
Appendix 1

Comment and Response Table Comments Received via Telephone and Website

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
ENVIRONMENT	
Are you assuming that nanoparticles act like vapours? If yes, do we know this for sure?	Nanoparticles are accounted for in the risk assessment. They are captured within the assessment between the fine particulate matter and the vapour phase. Text will be added to the final Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment report to add further clarification about this topic.
I understand that there will be waste water discharges from the cleaning of exhaust gases in an incinerator. Where will the facilities for the disposal of quenching and scrubbing water be? How is this water disposed of?	Significant quantities of water are reused within the process. Facilities can be designed to have "zero" waste process waste water. In these facilities the waste water is evaporated and discharged with the stack exhaust gases. If this is not done then waste water may be treated to ensure compliance with sewer use by-laws and then is discharged into the sanitary sewer.
Looking at the global perspective, the incinerator would be contributing to global climate change: of the 400,000 tons of garbage to be processed, 70% would go up as flue gases. I don't know how much of those flue gases are CO ₂ , NO _x or other pollutants, but I do know they make a mockery of my attempts to reduce my own carbon emissions. If we continue to measure our wealth by the rate at which we mine resources, manufacture goods, then burn them, we are heading toward a nasty shock in the not-so-distant future.	Thermally treating the residual waste to produce electricity and recover additional metals from the ash produces less greenhouse gas emissions than the current practice of transporting the waste and disposing of it in a remote landfill. On an annual basis, thermally treating the waste from a typical household generates about 1% of the greenhouse gas emissions that are generated by heating a house and driving a car.
I have attended council meetings, and meetings in the spring and recently at Faith place. I'm very alarmed that our mayor is not speaking out against incineration for many reasons. We have been informed re. concerns re. the Environment and cutting back on our greenhouse gases. Why would you contribute more deadly toxins into the air. We've had so many smog days and are in the major area that gets the majority of poor quality air. To say that the chosen site has many advantages is so unfair and ridiculous. Where is your responsibility to the citizens?	Human health is a primary concern of both York and Durham Regions and is a key factor in our assessment of the Consultants' Recommended Preferred Site (Clarington 01). Potential air quality impacts were examined as part of the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment. The report outlining the results of this study is located on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/healthrisk_assessment.php . Based on the results of this study, it was determined that there would be no unacceptable risks as a result of impacts on air quality due to the proposed facility. However, this site will be subjected to a rigorous and transparent site-specific assessment and approvals process that will address any potential air quality impacts and related health concerns. These detailed air quality studies will be carried out as part of the site-specific human health and ecological risk assessment. A Study was completed comparing the emissions from an EFW facility and those from a remote landfill. The study found that on a life cycle basis, emissions from the EFW facility contained less greenhouse gases, less smog precursors and less acid gases than the remote landfill scenario. The results of this study can be found at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/study/refrence/Summary-Comparative_Analysis.pdf .
When was the air monitoring station installed at the Courtice site? What parameters are being monitored? Are the sampling data analyses available for public review?	Air monitoring at the Courtice site (Clarington 01) began on August 20, 2007. As referenced in Section 5.1.1.1 in "Annex A – Report on Potential Air Quality Impacts", which can be found on the project website at:

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/consultants_prefsite.php, the parameters that are currently being monitored include SO₂, NO_x, CO, ozone and PM_{2.5}. Data regarding wind speed, wind direction and temperature is also being collected. The results of this Air Quality Study are available for review at the above mentioned website address. Air quality data will continue to be collected at this location throughout the duration of the project.
Will restrictions be placed on the facility feedstock with respect to the quantity of Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW), Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment (WEEE) and plastics that contribute to dioxins and furans remaining in the waste stream delivered for thermal treatment?	The primary method for removing such contaminants is at source via household hazardous waste and special waste programs. Efforts to expand and improve these programs by Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO) are presently on going. Some thermal treatment technologies remove recyclables prior to thermal treatment while other technologies recover metals from the ash. The decision on which technology to employ has not been made as of yet. Durham and York Regions will continue to promote and expand diversion efforts in order to reduce the amount of material requiring disposal.
Will the request for proposals for technology specify a wet scrubber as the most effective approach to cleaning air emissions?	The details of the RFP have not been decided yet. The issue of specifying a specific flue gas cleaning technology will be considered during the preparation of the RFP.
Your generic EFW risk assessment report while it falls far short of being reassuring, also does not take into account that the atmosphere ignores enforceable boundaries; 500 feet, 1000 feet, a thousand miles. The report states "This generic risk assessment did not account for existing baseline chemical concentrations in the environment". Why not? These pollutants will in all probability, combine with other toxins and spread out far and wide for all to breathe for many years to come. What a despicable legacy for the generations to follow.	The Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment did not account for site-specific baseline chemical concentrations because the Consultant's recommended site was not known at that time. In preparation for the site-specific risk assessment that will be conducted, baseline chemical concentrations in the air are already being monitored and plans are being put together for an extensive baseline soil, water, sediment and biota sampling in the spring/summer of 2008. These baseline concentrations will be accounted for in the site-specific risk assessment.
Page 7 of the Durham Works Newsletter Question: Will this facility release dioxins? "The annual quantity of dioxins... equivalent to burning 15 logs." Can you explain that in numbers?	This estimation was based on the following assumptions: -According to emission rates provided by technology vendors, a modern EFW facility is estimated to emit about 40 ng/tonne of waste combusted. -The average household in Durham and York is estimated to generate approximately 385 kg per year of post diversion waste. This assumes 60% waste diversion by the beginning of the planning period. Assuming the above rate of 40 ng/tonne, the average household would generate approximately 15 ng of dioxins per year. -The Environment Canada Study: Characterization of Organic Compounds from Selected Residential Wood Stoves and Fuels, 2000, derived an average emission rate of 0.5 ng of dioxins/furans per kg of wood combusted. This study can be found at:

