications.	Please let us know if you experience any further issues. Regards, Project Team		
10	October 21, 2016 1:17 AM	Project team web mail	To whom it may concern: I read about the pit fire in the Durham/York Waste to Energy Facility and have a solution to prevent another fire. When I was employed at the City of Spokane, WA, I solved this problem with a Fire Pit Deluge System. The Deluge system has been very successful in putting out many fires and can be repeated at other facilities such as the Durham /York Facility. See my attached paper that was presented at NAWTEC 2012. If you are interested, please email me or call me at	Good afternoon, Thank you for your interest in the Durham York Energy Centre(DYEC). The DYEC has two fire cannons (monitors); a full coverage sprinkler system above the pit; a full coverage sprinkler system above the tipping floor and a deluge system to protect the control room pit window. No system will prevent pit fires, but a well-designed system (such as ours) that meets or exceeds the NFPA 13 standard will minimize the impact of a pit fire by quickly suppressing it. The pit fire system valving and associated controls are located in the boiler house within steps of the control room. This design feature minimizes response time to a pit fire to catch it in an incipient stage. The use of these fire control measures during the fire at the DYEC was very likely the reason the facility did not sustain any damage.	November 2, 2016 11:11 AM	LW/AH/M N
	November 3, 2016 2:54 AM	Project team web mail	Thank you for your response project team. The pit fires occur from many sources and NFPA standards are not designed for large pits that hold thousands of tons of MSW. The Spokane, North Andover and other WTE facilities have the standard cannons and pit deluge systems. Due to adverse environmental conditions, large distance from the fire, overhead deluge pit systems heat sensors are not activated till it is too late. In the review of alternative sensors, the pit environmental dust conditions, were found not to be reliable and expensive. This delayed response created a large reliance on the two fire cannons and their operators. Unfortunately, the fire cannons are designed for small fires and is unable to put out a pit wide fire and conditions for the operators deteriorate very quickly. Fire pit deluge systems should be tested monthly, just like fire hydrants. Pit Deluge control, activation and deactivation, should be manually managed by the crane operator and the control room, they are always on duty and looking at the pit. Spokane decided to replace the existing roof deluge system with a lower pit wide deluge system in order to protect the crane and the accompanying festoons and enable it to maintain and test the deluge system. Questions to ask yourself: What is the fire piping system made of? If mild steel, what is the guaranteed life	Regards, Project Team		

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
			<p>span? How often is testing and inspection done? Can inspection and repair rigging be placed on the crane bridge? ususally not allowed by L&I, expensive scaffolding is necessary Can the cranes operate if inspections or repairs to the deluge system are being done? Are SCBA and fire suits adjacent to the fire cannons? Do all the operators have fire brigade training?</p> <p>Better it ask the questions now before another event happens and they ask why weren't these things addressed. Thank you,</p>			
11	October 21, 2016 1:24 PM	Project team web mail	<p>Hello, I was driving by the DYEC facility at 16:10 EDT on 2016-10-19 and noticed visible grey or bluish-grey smoke that did not dissipate like water vapour usually does. Wednesday afternoon was warm, so I would not expect to be seeing water vapour from the stack. Review of your CEMS data didn't show anything unusual. Can you comment on why there would be visible smoke in this instance? Regards,</p>	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>The flue gas emitted by the DYEC is characterized by both temperatures and water content which are higher than the surrounding ambient air, even in comparison to a warm afternoon which you experienced on October 19th. As a result, a water vapor plume became visible above the stack from water content condensation as the flue gas cools to ambient from the emitted temperature (typically 135oC) at the top of the stack. The water vapor in the plume become visible when the temperature of the plume goes below the dew point. The dew point is the temperature at which water condenses and evaporates at the same rate. The dew point is dependent on atmospheric conditions of temperature, relative humidity and pressure. Thus, the degree of plume visibility will be impacted by atmospheric conditions. The observed colors results from the interaction of sunlight and the water vapor plume as it dissipates and cools to ambient temperature.</p> <p>The CEMS includes an opacity monitor which measures any opacity of the hot flue gas within the ductwork leading to the stack. As the flue gas is hot where opacity is measured, there is no water vapor plume within the duct. As particulate was being efficiently controlled by the DYEC control equipment, no</p>	October 28, 2016 9:20 AM	LW/MN

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>opacity was reported by the CEMS.</p> <p>If you have any further questions please contact us again.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Project Team</p>		
12	October 25, 2016 10:30 AM	Project team web mail	<p>I am trying to follow the garbage from curbside to the next steps?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Waste depot. Sorting occurs. 2 Next stop at the transfer station where staff monitor trucks for radiation using detectors at the weigh station. 3. Staff inspect garbage as it is dumped by collection trucks and repacked into tractor trailers for delivery to the DYEC. 4. There radiation detection devices again monitor inbound trucks as they approach the weigh scales. Garbage loads that do not pass the radiation screening will be rejected and sent away. 5. Facility operators inspect waste visually prior to processing and will remove unacceptable items. <p>Can you confirm that this is what happens to our garbage? Thank you</p>	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for your interest in the Durham York Energy Centre. We received your email dated October 25, 2016 and offer the following response to your inquiry below:</p> <p><u>Curbside Garbage Collection (from the curb to final processing)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curbside collection vehicles collect household municipal solid waste from designated stops. 2. Curbside collection vehicles bring the collected waste to a designated waste transfer station. 3. Inbound trucks are subjected to radiation detection devices as they approach the weigh scales at the designated waste transfer station. If detected, any unacceptable materials are identified using a hand-held detection unit, removed from the load and placed inside totes on the tipping floor. 4. Site operators conduct a visual inspection of the curbside residential solid waste material and remove unacceptable items. 5. All acceptable curbside residential solid waste is repacked into tractor trailers for delivery to the Durham York Energy Centre (DYEC). 6. Inbound trucks are subjected to radiation detection devices as they approach the DYEC weigh scales. If radiation detection is found on incoming loads at the DYEC, the loads are rejected and returned to the designated transfer station for remediation. 	October 26, 2016 11:32 AM	DL

Inquiries						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
				<p>7. One truck per hour is dumped on the DYEC tipping floor for a visual inspection by facility operators (all other trucks dump direct into the pit). If unacceptable materials are found in these loads, facility operators will remove unacceptable items prior to processing.</p> <p>8. All acceptable curbside residential solid waste is placed in the pit for final processing.</p> <p>If you have any further questions please let us know.</p> <p>Regards, Project Team</p>		
13	October 26, 2016	Project team direct telephone	Company representative looking to partner in a joint venture EFW facility in India.	General information about waste streams in Durham and York Region was given. Covanta Business Managers number was provided for inquirer as requested.	October 26, 2016	LW
Total Project Team Inquiries this month (project web email/telephone):				8		
Total Covanta Inquiries this month:				0		
Total Council/ Committee Inquiries this month:				5		
Total Durham Call Centre Inquiries this month (separate attachment):				0		
Total Inquiries from York this month:				0		
Total Inquiries from previous months:				24		
Total Inquiries in 2016:				37		

Complaints						
#	Date Received	Method Received	Comment Details/Description:	Response/ Remedial Action	Response Date	Staff
Total Project Team Complaints this month (project web email/telephone):				0		
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:				25		
Total Complaints in 2016:				25		