
Appendix 3B

October 9, 2007

Public Information Session Summary Report



**Durham/York
Residual Waste
Study**

**Consultant's Recommended
Preferred Site**

Public Information Session

October 9, 2007
Faith United Church
1778 Nash Road, Courtice

ENERGY FROM WASTE

PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION

October 9th, 2007 – 2:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.

**Faith United Church
1778 Nash Road, Courtice**

Presentation at 7:00 p.m.

Presentation began at 7:00 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

Welcome and Introduction to Facilitator and Guest Panelists by Angelos Bacopoulos,
Project Manager

Introduced the panel:

Chris Winsor, Hill & Knowlton – Facilitator
Jim McKay, Jacques Whitford – Senior Planner, 9 years waste management experience
David Merriman, GENIVAR - Technical Lead, 30 years waste management experience
David Payne, GENIVAR - Project Management, 35 years experience
Greg Crooks, Jacques Whitford – Air Quality Service Director, 18 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

Presentation on consultants' recommendation of a preferred site for the Energy from
Waste facility – 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 on:

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

Clarington 01 is the Consultant's Recommended Preferred Site.

Outlined the different approvals and requirements, including how long will it take and the
costs associated with it.

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 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.

The RFQ closes on Oct 11th. Qualified vendors will be identified and they will be eligible
to respond to the RFP 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 MOE by the end of 2008 so that they can start their review.

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 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 and move on to 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.

You may put your questions in the recycling box; ask for a card to write down your question if you don't want to ask it yourself.

Please give us your name and where you are from.

Thank you.

Questions and Answers:

QUESTION #1: How high is the stack going to be and what is the range in air emissions?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The stack is typically 60 metres; the exact height will be determined through modeling of air emissions and will meet the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) requirements.

Question 1b: What is going to be the maximum distance that the emissions will travel? Should I be concerned living in Courtice?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The concentration of emissions decreases dramatically with distance from the stack. Typically these emissions become negligible compared to the background concentrations within a few km. The point of maximum impingement would be at a distance of about 300-700 meters from the facility. The EA process shows the number of residents within a 1 km radius and looks at the closest residence and schools. Health concerns will be satisfied.

Question 1c: With the people in Sudbury and their devastation with that stack, why put us in that situation if there's an "if".

Answer provided by David Merriman: It is no longer possible to meet Ontario air emission requirements by simply building a taller stack. Ontario put in regulations that regulate the pollutants in the stack. In order for the facility to be approved, the emissions would have to meet these regulations.

QUESTION #2: In 1999, the Region of Durham passed a resolution banning new landfills. Bottom ash from an incinerator is approximately 25 to 30%. Where is the ash going to be landfilled and at what cost per tonne?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: Bottom ash may be used for construction of landfill roads and landfill cover. We have not determined where the ash is going to be landfilled and do not know what the cost per tonne is as of yet.

Question 2b: What about the toxins? It is physically impossible for the scrubbers to capture all the toxins. Where will they be captured and at what cost?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: Fly ash can be disposed in Sarnia. We do not know the costs yet, it may be around \$300 per tonne.

QUESTION #3: It is very difficult for me to understand that fog stays in that radius. I'm almost convinced the fog will go into our subdivision. This community will pay on the account of this facility.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: It is true that there will be different air pockets in the area. Once we have site-specific data, we will run it through the air models, for different times of the year. Typically the radius will be within 1km of the facility. We will know more once we have the site-specific data.

Answer also provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: The particular emissions, such as the dioxins, will be below the regulatory limit, which is an acceptable risk that is already there. There will be a negligible amount of added risk.

Question 3b: If we have a lot of rat poison it will kill us. What will the proposed facility do to future generations over time? There are no acceptable limits.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: Long-term problems are based on the 35 year lifespan of the facility. It is all based on health information available for all potential emissions.

QUESTION #4: When do we start building this facility and will it be functional in 2011 when we need it? When going to these meetings, the only problem we hear about is the incinerator. The real problem is the generation of garbage. Incineration is not great, but there is no great solution. We have recycling, composting, incineration, and landfill. The Brock landfill is based on 1950s technology and is a natural disaster and remediation is going to cost a lot.