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	http://www.nj.gov/dep/airworkgroups/docs/hr/hr_study_woodburning_woodstoves.pdf. This value was subsequently used for the calculation of the National Dioxin Inventory by Environment Canada. 15 ng of dioxin per household per year (see above assumption) is about equal to the burning of 30 kg of wood (using the above rate of 0.5 ng/kg). Assuming approximately 2 kg per log, this is about equal to 15 logs. Therefore, the annual quantity of dioxin emitted by thermally processing the residual waste from a typical household in an EFW facility is about equal to that same household burning 15 logs in a woodstove or fireplace.
In addition, the human health and environmental risk assessment must consider cumulative effects of multiple emission sources, including but not limited to Highway 401, St. Marys Cement, Ontario Power Authority and General Motors. From my participation on the St. Marys Cement Community Relations Committee, I know that PM-10 emissions at monitoring stations located in surrounding residential areas have, at times, exceeded Ministry of Environment proposed thresholds. While these exceedences have been associated with certain weather conditions, it remains a fact that Clarington residents are occasionally exposed to PM-10 emissions above acceptable thresholds. Any additional contribution of PM-10 to Clarington's environment will exacerbate air quality problems in the area. This may also be true for other emissions that are not currently being measured by St. Marys.	Regional air quality data was included in the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment that was conducted. The results of this study can be found on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/healthrisk_assessment.php. However, specific data pertaining to emissions from multiple sources, including Highway 401, St. Mary's Cement, Ontario Power Authority and General Motors, was not included in the generic risk assessment. This data will be considered during the site-specific risk assessment that will be carried out on the Clarington 01 site following the selection of the technology vendor.
I understand that York/Durham is planning to make an incineration plant to halt all garbage going to Michigan by 2010. I think this is a great idea, however, would be interested in weighing out the factors of: Pollution from hauling to Michigan (emissions from trucks) vs. Pollution from incineration I think this would be a very fair comparison to make, and would really be a tell tale factor to make this project feasible both from the cost and environmental factor over time. I'm hopeful the latter will be much more environmentally friendly! Please let me know if you have done such a comparison. And if you have the statistics available on.... what	We have compared the environmental effects of a local energy from waste (EFW) facility with hauling and disposing of the post diversion residual waste in a remote landfill. In summary, the EFW option produces energy and has lower overall emissions of greenhouse gases that cause global warming, pollutants that cause smog and pollutants that cause acid rain than the remote landfill option. The remote landfill option has lower emissions of heavy metals and dioxins. These emissions from thermal facilities are well within regulatory limits and are less than the emission of these contaminants from many other established industrial sources.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
is the level of pollution emitted from an incineration plant similar to the one you are planning to create.	Details of this analysis are available on the project website in a document titled "Supplement to Annex E-5: Comparative Analysis of Thermal Treatment and Remote Landfill on a Lifecycle Basis". This document can be found at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/Annex-E-5-Supplemental_Report.pdf
In the Durham Works fall and winter newsletter many important questions are asked regarding the proposed energy from waste facility but the answers are disturbing. For example: Q: Will this facility release dioxins? A: The dioxins emitted annually for each household's waste is equivalent to that household burning approximately 15 logs in a fireplace. What size of logs are we talking about here and are we supposed to be lulled by picturing each family burning 15 logs on a welcoming hearth? Take the number of households in Durham and York regions and add in the households from Peterborough as well because the energy from waste facility may take their garbage too. Now think of them each burning 15 logs and that is one big fire and a lot of pollution. It is NOT reassuring to tell us that dioxins are also emitted by other sources. Is that supposed to mean it is fine to add more?	This estimation was based on the following assumptions: -According to emission rates provided by technology vendors, a modern EFW facility is estimated to emit about 40 ng/tonne of waste combusted. -The average household in Durham and York is estimated to generate approximately 385 kg per year of post diversion waste. This assumes 60% waste diversion by the beginning of the planning period. Assuming the above rate of 40 ng/tonne, the average household would generate approximately 15 ng of dioxins per year. -The Environment Canada Study: Characterization of Organic Compounds from Selected Residential Wood Stoves and Fuels, 2000, derived an average emission rate of 0.5 ng of dioxins/furans per kg of wood combusted. This study can be found at: http://www.nj.gov/dep/airworkgroups/docs/hr/hr_study_woodburning_woodstoves.pdf. This value was subsequently used for the calculation of the National Dioxin Inventory by Environment Canada. 15 ng of dioxin per household per year (see above assumption) is about equal to the burning of 30 kg of wood (using the above rate of 0.5 ng/kg). Assuming approximately 2 kg per log, this is about equal to 15 logs. Therefore, the annual quantity of dioxin emitted by thermally processing the residual waste from a typical household in an EFW is about equal to that same household burning 15 logs in a woodstove or fireplace. Your comments regarding the unacceptability of any additional emissions are noted.
Another Question posed is "will this facility process hazardous wastes" to which the answer is given - " Many common household wastes contain hazardous materials such as lead, mercury and cadmium ... All residents are urged to do their part in keeping our neighborhoods clean and safe by bringing household hazardous wastes to a licensed drop-off depot." There are many people who simply have little or no regard for our environment. I've seen car batteries left beside a creek	Direction of materials to the proper end-point is an important element of any waste management system. The primary method for removing contaminants, such as waste that contributes to the amount of chemicals and heavy metals in the waste stream, is Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and other stewardship 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 noted that the waste to be delivered to the proposed EFW facility is expected to consist of residual waste materials that cannot

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
in a beautiful greenbelt area. Does the waste management department really believe everyone is going to comply with their request to bring hazardous wastes to a drop-off depot when we can't get them to stop littering or illegally dumping garbage on our country roads? The municipality has a hard time getting some residents to sort garbage for the blue box. Are we now going to trust these same irresponsible people to sort hazardous wastes out of their garbage before it is sent to be burned emitting toxic chemicals into our air?	otherwise be included in the Blue Box, Green Bin or HHW programs. To ensure that these collection programs are effective at reducing the risks associated with emissions from the proposed EFW facility, ambitious collection targets for each material will be set and continuous improvement measures will be implemented as required to meet or exceed the specified collection targets. 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. We thank you again for taking the time to submit your concerns regarding the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process.
Another obvious reason to say no to incineration is our declining environment stability. There is no denying the effect of the emissions and waste produced by large industries on our air quality. They are a major contributor to the smog and pollution in our region. By adding a garbage incinerator in Courtice, or anywhere in Durham, you are talking a huge leap in the wrong direction and creating a bigger problem.	A comparative emissions study was completed which looked at emissions from an energy-from-waste (EFW) facility vs. a remote landfill on a life cycle basis. The results of this study can be found in the document titled "Supplement to Annex E-5: Comparative Analysis of Thermal Treatment and Remote Landfill on a Lifecycle Basis" posted on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/Annex-E-5-Supplemental_Report.php. Based on the results of this study, less greenhouse gases, acid gases, and smog precursors are emitted from an EFW facility than a remote landfill.
I am writing to express concern over the proposal to build an incinerator near Courtice Road and the 401. Although I have not followed the debate very closely I did listen with some frustration to a discussion on the Rogers channel during the summer. Speaking as a person with an extensive Chemistry background, there were a number of misconceptions which troubled me. One misconception was the "fact" that incineration would be preferable to landfill because methane is a greenhouse gas produced from landfills. While it is true that organic matter	An analysis has been performed based on Durham's post blue box and green bin diversion programs and the EFW option still produces significantly less greenhouse gas emissions than remote landfill. Although the blue box and green bin programs divert large quantities of organic material, a significant portion remains in the residual waste stream. In a landfill, this remaining organic material will decompose to produce methane, a potent greenhouse gas. Details on this analysis are available on the project web site at: www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/Annex-E-5-Supplemental_Report.pdf.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
can decompose to methane, and this has been a concern with landfills in the past, the fact is that in Durham, through our popular Green Bin program, we very effectively remove compostable matter from our garbage, and along with paper removed through the Blue Box program, those organic substances are not part of our residual garbage. Residual garbage is mostly plastic packaging. Our residual garbage would be giving off a minimum amount of methane.	
a) The study states that “maximum emission concentrations for all selected chemicals (CoPCs) were considered for the air dispersion modelling to illustrate a realistic worst-case scenario ...for the proposed technology “.Clearly the assumption here is that the emissions are in compliance with A-7 standards of the Ministry of the Environment (MoE). This can hardly be the worst case scenario .The worst case would occur when the standards are breached .This could happen when temperatures drop, or the incinerator is shutting down or perhaps even starting up in test mode or when a non-homogeneous load is inserted,or when “would be screened” materials are included .This could be something as simple as a radioactive diaper etc... The Study fails to investigate any of these worst cases and examines only the best case scenario. Recommendation Examine the multitude of worst case scenarios and consider action plans to respond to them in this study. b) I guess this means that this point will be incorporated	a) Of all the potential thermal technologies being considered, incineration would be considered the worst-case scenario; incineration was modeled in this generic risk assessment. The Guideline A-7 emission concentration limits were used as default exhaust stack air emission estimates for only the eight pollutants contained in the guideline. All other emissions estimates were based on current stack emissions from the KMS Peel thermal treatment facility located in Brampton, Ontario (i.e., Ontario’s only EFW facility). The risks derived from this generic risk assessment, therefore can be consider “worse-case”. Startup, shutdown, tests and upset conditions were not considered in this generic risk assessment as no vendor has been selected. However, these conditions would only be evaluated as to their potential risk from short-term, acute inhalation scenario. This will be considered in the site-specific risk assessment. Language in the Generic Risk Assessment will be updated to ensure clarity on this matter. b) This issue will be further examined in the site-specific risk assessment once a vendor is selected
a) The standards A7 and A8 provide for an annual testing followed by a reporting of compliance with emission standards .Understandably the MoE can ask for additional reporting and follow up action .Given the immense liability an incinerator operator /proponent would assume for the health of people and the ecosystem annual monitoring is simply not good enough . Continuous monitoring and appropriate action plans to deal with emergencies need to be in place .These would of course	a) If and when a facility is built, it will be regulated under provincial law and will be required to meet all monitoring and reporting conditions. Any host municipality specific requirements of the facility and its operations will be negotiated as part of the Host Community Agreement.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
facilitate judgement calls about the continued existence of an incinerator and the informed placement of responsibility for legal action related to damages in the area of health, loss of use and loss of enjoyment of ones property etc. In addition to Continuous monitoring at the stack, sampling and testing of the environment should be a prerequisite of any installation .in order to measure the environmental and human impact. Recommendation 1. The operator should provide a measure of risk posed by the operation of such an incinerator to the public and Municipalities on a regular basis and make such continuous monitoring information available to the public upon request. 2. The Municipalities require the operator to provide continuous monitoring of all emissions including sewage discharges. Further that Municipalities undertake environmental and health sampling in the effected areas on a regular basis as well as sewage discharge .Such information should be made public and form the basis for further action /decision . b) Perhaps the consultant would take the initiative and advise the host municipalities and the respective Regional municipality regarding the importance of monitoring .Safety of residents particularly down-wind is of paramount importance.	b) Monitoring requirements for such a facility are still in the process of being developed and will be contingent on the type of facility to be built. Consultation with regulators, the Medical Officer of Health and the public will be undertaken once a proposed monitoring program for the facility is completed in draft.
HEALTH	
I have more and more trouble each summer with asthma and breathing difficulties because of the air pollution - takes me 3 puffers right now to function "normally" - and your goal is to make it worse. Oh, indeed, that is what would happen.	Human health is the primary concern of both York and Durham Regions and is a key factor in our assessment of the Consultants' Recommended Preferred Site (Clarington 01). This site will be subjected to a rigorous and transparent site-specific assessment and approvals process that will address any potential air quality impacts and related health concerns. These air quality studies will be carried out as part of the site-specific human health and ecological risk assessment.
We know that emissions such as dioxins can be released from many sources, including EFW facilities. We also know that emissions such as dioxins are bioaccumulative, meaning that they can build up in our bodies and our food sources. Since	The Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment was performed as a preliminary feasibility study and was carried out in anticipation of conducting a site-specific risk assessment. It identified generic issues that will need to be taken into account during the site-specific assessment and was a useful tool at this stage for providing interim information

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
they are <i>bioaccumulative</i> my concern is that our airshed may already be negatively impacting our food supply and we don't even know it. My question is, did the site specific assessment do any testing of the cattle (for example) in our area and/or the milk from our area to see what levels of such things as dioxins are in them? It has been said by some that the levels of dioxins from an EFW are too minute to worry about. However, they bioaccumulate. It does not matter how much comes from the EFW - you have to take into consideration all of the other sources around us and ADD those from the EFW in.	regarding this study. When the detailed site-specific risk assessment is conducted on the Consultant's recommended preferred site, Clarington 01, site-specific background levels of contaminants will be considered. If available, background dioxin levels in cows and cow's milk may also be considered. Bioaccumulation/fate and transport of contaminants in the environment are all considered during the calculation of risk.
If this EFW facility is built, will there be any monitoring of human health and environment after the fact? For example, will there be environmental studies done on frogs for example (as frogs can be important bio-indicators of problems since they are particularly sensitive to environmental factors as are most amphibians) in a given area (up to 20km radius)? Will our blood and that of our children be tested pre-EFW and post-EFW to see what our levels of pollutants are and how they change after an EFW is in operation? What about testing the levels of pollutants in milk from lactating humans that live in Clarington?	Yes, biomonitoring of human health and the environment is being considered at this point in the EA process. Specifics of any biomonitoring program would be developed in the future, thus frogs and other amphibians may be considered at that time. Pre-EFW and post-EFW blood and human milk sampling may be considered, however the decision to undertake such a study would need to be made by the Public Health Departments of both Durham and York Regions.
Why were food chain intake values obtained from the U.S. EPA and not from values from Health Canada?	Our human health modelling is based on US EPA HHRAP (2005) guidance because neither the Ontario MOE nor Health Canada publishes specific guidance on the assessment of potential risk from air emissions emitted by waste processing facilities. Because the US EPA HHRAP model is set up differentiating between four different types of produce [aboveground exposed, aboveground protected, belowground (root), and fruit], use of the Health Canada (2004) intake rates (broken down into only two types of produce) posed a problem. Health Canada (2004) state that 'where Canadian data on required receptor characteristics have not been published, alternate sources such as the <i>US EPA Exposure Factors Manual</i> (US EPA, 1997) should be used.' For all receptors, the Exposure Factors Handbook was used, as it explicitly provides ingestion rates for all four types of produce. In addition, ingestion rates of agricultural products (beef, milk, poultry, eggs, and pork) were obtained from US EPA (1997) for all receptors. For fish, although Richardson (1997) (as cited in Health Canada, 2004) provides fish