Answer provided by Angelos Bacopoulos: There are about 130,000 tonnes of waste per year that Durham sends to Michigan and the border is closing in 2010. Ontario sent 3.4 million tones to Michigan last year. Both York and Durham Councils do not permit greenfield landfills. Zero waste will not be achieved by 2010 and Durham does not have many other options available. Both Regions want to divert as much waste as possible, but residual still has to be dealt with. Both Regions are hoping to have the facility up by border closing (2011).

QUESTION #5: Trucks traveling to the site will emit emissions. More trucks mean more emissions and truck traffic. Have you factored this in?

Answer provided by Ilya Sher, URS - We have calculated the number of trucks for the different scenarios. A 150,000 tonnes per year facility would equal around 36 trucks per day one way. The emissions from these trucks have been considered.

Question 5b: Were emissions from trucks taken into account in the Generic Human Health Risk Assessment?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: It was taken into account in the generic health risk assessment and will be accounted for in the site-specific assessment.

QUESTION #6: What is the composition of flue gas and how much is there? Stuff that is not scrubbed, what happens to that? 30% is bottom ash, what about the other 70%?

Answer provided by David Merriman: Emissions are mainly CO₂ and water. Trace contaminants are of concern and are governed by regulations and were assessed in the Generic Health Risk Assessment. We will have more details based on a site-specific assessment which will take schools and residences that are around the site into consideration to ensure no risk is imposed.

Question 6b: In terms of tonnage, how much CO₂ will be emitted from that stack?

Answer provided by David Merriman: I do not have the exact amount with me. With 150,000 tonnes of waste per year, half will be emitted as CO₂. Given that we have waste to transport, EFW produces fewer emissions than long hauling to a remote landfill. I do not have exact number but can get that to you.

[Comment added later: For the purpose of considering greenhouse gas emissions, an estimated 50,000 tonnes of CO₂ would be emitted per year]

Question 6c: Is the maximum tonnage 400,000 tonnes?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The initial capacity will be 150,000 tonnes of waste per year to start. Over the 35 year planning period, the maximum could be developed and that would be 400,000 tonnes of waste per year.

The answer to your question is in the detailed reports, if you would like to send me an email, I will refer you to where the answer is in the report.

QUESTION #7: I have been driving on the 401 everyday to work over the past 15 years, I can see the smog, the stack from St. Mary's. Don't say it is within 1 km. The plume of smoke is very heavy in the morning and overnight, the smoke is black. The facility burns tires or something else. The smog goes over the horizon, over Lake Ontario and doesn't drop over 1 km. The stack is 60 m high. There is proof that the air is moving out of the stack.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The site-specific study has not been completed yet. We are not saying that the plume coming out of stack does not travel further than 1 km. We have done a generic health risk assessment and what happens is that although the emissions travel a great distance, contaminants of concern tend to fall out in highest concentrations at ground level 300-700 meters from the facility. Site-specific precipitation data is not known as of yet but will be looked at in future studies.

Question 7b: Looking at haulage traffic, how can it be 36 trucks per day? In the tables it looks at interchanges, additional lanes to Highway 401. Why assign same weight to traffic as other criteria? Why do you put so much weight on traffic?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: Traffic was not weighted any higher than other criteria in the social/cultural category. They were all considered to have the same weighting. They were all rolled up in advantages/disadvantages in each category to get the overall weight. There are a number of different ways to measure traffic.

QUESTION #8: My question is regarding air quality studies for next month and the next few months. Is there a concern that modeling wasn't done during the worst times for air quality, in the summer? And did you look at soccer fields and will they be closed as a result of poor air quality?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: When we looked at the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment, and got to the short-list, we realized that we did not have good data from the early summer. It takes time to get air modeling started. We brought that forward to both Councils and the first site was looked at in August. All data will be completed by next summer and there will be continuous monitoring.

With regards to the soccer fields, I drove by them today. It is an existing infrastructure. We will ensure that at the end of the day when the facility is up and running, emissions in local and regional air sheds will be safe.

QUESTION #9: Why are you using Cobourg data to make comparisons, about temperature, etc. when the wind speed is coming from Cobourg?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The data used in the Generic Human Health Risk Assessment came from a number of different sources. The team is now collecting that data to feed into the model. Cobourg data was used because it is one of the closest meteorological stations to the short-listed sites.

QUESTION #10: I agree with a statement someone just made that the landfill near his house is from the 1950s and things have changed since then. Last week Jim McKay said that the EFW facility should not go in an agricultural area and that some emissions

are bio-accumulative. With all the pollutants in the air already, our food chain will be affected, Durham has an important agricultural area. Has this EA study tested humans, milk and cows in Clarington?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The reality is that there are certain compatible land uses; agricultural land is the least preferred. Soy beans and cattle near the area were all taken into consideration. The health team ensures that they are aware of what is in the area and the loading of contaminants will not be at a level that will affect crops. Baseline studies are very expensive. We started with air quality in three general locations. The site-specific testing in the spring looked at baseline soil and small mammal data. There is no bio-monitoring program right now. Health Canada recognizes there will be a national bio-monitoring program.

Question 10b: You will be doing the site-specific assessment, can you guarantee me that studies will be done on humans and cow's milk?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: I cannot guarantee. Please send your questions to the Study Website.

Question 10c (asked by the Facilitator) - What does loading mean?

Dr. Chris Ollson defined loading as the amount of pollutants released to the environment.

QUESTION #11: Will the filtering be in place and will it be successful?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The Ministry of the Environment will put conditions on approval of the proposed facility and will ensure that it is working properly.

QUESTION #12: I have three children going to school here. A number of Clarington residents have expressed concerns related to building this EFW facility. Why aren't our Councilors screaming in opposition to this project?

Answer provided by Angelos Bacopoulos: In fairness to the panel, this is a political question and the panel is unable to answer it.

QUESTION #13: One of the gentlemen said that one of the factors that was looked at was non-residential areas. Given the fact that the life span of this facility is 35 years, over 20 years, we are looking at population growth possibly doubling. How can you say Courtice, Clarington, Durham is not a residential area?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: Clarington Energy Park is zoned as industrial. Courtice is residential, but the proposed site is in the middle of an industrial area.

Question 13b: What about the population increasing, the health effects of people in the area if you have 45,000-90,000 people moving into this area?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: Within a 1km radius of the proposed site, it is considered an industrial area. Past that, it is residential, and there are people living in that area. We will be looking at this site in a site-specific assessment, we will take into consideration the schools and people living closest to the site.

Question 13c: Why should I trust that you will do that?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: I have a team of health professionals and there are peer reviews. Please do not trust one study. You need to trust that there are a lot of people doing peer reviews. I encourage you to look at those peer reviews to confirm that what we are saying is valid.

QUESTION #14: We hear the expression Energy from Waste being used. What really is energy density and how does it compare with other sources of energy?

Answer provided by David Merriman: Since the blue box program, it has gone up to 5,000 BTU per pound. It has more than enough energy to sustain itself. If you compost and recycle everything you can, the energy in that garbage will run the lights in your house. The net output is that garbage can and will run your energy efficient lights. 600 kw of electricity per tonne of waste will be generated.

QUESTION #15: Cost has not been discussed. Can you explain how the costs will be broken down for Clarington tax payers?

Answer provided by David Merriman: After considering operating costs, the mortgage, long-term debt and electricity production, it's about \$120-150 per tonne. EFW is comparable with the green bin but is more expensive than landfill and recycling. If we are talking about a typical household per year, \$50 per household per year is a rough estimate.

Question 15b: When will it be paid off? When will we see a profit?

Answer provided by David Merriman: It will cost to run the facility. The facility will be owned by the Regions of Durham and York. It will be operated by the Regions of Durham and York. It will not be a private sector money making facility.

Question 15c: Will it be sold to another corporation?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The plan is that it is to be a private sector design, build and operate with ownership remaining with the public sector.

Question 15d: Which companies are being considered?

Answer provided by David Merriman: We have a procurement process to follow. This process closes Thursday October 11th. The invitation to submit qualifications was sent out. We will review the submissions. After the evaluation of submissions, there will be a public document listing the vendors that qualified and this will go to Regional Council.

QUESTION #16: In the independent peer review that Clarington requested, due to timelines, the consultants were not able to review the information with regards to the Oshawa airport. What impact will this facility have on runway 30, which is commercially endorsed traffic.