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	consumption rates for non-native populations, these rates include a wide variety of fish products, including marine fish (cod, haddock), canned salmon, tuna, and sardines, freshwater fish, and shrimp (fresh, frozen, and canned). As the intention of this assessment was to evaluate the risks arising from the consumption of freshwater fish caught within the modeled watershed, these values were not considered appropriate. Jacques Whitford feels that the Health Canada default fish ingestion rates would overestimate the actual ingestion rate of a non-First Nations receptor and further, would overestimate the community-wide risk to such receptors, given the inclusion of all fish products (including canned, frozen, and marine species). Therefore, mean fish intake rates for individuals who eat fish and reside in households with recreational fish consumption from the Exposure Factors Handbook (US EPA, 1997) were used. <i>US EPA. 2005. Human Health Risk Assessment Protocol for Hazardous Waste Combustion Facilities (HHRAP), Final. EPA520-R-05-006</i> <i>Richardson, G.M. 1997. Compendium of Canadian Human Exposure Factors for Risk Assessment. Ottawa: O'Connor Associates Environmental Inc.</i> <i>United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). 1997. Exposure Factors Handbook, Volume I: General Factors; Volume II: Food Ingestion Factors; Volume III: Activity Factors. EPA/600/P-95/002Fa, U.S. EPA, Washington, DC. August 1997</i> <i>Health Canada, 2004. Federal Contaminated Site Risk Assessment in Canada. Part I: Guidance on Human Health Preliminary Quantitative Risk Assessment (PQRA).</i>
I understand you choose the Clarington 01 site for the new incinerator over the site at East Gwillimbury. The population density for Clarington is 127.3/ sq.km (and growing all the time on small lot sizes of about 40x85) vs. only 86 /sq.km for East Gwillimbury (where apparently there are estate size lots in the general area). Our population density is 48% higher here in Clarington than in East Gwillimbury. Dr. Smith said that the emissions from the incinerator will only effect 1 in a million for cancer, but if we have a higher population density in Clarington, will it not effect more people???	The risk calculated is not dependent on population density or size; therefore, a cancer risk calculated in dense population vs. a less dense population is the same. The cancer risk of 1 in a million refers to the incremental increase in the incidence of cancer above the current cancer rate from exposure to contaminants from the site in question. If a cancer risk were calculated that went above the current cancer rate, this would be labeled by the Ministry of the Environment as an "unacceptable risk" and the proposed facility would not be built.
I have been faithfully reading the local newspaper's editorials and articles on the latest incinerator news. I understand that the	Based on the results of the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment that was conducted, it was determined that an energy from waste facility, such as the one proposed

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
waste solution is not an easy one. Yet I cannot see any common sense in just burning the garbage. The incinerator will affect it's surrounding communities in Clarington, not just Courtice. There is solid evidence the incinerator poses health and environmental threats. The incinerator is not a safe answer to our waste woes. There is already poor air quality in Clarington from the 401 Highway, GTA smog, and St. Mary's Cement emissions. Furthermore the Darlington Nuclear plant gives us some radiation. The citizens of Clarington do not need anymore toxins in our air and area. The incinerator will emit multiple dioxins and carcinogenic gases. No amount of toxic emissions are acceptable. I am writing this letter on behalf of my family and relatives that live in Clarington. Please for the sake of the health of children and grandchildren in Clarington reconsider burning garbage. The incinerator is not a safe solution.	for Durham and York Regions, would not have a significant impact on human health and it would be safe to build such a facility in Durham Region. The results of this risk assessment are available to the public on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/healthrisk_assessment.php. An Air Quality Impact Study was carried out as part of the evaluation of the short-listed sites. The results of this study also indicate that there should be no significant impacts to air quality as a result of building and operating the proposed facility. The results of this Air Quality Study are included in "Annex A - Report on Potential Air Quality Impacts" which can be found on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/consultants_prefsite.php. Air quality monitoring at the Consultants' recommended site is continuing. A site specific Health and Ecological Risk Assessment will be undertaken to confirm that the proposed facility is safe.
As a taxpayer, I don't want to pay for a facility that will affect my health, raise my taxes and lower my property value. I don't see any economic benefit for the region or Clarington. In fact, I see even more indirect damage, in terms of increased health care costs (respiratory ailments, cancer, congenital defects, etc.), traffic impact and reduction of quality of life for the region: fewer employers will want to locate here, and fewer jobs means people will still need to commute to Toronto.	The work done to date including the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment and reviews of other studies indicate that the proposed facility should not create any unacceptable health risks. There is no indication that existing facilities in other jurisdictions have an adverse impact on host community property values. These issues will be considered further in the upcoming site-specific studies.
The risk assessment hides behind conservative assumptions to dismiss its own findings.	Using conservative assumptions, for example running models using the maximum permitted air and A-7 limits is a proper screening tool for this type of assessment. Using these conservative assumptions, only two types of receptors were found to be of potential concern (only one realistically given the lack of aboriginal people eating fish from the nearby stream). The results provided likely are an overestimation of actual exposure. The A-7 air emission guideline limits were used in the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Study because though thermal treatment has been selected as the preferred technology, the vendor-specific energy from waste (EFW) equipment/air pollution control system has not yet been chosen. It will be selected during the procurement process and must be shown to emit emissions that meet or are below the A-7 guidelines and other regulatory

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	air standards. In order to be selected, the proposed technology must meet this requirement. To clarify, the preferred technology has already been selected for the proposed facility. As referenced in the report titled "Evaluation of "Alternatives to" and Identification of the Preferred Residual Processing System" located on the project website at http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/Final-Report-May30-06-no-e-signatures.pdf, either system 2(a) (Thermal Treatment of Mixed Waste with Recovery of Materials from the Ash / Char) or System 2(b) (Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel) will be implemented. The emission characteristics of these two similar technology groupings are broadly known. The vendor-specific EFW equipment/air pollution control system under those technology groupings is what remains to be selected by the competitive procurement process. Once that has been selected, the specific emission characteristics associated with the selected vendor's EFW equipment/air pollution control system will be known to a greater level of detail. That more specific information will be incorporated into the subsequent assessments required for approval of the facility, including further health and ecological risk assessment studies. We assure you that any negative findings will be subject to further investigation.
The study continues to fail to commit to a "thermal treatment" type – rendering the emissions estimates in this RA fictional and denying the public any opportunity to compare the environmental impacts of thermal treatment types.	The Risk Assessment initially assumed emissions at the guideline and regulatory limit. Established technologies generally operate with emissions well below these limits. New technologies may offer even lower emissions. As mentioned in the response to question 1, one of the main criteria for selecting the vendor-specific EFW equipment/air pollution control system is the ability for this technology to meet or exceed the A-7 guidelines. In summary, regardless of the specific technology and vendor selected through the procurement process, the emissions from the facility are expected to be comparable to or lower than those assumed in the Risk Assessment. Requests for Qualifications/Proposals from EFW system vendors will be open to two similar types of thermal treatment technologies (Systems 2(a) and 2(b) as previously determined during Part B of the EA study), which must be shown to operate reliably and consistently meet the A-7 guidelines in order to be considered.
The peer review and our own review identified some ecological assessment problems. a) We note that the study does not assume any background concentrations of contaminants. This is a highly unrealistic assumption in many parts of Durham and York regions. The	a) The assumptions regarding background concentrations were necessary to enable a single generic risk assessment of all potential sites for the energy-from-waste (EFW) facility. This is discussed in Section 6.1 "ERA Assessment Boundaries and Scenarios" in the Generic