Answer provided by Jim McKay: The peer reviewer identified that flight paths had not been assessed, and noted that we did not account for how high the building stack can be and how close it can be to airport. This information will be added to the documentation. The area was screened out for other reasons. The facility can be built without impacting the regulations.

QUESTION #17: Leftover ash has been banned for use as construction material in the UK due to health concerns. Why is it being used here?

Answer provided by David Merriman: We are not aware of this information. If this person can send us this information, we would love to see it. Bottom ash used in construction is processed before it is actually used for road construction. We will process and test it first to ensure that there are no adverse effects.

QUESTION #18: There are sites in England and Florida where bottom ash is used and there have been lawsuits regarding the use of bottom ash. I do not like to hear that you will use bottom ash on our roads. This area is the 2nd highest area with asthma. I think our citizens' health is already compromised. Can we have your assurance that if our air shed is already compromised, we need a guarantee that this facility won't be built. In your presentation, what you left out is more important than what you put in.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The generic human health risk assessment was done in early summer. There are documents out there that were published since then, all concerned with emissions. All data and background information collected will

be open and transparent. The Consultants will show their results and will be open and clear about them.

Question 18b: You talk about a clear process. Dr. Smith did a report with regards to her statement regarding plastics. In the original report, she said plastics should not be burned. In the final report, that line was removed. Why was the original report altered and changed without saying it was changed.

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: Upon further reflection, I consulted with other colleagues. I did a clarification and amended 3 parts within the report. This was done openly and was posted with an explanation. It was an amendment to the question. It was a statement that was not explained properly. It is now on the website, I wanted to clarify that it was not correct.

Question 18c: The document is on the website?

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: Yes, the document is on the Durham Region website, in a Durham report to Dr. Kyle.

QUESTION #19: I would like to make a statement. Earlier tonight it was asked whether the soccer fields would be safe. The lands are directly across from us. There is only a road between us and the garbage, and it is ludicrous to say it is acceptable for the soccer field and dangerous on the other side. I would like to know where there is a site located that has the capacity for 400,000 tonnes?

Answer provided by David Merriman: There are numerous facilities of that size, and larger in the US. The largest facility is over a million tonnes per year.

Question 19b: I understand the US has banned incineration.

Answer provided by David Merriman: There are 90+ facilities in the US.

Question 19c: What is the maximum size you can make the facility?

Answer provided by David Merriman: This EA will only allow for a maximum capacity of 400,000 tonnes. Anything over that would need an amendment to the EA and the process would start over again.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The soccer field will be looked at. Certainly this facility cannot be built unless everyone close to the facility is safe.

Question 19d: Have you any guarantee that Toronto will not send their garbage here?

Answer provided by David Merriman: The facility is being built for Durham and York area waste. The planning process does not allow for other GTA waste, including Toronto waste.

Question 19e: Green Lane is only a short-term landfill.

Answer provided by Jim McKay: Our EA will not allow Toronto to send its garbage to this facility.

QUESTION #20: Why is the maximum capacity 400,000 tonnes?

Answer provided by David Merriman: 400,000 tonnes is the upper limit based on all York and Durham waste and 35 years of population growth. 400,000 tonnes is the absolute upper limit.

QUESTION #21: Is it going to be filtered? Something that actually works? There is a school that is not more than 5 minutes away. Has it been taken into consideration?

Answer provided by David Merriman: We will ensure that there will be no negative effects in the area.

Question 21b: What is the effect on recycling?

Answer provided by David Merriman: We need to recycle more. We are planning the facility size based on having a very effective recycling and composting system.

Question 21c: Is there a reason that some of the recycling is not being picked up?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: We are trying new places to send some materials that are not being picked up. I want to assure you that we are working to pick up as many materials as possible.

QUESTION #22: Would Europe approve of the nuclear plants? Or did you have to go to the US to get their approval?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: I cannot comment on that. The proximity of the nuclear facility was not taken into consideration, there is no connection. What is your concern?

Question 22b: They are too close to each other. Considering it is farmland, farmers usually go out and pick up stones. How do you expect to find anything?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: We have to do a Stage 2 archaeology study in the next step of the process. There will be a monitoring program.

Question 22c: How far do they dig down?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The team will go out and do a site-specific study. If there is any evidence, if there is one home in the area, they will look in that area. What he is referring to, even if they haven't found anything, an archaeologist will do a soil test in the area. If there are artifacts, they will keep looking.

QUESTION #23: I understand there will be polling conducted? Will all houses in Courtice be polled and if not, why not? Will it be simple? Do you want an incinerator in Courtice, yes or no?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: The survey questions are being worked on right now. The company that is doing the sampling has assured us that it will be representative.

QUESTION #24: This is the third meeting I have been to. I cannot say enough about the incinerators. Not enough is being said about our health. I care about the travel time it takes for the toxins from the stack to get to our lungs. Dr Smith, trying to convince us that dioxins are not a risk for our health, this community is already burdened with asthma. 2 year olds with asthma, cancer, children in the emergency room. When we asked Dr. Smith, what is the risk of cancer, will the risk of cancer rise due to the incinerator, her answer was one in a million people, that is the risk. I want to know where did you get that figure from? Are there studies done that we do not know about? Was Brampton studied?

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: You are right to ask that question again. One in a million is not a simple answer. The risk assessment is the only tool we have to do this assessment. It is the only method to forecast a risk, we will use all that information and will do the calculations. This is translated into health risk. All the emissions considered, the risk to the population will be less than the one in one million regulated acceptable risk over the background risk.

Question 24b: Were there studies done at the hospitals?

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: The studies are human and animal studies, laboratory studies of animals, cancer in animals. The evidence varies due to the chemicals.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: As part of the generic study, the air modelers take the data. What the risk assessment does is takes the concentration, based on the different studies, and it determined that the risk of getting cancer would be less than one in one million over the background risk.

QUESTION #25 Will every household in Courtice be surveyed? If not, why not? How will questions be worded?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: Polling questions are being developed right now. It will be a statistically relevant sample.

QUESTION #26: For those of you that are not aware of this, Angelos Bacopoulos is the former General Manager of Solid Waste in Toronto. He sat on a task force for solid waste where incineration was opposed. Maybe Mr. Bacopoulos can explain how something that was not acceptable in Toronto is acceptable here?

Answer provided by Angelos Bacopoulos: The task force is still ongoing, Toronto will be considering all methods of waste disposal, including incineration. It was a political decision to not look at incineration at the time. Toronto bought the Greenlane landfill but is still looking at different options.

QUESTION #27: Bottom ash is about 10%?

Answer provided by David Merriman: About 10% of the volume is bottom ash. That will go to a licensed landfill.

Question 27b: In Table 3.11 of your report, where you identify Clarington 01 as the preferred site, everything I have read says its 25% and it's confirmed in the figures in your chart. You are saying 36,000 tonnes of bottom ash is being hauled away.

Answer provided by David Merriman: Ash is much denser. For each cubic metre, it is much heavier than garbage. By weight bottom ash is about 20-25%, by volume it is about 10%.

Question 27c: Whatever I read, it is the percentage by weight.

Answer provided by David Merriman: Landfill sites take up space. We refer to how much space it takes up. When you pay for this space, you pay by weight.

Question 27d: In Table 4.7 where you summarized all the environmental categories for each site and came up with your analysis, overall Clarington 01 was an advantage and East Gwillimbury was neutral. When I look at it, and you rate Clarington 01 as an advantage, I get suspicious. The air quality is an important fact and you noted the East Gwillimbury site was not industrial area, etc.... The analysis is very subjective, are all the charts subjective?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: For certain factors, there was some professional judgment used, some of it is subjective.

Question 27e: The bottom line, did you weigh the health factors? Did you give it a higher rating than the lower rating?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: There is a science behind this. The methodology that went into these categories is fully spelled out in that document.

QUESTION #28: I have a concern about the economical and financial implications. We asked about the cost benefits and in many instances the costs are not known. How did you make Clarington an advantage without knowing these costs?

Answer provided by David Merriman: Supplying water, improving roads, there is a cost to service the facility that is specific to the site. We used the site-specific costs.

Question 28b: Shipping ash to Sarnia will not be cost effective. Was this not taken into consideration?

Answer provided by David Merriman: Those are the costs for ash disposal. Costs for monitoring are in the capital and operating costs.

Question 28c: Are they broken down in detail?

Answer provided by David Merriman: No, the estimates are for the facility, regardless of the site.

QUESTION #29: Have effects on property values been taken into consideration?