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
report does not adequately justify why this assumption was made – or rather left to be addressed by a site specific analysis. b) The Peer review identified problems with the analysis for bird toxicity related to the use of mammalian data – we would like more information on how this was remedied. Based on our review of the report (p.73) this issue was not fixed. c) The analysis for reptiles and amphibians is not comprehensible – despite high exposure levels predicted for	Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report, "...Existing concentrations of chemicals in the environment were not evaluated; rather, this ERA focused on the additive risk (in addition to baseline) which may be introduced to the environment due to emissions from the EFW facility..." Background concentrations are also discussed in section 6.6 "Ecological Risk Characterization" in the above mentioned report, where the decision to use a HQ of 0.2 (rather than 1.0) is explained, "...given that background concentrations in environmental media were not taken into consideration a more conservative HQ benchmark of 0.2 was employed. Although this is rarely the case in ecological risk assessment, this more conservative benchmark was warranted given that cumulative effects were not assessed..." Background concentrations will be quantitatively assessed in the site-specific risk assessment to be conducted as a later component of the facility approvals process. b) The effect of omitting mammal-to-bird extrapolations of toxicity data prevents a quantitative assessment of the health risks to birds for those compounds without toxicological information. This is discussed in section 6.5.3 "Oral TRVs for Valued Environmental Components" in the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Report. "In many cases for avian (bird) species, specific toxicity reference values for avian species were not available. Therefore, potential risk from exposure to these chemicals of potential concern can only be evaluated qualitatively, meaning that if there is no risk to mammals from these chemicals in the absence of bird toxicology one must assume this would be protective of birds in the area." The current state of knowledge on the effects of contaminants to bird species does not always permit a quantitative assessment of risk. The absence of unacceptable risk to all terrestrial mammalian species in this assessment is taken as an indication that adverse effects to birds are also unlikely. The future site-specific risk assessment will make use of any new and relevant toxicity data pertaining to effects on birds. If those results warrant, biomonitoring programs may be recommended to ensure any adverse effects to birds are identified and addressed. c) Given the ecology (i.e., habitat, life history, etc.) of amphibians and reptiles, Jacques Whitford feels the strategy applied in the generic risk assessment is most appropriate for assessing potential environmental effects to these receptors. Of particular importance for

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
aquatic life to dioxins and furans the study finds they “were adequately protected” (p.79). Given that a large number of turtle and frog species in southern Ontario are under serious population pressures, these issues merit more attention.	amphibians is the portion of life spent as an entirely aquatic organism (typically larval stage). For reptiles, a terrestrial existence is more typical. The approach used to assess amphibians and reptiles is very similar to that used for birds in the absence of contaminant specific toxicity. Even more so than avian species, the current state of knowledge on the toxicity of contaminants to amphibians and reptiles is limited. Consequently, only a qualitative assessment is possible. As was done for birds, a comparison to results for mammals was used for amphibians and reptiles. Additionally, a comparison to aquatic receptors was also considered for amphibians. Referencing the risk characterization for birds and mammals to assess reptiles, and aquatic life to assess amphibians has also been recommended by the USEPA. Granted, the most desirable approach would be to assess amphibian and reptile VECs in the same manner used to evaluate other VECs (mammals and birds). However, current toxicological data does not permit this. With regard to the elevated predicted exposures by aquatic receptors to dioxins and furans, it was explained in the Ecological Risk Assessment that when using emission levels recorded at the KMS Peel facility (instead of MOE guideline A-7 emission limits), the exposure decreases to levels not considered to have potential for causing adverse effects. Furthermore the theoretical watershed applied to the ERA is extremely conservative, likely leading to an overestimation of actual exposure. Many of the simplifying assumptions necessary for completion of the generic risk assessment will be refined or replaced with site-specific information in the subsequent risk assessment to be conducted later in the EA process. For dioxins specifically, a toxicological study has been published which lends further support to the assumption that if aquatic receptors are deemed to be adequately protected, then so too are amphibians. Jung and Walker, 1997 assessed the developmental toxicity of 2,3,7,8- TCDD to anuran amphibians, and compared results to similar endpoints in fish. Their conclusion was that anurans were 100 to 1000 times less sensitive to 2,3,7,8-TCDD during development. Jung, R.E. and Walker, M.K. 1997. Effects of 2,3,7,8-Tetrachlorodibenzo-p-Dioxin (TCDD) on Development of Anuran Amphibians. Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry. 16(2): 230-240.
d) The study concludes that there is risk to infants who are breastfed by a mother who eats a large proportion of local foods and a risk to toddlers from fish consumption generally	d) For this generic risk assessment, fish consumption patterns were modeled conservatively. This approach is appropriate given no specific site had been selected. Although we agree fish consumption patterns may not necessarily reflect a specific community’s consumption,