Answer provided by David Merriman: No specific effects on property values have been considered. We do not think it will affect them.

QUESTION #30 I do not think this is the right solution. I am not for the traditional landfill, however, you better change it to something that is better. You indicate an EFW facility. You haven't improved the problem. It is a good political solution. We have too much waste. The greatest impact is on air quality and public health. I was puzzled to hear that 5 of the 6 sites in Durham and York were concentrated in Clarington. Clarington 01 was listed as an advantage for public health. Why is Lake Ontario not considered as part of the assessment when it was considered for the East Gwillimbury site?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: On the environmental aspect it was an advantage. Overall it is better than all the other sites. Lake Ontario, wind coming off of Lake Ontario was taken into consideration. It is discussed in the report.

Question 30b: How can you come up with that as an advantage?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: I can tell you, it will be taken into consideration in the site-specific study; this was the initial assessment.

Question 30c: Why do you think you can better assess public health, when 43 doctors in Durham, 16 doctors in Clarington, signed a petition stating that they think this will cause health effects?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The doctors are entitled to their opinion.

Question 30d: You made a decision on a site. Why would you make the recommendation if you still need to study?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: Regardless of the site recommended, we need to now do site-specific assessments. There is consideration on the air shed and more answers are required.

QUESTION #31: Specifically I have two clear points. This meeting was scheduled for 8:00 p.m. I asked that it start at 7:00 p.m. I asked Jim to be shorter on his presentation, he was 32 minutes. We should not leave this room, let no question be unanswered tonight.

Facilitator: We will do our best.

QUESTION #32: We walk our dogs and are happy to see local farmers in the area. In East Gwillimbury, the residential area was marked as an estate residential. We are

considered agricultural. Is there a difference between estate residential and agricultural?
Are a million plus homes considered estates?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: I believe there are 6 homes within 1 km of the site.
Question 32b: 1 km vs. a few hundred metres.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: Whether it is a farm or an estate, it is the same to me.

Question 32c: Do water pollution plants generate heat that they cannot use?

Answer provided by David Merriman: They generate methane gas. Some of it can be used to heat the buildings. If heat is provided by the EFW facility, the methane can be used to generate electricity.

Question 32d: I question the logic of it.

Answer provided by David Merriman: They have methane gas, used to heat digesters in the winter. You could make electricity with the methane, fueling the engines all year round if the required heat were provided from the EFW facility.

Question 32e: With regards to the air shed, there is St Mary's on one side, and other pollutants nearby. Why create another source?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: We (the Health Risk Assessment Team) are not involved in the preferred site selection, we take all the concerns into consideration.

Question 32f: There is a ton of information provided in the MOE information.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: We are aware of that data. Generic data was used for both York and Durham. There are two air stations in this area as well as one in York.

Comment: If you build it, you will burn it. You will need to feed it, it takes away from reducing waste.

QUESTION #33: I am a mechanic in Oshawa. We get tons of cardboard that goes into the garbage every week. If we look at Toronto, we have a City struggling to clean up the waterfront. I do not understand how Clarington 01 was chosen as a preferred site.

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: The Region of Durham provides garbage/recycling collection to “residential” only, it does not provide this service to the ICI/commercial sector. The owner of the business needs to get in touch with a private hauler.

Question 33b: If we are producing garbage; if it’s going to cost our shop; if the owner needs to pay which way do you think he’ll go? We all have to look out for ourselves.

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: I have to tell you again, the mandate of the Region of Durham is to provide collection to residential only.

QUESTION #34: We tried to get a debate on the pros and cons of incineration, it would not happen. I am concerned when I look at the frequently asked questions. There are no public health and safety questions on the frequently asked question sheet. I feel that the reason you don’t have a packed house is that people think that this is a done deal and feel they can’t stop it. I asked a friend of mine why he sold his house and he said, “I sold it because of this incinerator, I don’t want to lose on my investment. The real estate value is going down.” Can you guarantee Clarington residents, especially children, that the emissions will not increase and what the additional health care cost will be?

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: The health care costs should be zero. The reports we produce, if we are not happy with the findings, if the health team thinks there is potential risk to children, we will recommend that it should not be built.

Question 34b: Will it increase the body burden?

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: There have been studies of residents close to incinerators in Portugal. These studies looked at a number of environmental contaminants and they found that there is no difference in the levels of contaminants and mercury between the residents and other people. There was no difference.

Question 34c: You are saying they did a survey of effects before?

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: Yes, before and after, from the calculations as to whether or not there will be an increased body burden.

Question 34d: Those studies are accessible to us? Can this be posted on the website?

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: Yes, they are included in my report to Dr. Kyle which is on the Region of Durham website on the homepage under the heading Public Health.

Question 34e: How can we achieve zero waste?

[Comment added later: Society must change its patterns of consumption.]

Answer provided by Jim McKay: This facility is designed to deal with York/Durham/Peterborough/Northumberland waste and small amounts of ICI waste. It will not be permitted to deal with larger ICI companies.

QUESTION #35: Who is our contact in the MOE since they are making the final decision of this site apart from the minister. I would like an email address. There is a lot of information they have not taken into consideration.

Answer provided by Jim McKay Gavin.Battarino@ontario.ca

Comment: This information should be provided to all.

Answer provided by Jim McKay: This information will be included in the transcripts of tonight's meeting which will be posted on the website.

QUESTION #36: Should I go back and talk to the politicians and praise them for what is happening? That the Region of Durham has taken 88% of building this facility and York has doubled recycling and are selling their garbage. The Region of Durham will see an increased tax burden and York Region is getting off free. Are we being taken advantage of in Durham?

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: 90% of the waste going into the facility will be generated in the Region of Durham. Durham is taking the responsible way of managing its garbage.

Question 36b: I think Hamilton and Halton made other decisions. The Medical Officer of Health and the Commissioner in Hamilton thought they would save money by not building it. The Region of Halton investigated building an EFW facility versus using a landfill site and decided that they will continue to use a landfill site and look into EFW in 5 years. Why is Durham not doing the same as York? Selling our garbage to make pellets, doubling our recycling.

Answer provided by Mirka Januszkiewicz: Durham and York have excellent blue box and green bin programs. York issued a public RFQ and that is how it ended up with the waste pelletization solution.

QUESTION #37: Who is going to make this decision if it is not going to be you? What is going to be the outcome? Who will come up with the options, who will make the decisions? Is it our municipality, the Region of Durham, our government?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: The Region of Durham will make the decision. The Ministry of the Environment will provide feedback. The Region of Durham Council will make the decision.

QUESTION #38: I was raised in a municipality that had an incinerator. After many years I became sick. We were living close to the monster in Toronto and who is going to cover the medical costs? They refuse to cover the medication that I cannot afford to pay for.

Answer provided by Dr. Chris Ollson: When we look at this facility, there should be no burden to the health care system. We are making predictions about whether it will pose an unacceptable risk or not. There should be no unacceptable risk as a result of the proposed facility.

Comment: I feel that is what happened to me. It all goes back to that monster in Toronto and other people will get sick from it.

QUESTION #39: I was confused with the comment made by Dr. Smith. Your conclusion was that studies could not be used to support or not support incineration. Please clarify.

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: I looked at a lot of studies, looked at the presence of emissions from an EFW facility. Those studies do not show any impact due to the presence of an EFW facility. My conclusion was that there was no difference in the body burdens and levels of people living close to incinerators. The evidence was inconclusive. The report is on the website.

QUESTION #40: I understand thyroid problems are one disadvantage of incineration. Go back and get an update. Are East Gwillimbury's estates more important than the EFW industrial park? I have part of the June 20th Council minutes. On page 67 it says that vendors will be required to demonstrate an ability to further expand the facility in 2036. I asked how far and you said 400,000 tonnes maximum.

Answer provided by Jim McKay: We will only build the building for what we need. We are asking the vendors to demonstrate how they would take it from 150,000 tonnes or 250,000 tonnes to 400,000 tonnes should we need to expand it.

Question 40b: I have another statement that York has the option of increasing the capacity as it requires.

Answer provided by Jim McKay: The limit is 400,000 tonnes. That's the maximum.

Question 40c: It cannot go over 400,000 tonnes?

Answer provided by Jim McKay: Correct, it cannot go over 400,000 tonnes without an amendment to the EA.

QUESTION #41: - You mentioned studies, there are other studies that I would be happy to share with you, a couple of statistics. Between 1996 and 2000, there was a 30% increase in lung cancer. Studies have been done regarding incineration and human health, and they were forwarded to Dr. Smith. Other than your own studies, what have you studied?