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
due to methyl mercury (pg.55-58) due to contamination in non-local fish, this may be true for those who eat less local fish as well but this is not discussed. e) More explanation of the watershed model that was used would be helpful in assessing the study.	it does overestimate consumption in the region and therefore any risks derived would be important to know. This will be addressed in an appropriate manner in the site-specific Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment. e) To allow completion of this generic risk assessment, because no specific site had yet been selected, a hypothetical 10 square kilometre watershed was assumed, within which the receptors would live, grow produce and agriculture, fish, and hunt. Within that, it was assumed that a typical waterbody (or more specifically, a local fishing hole) might comprise 1/10 of the total area (or 1 square kilometre). It was acknowledged by the third party peer reviewers that this approach may in fact be overly conservative (i.e. over-estimates exposures) given that it is generally known that no such concentrated watershed and intensive consumption situation exists within the broad vicinity of the areas where candidate sites are located. This conservative approach is considered appropriate in the context of a generic risk assessment. Once a site is determined and a site-specific risk assessment is conducted, all existing watershed inputs and outputs will be considered.
I would like that my region invest to find a better solution that will not ruin the environment and my health.	Site-specific studies will be carried out on the Consultants' recommended site (Clarington 01). If the results of these studies indicate that it there would be an unacceptable risk to human health and the environment as a result of building and operating the proposed facility, the site would not be developed.
Our mayor and regional councillors say they are waiting for an environmental assessment study of toxic emission levels. Why? The people have spoken. We don't want it. We don't want to be breathing in 'acceptable amounts' of toxins. Acceptable to whom? Certainly not the citizens of this community.	A Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Study was conducted which identified generic issues that will need to be taken into account during the site-specific assessment. It was completed as a preliminary feasibility study and was a useful tool at this stage for providing interim information regarding this study. The results of this study can be found on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/healthrisk_assessment.php. Based on the results of this study, it was determined that there would be no unacceptable risk associated with building and operating the proposed facility. Following the selection of the site, a detailed site-specific Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment will be completed for the Clarington 01 site. If the results of this study do not confirm that it would be safe to build the proposed facility at this location, it would not be built.
Our area is already a hot-spot for cancer and asthma, but rather than directing their energies towards cleaning up our environment and protecting the integrity of our already compromised air quality, the mayor and regional councillors have turned a deaf ear to the electorate and chosen to lobby	The decision to build the proposed facility has not been finalized. As mentioned above, once a site is selected, site-specific studies will be conducted. If these studies confirm that it would not be safe to build and operate an EFW facility at the Clarington 01 site, the facility would not be built.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
along with incinerator consultants against the people that they are supposed to represent.	
Garbage incineration raises too many questions, as well as too many risks for us citizens. There is the question of air quality. Proper research has yet to be conducted. I also question what your meaning of acceptable risk is? Would you want to live in the same area as this monster trash burner? Would you want to raise your family in its back yard, and have your kids breath in the air? Would you consider it an acceptable risk?	Potential air quality impacts were considered as part of the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment. Details regarding this study can be found on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/healthrisk_assessment.php. Based on the results of this study, it was found that there would be no unacceptable risk as a result of building and operating the proposed facility. A site-specific health and ecological risk assessment will be conducted to confirm this. If the emissions from the proposed facility do not meet the regulatory requirements, the site would not be developed. In our society, one has a 1 in 3 (to 1 in 4) chance of contracting cancer in a life time. An acceptable risk, as defined by Canadian regulations, is an increase in that risk factor by less than an additional 1 in 1,000,000.
Courtice is already host to many major environmental sacrifices. We are not only next to General Motors Manufacturing Plant, but we are also home to a Nuclear Power Plant, a Water Pollution Control Plant and St-Mary's Cement Plant. Durham region's air quality is already quite poor and too often visible, like a thick brownish smoky blanket. I firmly believe that building a garbage Incinerator, or its friendlier name 'Energy from Waste Plant' is irresponsible and does not show any consideration for the well being, health and future of the residents of Courtice and Bowmanville. <i>"Key sources in the area that will impact the site specific local air quality in the Clarington sites include St. Mary's Cement, (the) Oshawa urban area, General Motors and major transportation corridors (eg. 401 and 35/115)," said Dr. van der Vooren's report. "These are existing sources that will impact the sites an through these have been qualitatively assessed (i.e. the presence of theses sources reduces the desirability of the Clarington sites) it has not yet been determined if</i>	Other sources of air emissions, including the General Motors manufacturing plant, the nuclear power plant, St. Mary's Cement and Highway 401 will be taken into consideration during the upcoming site-specific studies. If the results of these studies show that locating the proposed facility on the Clarington 01 site would cause a negative impact on air quality or if the emissions were found to exceed the regulatory required limits, the site would not be developed. The Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment was performed as a preliminary feasibility study and was carried out in anticipation of conducting a site-specific risk assessment. It identified generic issues that will need to be taken into account during the site-specific assessment. As mentioned above, the results of this study are posted on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/healthrisk_assessment.php. Based on this generic health risk assessment, it was found that there would be no unacceptable risk to residents, including those who consume local fruits, vegetables and meat. It should be noted that the approved Terms of Reference for the project do not permit large quantities of waste to be imported from outside Durham and York Regions.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
<i>the absolute level of impact at the sites are acceptable." - Jennifer Stone, Newsdurhamregion.com</i> Any level of impact should not be okay. It is not in any way acceptable to put at risk the health of every person in this community, as well as the health of all the people who consume the fruits, vegetables and meat that are produced in the area. There are already enough major polluters in Durham. Please, say no to the proposed incinerator. For the sake of all of us! We do not want to get sick because you accepted to burn other municipality's garbage.	
The residents of Courtice and Bowmanville DO NOT want to host this 'energy from waste' plant or Garbage Incinerator. It is not a safe and sustainable option and compromises too many lives. It will not only eventually make many people sick, but will also contribute enormously to our environmental problem. It will be the future generations that will be left with the downfall of this decision and have to try to 'decontaminate', like in Port Perry.	Human health and the natural environment are the primary concerns of both York and Durham Regions and continue to be key factors in our assessment of the Consultant's recommended site. The results of the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment indicate that it would be safe to develop the proposed facility at the Clarington 01 site. Site-specific studies will be conducted to confirm this and to ensure that public health will not be compromised as a result of this facility.
Although plastic, if not specifically biodegradable, will last for decades in landfills sitting in a hole in the ground, it does NOT give off toxic gases or leach toxins into the groundwater. However, when plastic is burned (as in incineration), plastic releases numerous dangerous products into the air. Considering that air quality is already a concern in Durham, and that we have one of the highest asthma rates in the country, I am amazed and alarmed that our regional politicians would be considering a plan which would further degrade our air quality.	The emissions from an EFW facility will be well within regulatory standards. The health risk studies performed to date indicate that a facility can be safely developed. This will be confirmed through the site specific health and ecological risk assessment.
a) The study identifies a variety of receptors i.e. those who will be ingesting the toxic mix of emissions i.e. DY residents, subsistence farmers DY workers .The study does not deal with the consequences for expectant mothers, those in retirement homes or those of compromised health. ...Perhaps this is an oversight, or a convenient assumption .Our society has known for some time that the fetus is particularly sensitive to toxic chemicals, as are those in poor health.	a) All sensitive populations were accounted for when calculating risks in the generic risk assessment. Toxicity reference values used in risk-calculations have safety factors applied that account for sensitive populations. More specifically, the toxicity benchmarks that were used do account for potential teratogenic effects (birth defects) from exposure of pregnant women to those chemicals modeled.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
Recommendation The study be required to include the expectant mother and those whose health is compromised by virtue of age or affliction. It doesn't appear that has happened as you assert .Section 4.2.6 of the report says .” ...infants are likely to be exposed to higher levels before birth and as a toddler than during breast feeding.” This seems to be the only reference to infants before birth. b) The study directly looks at several pathways including DY residents,DY subsistence farmers ...DY workers .The residents according to your report are factored into adult, toddler and nursing infants only. Expectant mothers and the fetus appear to be dropped off the list of important stages of development It 's good that you've considered teratogenic chemicals, as a minimum .However ,other chemicals apart from those that are teratogenic are important to development .Those would include lead, methyl mercury and other heavy metals like .antimony,arsenic,cadmium as well as nickel....All of these and others are products or effluent from the incineration /thermal treatment process as indicated in your study .I believe David Shragge responded on this topic in detail in his July 31 ,2007 submission to you.. So I won't go into endocrine disruptors and the like, dealt with just this week in the media such as bisphenol -a My claim here would be simply that this area needs to be investigated as part of any Human health study conducted for any proposed incinerator development. Although this issue has the tendency to become a “right to life” type of issue I would submit that it is necessary part of the study from the perspective of our future as the human race and has little to do with the legal rights or the lack of them of the fetus. Accordingly, you should include a consideration a study of	b) More comprehensive wording will be included in the site-specific risk assessment. Again for clarity, the toxicity reference values that are used are from Health Canada, WHO or US EPA. These benchmark values are based on the most sensitive endpoint in toxicity studies and include consideration of reproductive studies and endpoints. They also include endpoints such as potential impact on development (both physical and neurological).