Answer provided by Dr. Lesbia Smith: The studies I looked at were studies that were published from 2000 to 2007. The Halton report looked at those studies and the question posed to me was to respond to the Halton health report. It is justifiable to look at those results only, they represent the population that have been exposed to these risks. My study, my review of literature is limited to those years. There are many studies that have taken place in the 70s, 80s and 90s but they weren't relevant to current incinerators and current effects. Whatever these studies were, they were not the focus and I cannot comment on them. I did a review of the database, abstracts. Only 14 studies addressed health effects around incinerators. It was a pretty recent assessment; we looked at what is relevant to the question.

Answer provided by Dr. Ollson as well: Incineration has been around a long time. These are all things we are concerned about. If we weren't concerned, there could be a lot of money saved. There were a lot of concerns on mass burn incineration, you have listed things that may have been issues in the past but there have been further studies. That is what the study is about. That is what leads us to the studies we are doing.

**QUESTIONS THAT WERE NOT ASKED DURING THE Q&A PERIOD
ON OCTOBER 9, 2007**

- 1) Doesn't Durham Region already have two large dangerous polluters, the Darling and Pickering Nuclear facilities? Adding a new EFW facility is adding another risk to this area. How much is too much?

Answer: The presence of other sources of air emissions in Durham Region, such as the Darlington and Pickering Nuclear facilities, will be considered in the site-specific air modelling which will be undertaken following the selection of the preferred site and technology vendor.

- 2) If after this site is confirmed and operational, and my home's value decreases by over 10%, as has happened in the areas surrounding other EFW facilities, can I expect my property value based taxes to decrease by a similar amount?

Answer: Calculations regarding property taxes have not been addressed as of yet. We have seen no data indicating that the presence of an EFW facility in an industrial area will have an adverse effect on residential property values.

- 3) Why, when Toronto and other Cities including Bowmanville are trying to reclaim and rejuvenate their waterfronts would you choose to build an industrial waste facility basically right on our waterfront?

Answer: The Clarington 01 site is not right on the waterfront, it is located on the north side of the rail corridor in an area planned for industrial land use.

- 4) What efforts will be undertaken to show support for this project (due to the consistent negative comments/quotes put out by the local newspapers)?

Answer: The project endeavors to provide factual information to the public and the press. We cannot control what the press chooses to report.

- 5) The October public poll should be to a large percentage of the local population/citizens..... Some citizens do not know all the details and need to be informed and allowed to "vote" on what will be in their neighborhood, Clarington 01.

Citizens should be allowed to vote on something that can affect their health and air quality.

Answer: Established polling techniques will be used and a sample size to yield the required accuracy will be selected when the public poll is conducted regarding the proposed facility. This will give residents an opportunity to provide their input regarding the Durham York Residual Waste Study. 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. Further, residents may submit any comments or concerns regarding this project or any of the study documents to the Study Team and a response will be provided. There will not, however, be a public voting process carried out as part of this project. All final decisions regarding this project will be made by Regional Council, who represent the citizens and who are responsible for the delivery of required infrastructure such as the proposed facility.

- 6) How would garbage be screened before it goes into the incinerator? Some people throw paint, batteries and other hazardous items into the garbage. Plastic (clear) containers are not being accepted by the recycling program in Clarington..... This means they will end up in the garbage.

Answer: Direction of materials to the proper end-point is an important element of any waste management system. The primary method for removing such contaminants is at source via Blue Box, Green Bin and Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) programs. Durham and York Regions apply continuous efforts to ensure the effectiveness of these measures through promotion and education campaigns, the development of Community Environmental Centres, and Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO). It should be recognized that the waste to be delivered to an EFW facility is expected to consist of residual waste materials that cannot otherwise be included in the Blue Box, Green Bin or HHW programs. It is possible that the waste will be further 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 ongoing diversion programs.

Even with extensive education, it is possible that residents will dispose of potentially hazardous material in the garbage (e.g. an old thermostat containing mercury). The flue gas cleaning system installed at the facility will control the vast majority of these emissions such that the emissions to the environment are all within the prescribed regulatory limits. These regulatory limits are set to ensure the protection of public health.