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
these effects on expectant mothers and their fetus in any study relating to the final selected site.	
a) The study identifies a variety of exposure pathways like direct inhalation, drinking water etc...The study does not identify with any specificity such pathways as dairy, grain and feed - production and its consumption , commercial market – gardening .Since these pathways provide for the food and sustenance of livestock like cattle, cows goats, sheep and chicken and other exotic animals and indirectly human residents ,these pathways need to be provided and accounted for and made explicit as to their consequences ecologically and human health wise . Recommendation 1. The study be required to include these pathways and provide for them in terms of their contribution to the risk analysis to human health. 5) The study seems to provide a scant accounting of the food chain and the effects of biological magnification as it affects human health This may be an oversight on my part however I can find no data links that illustrate and account for the flow of toxic substances up the food chain to man It is well known that human kind ingests much more toxic chemicals through food than air water and soil .For example residents eat beef and chicken that have been fed on grasses and grains that may have experienced a dusting of toxic emissions .They also drink milk and eat cheese from cows that grazed on grasses that were impacted by toxic emissions .The chart provided on page iv of the executive summary excludes Durham York residents from agriculture (meat ,poultry) and wild gameThe reality is residents do eat poultry, meat and some wild game .Moreover ,the meat has acquired a burden of toxic exposure through grains or grazing over its respective lifetime Humans inherit this burden directly ..The residents also eat vegetables grown by commercial market gardeners, not just from home gardens as the case of the subsistence –farmer as	Questions 4 and 5 answered below: a) All these pathways are accounted for in the generic risk assessment. Section 4.0 of the report discusses these pathways and provides diagrams that show contaminant movement in the environment through the various pathways. Section 5.1.3.4 further discusses food chain uptakes and a conceptual diagram (Figure 5-1) is provided to show how this exposure pathway fits in with other pathways used to calculate risk. A more detailed exposure model can be found in Figure 5-2. It should be noted that not all chemicals biomagnify (increase in concentration) as the progress up the food chain.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
the report presentation suggests Recommendation The study review and be clear as to the total toxic burden that results from the biological magnification process and that the new agricultural food chains described herein be incorporated and or clarified. The diagrams are helpful .They however don't appear to speak to the calculations in your attached appendix D, E, F and G The issue of biomagnifications is significant in its consequences. Your report states in Section 6.7.7 (page 81) <i>“Very limited real world data exist that allow quantification of the true relationship between a chemical in an environmental medium and chemical transfer through the food chain. Only a few classes of chemicals appear to be magnified through the food chain, These substances include methyl mercury, mercury, PCB's, some chlorinated pesticides (such as DDT) and some PCDD/PCDF compoundsAmong the inorganic chemicals some such as copper and zinc are subject to biological magnification .Others such as thallium and mercury appear to have high potential for bioaccumulation and still others such as methyl mercury undergo biomagnifications in the food chain. The extent of food chain magnification is a source of uncertainty that is generally treated in a conservative manner.”</i> b) Somewhat contrary to your response to me of Sept /07 there appear to be a goodly number of chemicals that biomagnify .In addition to your report Common- knowledge would add to these the following as well : arsenic and cadmium .Interestingly these are also associated with incineration . The appendices E, F and G regarding the calculations of : Exposure ,LADDs /CDIs and ILCRs /HQs don't appear to have a clear accounting of concentrations involving a consideration	b) The model incorporates biomagnifications of contaminants in the fate and transport section of the modeling. For example the concentration of PCDD/F (dioxin) calculated to be deposited in the soil undergoes biomagnifications in the food chain model, it is at this point where dose calculations of exposure are considered. Again, the issues of chemical biomagnifications in the environment (arsenic and cadmium are not compounds that biomagnify) were treated with conservative uptake factors. It should also be noted that the other chemicals, although they do not “biomagnify” in the environment, certainly have uptake into vegetation, etc. which was also accounted for. Specifically in regard to the DY Resident not eating farm produce or poultry and beef, these are not examined as the greatest potential risk would be to the subsistence farmer. Therefore, given that the maximum concentration of chemicals was used to model the transfer of chemicals up the food chain to the farmer and their family, this is very conservative and also protective of the DY residents. We agree with this statement and these people would be protected under the investigation of

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
of biological- magnification . Given that DY residents eat from the largess of the agriculture of the regions one could submit that their diet would be somewhat closer to that of the subsistence farmer .Who knows how close ...maybe 50%.The point here is that DY residents appear to eat more from the regions vast agricultural resources, not just their own backyards .Moreover their diets are not just supermarket imported but local .	the subsistence farm family. The DY resident was assumed to eat garden produce from the highest area of impact to the proposed EFW facility (i.e. their backyard), thus this would be very conservative and protective of their exposure to produce collected at market.
a) The Newmarket and Aurora area present a special case to this study .Although Carbon dioxide and nitrous(ic) oxides pose a special risk and are identified in the list of Chemicals of particular concern, they appear to have fallen off that list since they don't appear on the spreadsheet known as table 5-11. These largely populated areas are downwind of the Bales site about 20% of the year as determined by a meteorological study from Buttonville Since local data was unavailable to us there probably is some margin of error in this estimate .This is the equivalent of about 71 days per year. We also know that ,based only on AQI reports that Newmarket has more bad air days than other areas. The Illness cost of Air pollution produced by the OMA (Ontario Medical Association) identifies a number of premature deaths in York as 290 in 2005 .The report attributes this number to air quality issues.The impact of an incinerator on this area could cause these numbers to be effected. This needs to be examined by your study and considered. Recommendation The study be required to examine into the effects of toxic emissions and their synergic effect on air quality and local health in large populated areas like Newmarket Aurora. b) It seems that the findings of the Ontario Medical Associations' (OMA) study entitled <u>The Illness Cost of Air Pollution</u> doesn't count for any consideration here .I would hope that this point would be revisited in any future studies .	a) Carbon dioxide and nitrous oxides are not included in Table 5-11, because these are not considered pollutants that would deposit on the ground and undergo transport in the environment. These contaminants were assessed through the inhalation assessment found in Table 5-8, that concluded at a generic level that there would not be a potential incremental risk from these contaminants, even including the loading of background concentrations. That being said, one of the limitations of the Generic Risk Assessment is the evaluation of the Criteria Air Contaminants (such as NOx and CO) against site-specific data. Therefore, the recommended ambient air monitoring program in the report has already begun at the short list of sites, with data to be collected for at least one year. This information, along with vendor specific information on emissions, will be used in the detailed site-specific risk assessment. b) It is studies such as the OMA's and other scientific literature that are certainly taken into account when considering ambient air quality concerns surrounding the siting of any facility that has an emission to air. Again, one of the limitations of the generic assessment was the lack of local air quality data which is being collected at this point and will be considered in the site-specific risk assessment.
DIVERSION	
We recycle, compost and have a very small amount of garbage,	Durham and York Regions currently have very aggressive diversion programs, and have

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
and it is almost all plastic containers. Therefore, your EFW facility gets to burn plastic (and metals and fabrics). Why would we consider this a suitable fuel? Hundreds of complex chemicals and metals up the stack. Marvellous! You appear to believe that a high temperature destroys matter, but of course, in its ultimate state, the atoms produced from heavy metals, for example, are not destroyed at all. No alchemy or atom-splitting here! The gases which contribute so readily to breathing problems and acid rain pour into the sky.	plans for future programs in place. Direction of materials to the proper end-point is an important element of any waste management system. The primary method for removing contaminants, such as waste that contributes to the amount of chemicals and heavy metals in the waste stream, 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 noted that the waste to be delivered to the proposed EFW facility is expected to consist of residual waste materials that cannot otherwise be included in the Blue Box, Green Bin or HHW programs. Efforts will be made to ensure that these collection programs are effective at reducing the risks associated with emissions from the proposed EFW facility by setting ambitious but attainable collection targets for each material and implementing continuous improvement measures as required to meet or exceed the specified collection targets. Even with extensive education, it is possible that residents will dispose of potentially hazardous material in their garbage. 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.
I am in opposition to an EFW facility here, in York, or anywhere. I believe we can do better...we need to CHANGE THE WAY WE LIVE. Not just in Durham Region, but everywhere. It is a monumental task, but one that must be taken on. We have forgotten about the other two R's - reduce and reuse. We cannot continue to consume our resources as we are doing. How can we get people to understand this?	Waste diversion is a high priority for both Durham and York Regions. The Regions will continue to invest in, encourage and promote diversion programs, such as recycling and composting. At source household hazardous waste and special waste programs are currently being developed and will also be promoted in the hopes of increasing public involvement. Efforts to expand and improve these programs by Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO) are presently on going. Durham and York Regions are dedicated to educating their residents of the resources available to them, and hopefully through this education, people will better understand that we cannot continue to consume our resources as we are currently doing.
How can you assure that no hazardous waste is put into the incinerator? If there is no presort, then whatever goes in our garbage bags will be incinerated and could be potentially hazardous.	Obvious hazardous waste (e.g., drums of unknown material) would be removed prior to thermal treatment. Members of the public will continue to be encouraged to sort their waste properly and dispose of Household Hazardous Waste at the appropriate facilities. Even with extensive education it is possible that residents will dispose of potentially hazardous material in their 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.
Were Zero Waste initiatives, by aggressive diversion, extended	Zero Waste initiatives including recycling, composting and diversion of household

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
producer responsibility, and more stringent packaging laws, investigated? If so, what did the studies reveal?	hazardous waste have been investigated as part of this project. Waste diversion is a high priority for both Durham and York Regions. The Regions will continue to invest in, encourage and promote diversion programs, such as recycling and composting. At source household hazardous waste and special waste programs are currently being developed and will also be promoted in the hopes of increasing public involvement. Efforts to expand and improve these programs by Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO) are presently on going. Extended producer responsibility and more stringent packaging laws are important issues that may be looked into further in the future, however they were not included in the scope of this project.
The potential health consequences are alarming. There is no guarantee that the smokestack scrubbers will catch all the contaminants from burning. The emerging threat of nano-particulates was dismissed in the generic health assessment because not enough is known about them. In my view, this is simply irresponsible. Since garbage includes everything that we buy and use, I expect a certain amount of material to escape sorting and end up being burned and contributing toxic materials to the effluent -- lead, cadmium and mercury from batteries, mercury from CF lightbulbs, arsenic from pressure treated wood, etc. There is too much reliance on a perfect sorting process to be safe in the long term.	The performance of the air emissions control system is generally monitored on a continuous basis to ensure it is operating properly. Nanoparticles are accounted for in the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment. Although nanoparticles were not explicitly stated in the text, they are captured within the assessment between the fine particulate matter and the vapour phase. Text will be added to the final report to add further clarification about this topic. At this time, equipment is not available to determine the emission levels of nanoparticles as a separate and discrete measurement from total particulates. 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.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
The EFW myth defeats 3R programs. If people start believing that society benefits from burning garbage, they will stop supporting reduction, reuse and recycling programs. In fact, burning the blue box is good for incineration: paper, wood, plastics and garden waste make great fuel. This would be good for the contractor operating the facility but disastrous for society, given all the reasons mentioned above.	These regulatory limits are set to ensure the protection of public health. Waste diversion is a high priority for both Durham and York Regions. As a result of public feedback through the consultation process, the proposed thermal treatment facility is only being designed to handle Durham and York's residual waste after 60% diversion has already been achieved. In future years, the diversion rate will have to increase to even higher rates to offset the effects of population growth in the regions. The regions will continue to invest in, encourage and promote diversion programs, such as recycling and composting, so that these diversion targets can be met and to reduce the amount of waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility.
I expect a contractor operating this facility would want a "put-or-pay" contract which would further undermine waste reduction and diversion initiatives. It would become more expensive to recycle than to let it all go to the furnace.	Current plans call for the Regions to own and control the operation of the proposed facility. They can therefore ensure that the facility does not compete with recycling for material. Generally recycling costs less and has greater environmental benefits than thermal treatment.
Why isn't this energy and the dollars being spent on recycling? One can see these days that less is being recycled. Now we are told of all the things we can't recycle. Why not be progressive and find uses and markets so that we can recycle 80 % like other areas. I know we are not at 50 % even.	Durham and York Regions currently have very aggressive diversion programs, and have plans for future programs in place. As a result of public feedback through the consultation process, the proposed thermal treatment facility is only being designed to handle Durham and York's residual waste after 65% diversion has already been achieved. In future years, the diversion rate will have to increase to even higher rates to offset the effects of population growth in the regions. Direction of materials to the proper end-point is an important element of any waste management system. The primary method for removing contaminants, such as waste that contributes to the amount of chemicals and heavy metals in the waste stream, 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). Efforts will be made to ensure that these collection programs are effective at reducing the risks associated with emissions from the proposed EFW facility by setting ambitious but attainable collection targets for each material and implementing continuous improvement measures as required to meet or exceed the specified collection targets. Extended producer responsibility for Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) and Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment (WEEE), along with more stringent packaging laws are important issues that may be looked into further in the future, however they were not included in the scope of this project. As these programs are developed further, they may be included as a waste management option to help reduce the amount of residual waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
Page 7 of the Durham Works Newsletter Question: Will this new facility work in conjunction with our recycling and composting programs or will it discourage waste diversion efforts? I thought Scugog had a complete waste program: blue box green bin etc?	At the time that these frequently asked questions (Pages 6-7 of Fall/Winter Durham Works Newsletter) were drafted, the integrated waste management program for Scugog had not yet been fully implemented. Scugog has now fully completed its integrated waste management program including green bin, blue box and bi-weekly collection.
I would like to acquire the receptacles for recycling plastic bags and participate in the program.	Thank you for your email. I have passed it on to the Region of Durham. They will be able to provide you with a response concerning how to acquire receptors for recycling plastic bags.
It's my garbage and what I would like you to do is not to burn it. Instead, it would be more logical to invest money into new recycling programs to be able to recycle more products.	Waste diversion is a high priority for both Durham and York Regions. As a result of public feedback through the consultation process, the proposed thermal treatment facility is only being planned to handle Durham and York's residual waste after an initial diversion rate of 60% has been achieved. This rate will be reviewed prior to finally determining the initial size of the facility to ensure there will be no competition with diversion. In future years, this diversion rate will have to increase to higher rates to offset the effects of population growth in these rapidly growing regions. The Regions will continue to invest in, encourage and promote diversion programs, such as recycling and composting, so that the established diversion targets can be met.
Moreover, it would be a good idea to create a recycling program for computer and their accessories like the one in Quebec, where they collect the material at Staples/Business Depot locations. I would like to see another recycling program for the new CFL/fluorescent light program. Why? Because, once in the garbage, those light can be even worst then the normal light bulbs.	Direction of materials to the proper end-point is an important element of any waste management system. The primary method for removing contaminants, such as computer parts and florescent light bulbs, is Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and other stewardship programs. A program for the management of Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment (WEEE) in Ontario is being developed under the direction of Waste Diversion Ontario (WDO). Durham and York Regions apply continuous efforts to ensure the effectiveness of these measures through promotion and education campaigns and the development of Community Environmental Centres. It should be noted that the waste to be delivered to the proposed EFW facility is expected to consist of residual waste materials that cannot otherwise be included in the Blue Box, Green Bin or HHW programs. To ensure that these collection programs are effective at reducing the risks associated with emissions from the proposed EFW facility, ambitious collection targets for each material will be set and continuous improvement measures will be implemented as required to meet or exceed the specified collection targets. 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.
Put pressure on the big money making companies, such as	Extended producer responsibility for Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) and

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
Wal-Mart, Home-Depot, Loblaws, Canadian Tire, etc... to be responsible of the disposal of the packaging and their products. Similar to the LCBO/Beer Store program	Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment (WEEE), along with more stringent packaging laws are important issues, however they were not included in the scope of this project. As these programs are developed further, they may be included as a waste management option to help reduce the amount of residual waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility.
The quantity of residual waste requiring management is a critical issue when sizing any residual waste facility. If the facility is too large, it represents an unnecessary economic expenditure and may inhibit the expansion of diversion programs. While the EA process has been based on a 70% diversion rate, with 30% residual waste, it is unclear whether this is an appropriate diversion rate for the first year, the mid-point or the final year in which a residual waste facility would be operating.	Waste diversion is a high priority for both Durham and York Regions. As a result of public feedback through the consultation process, the proposed thermal treatment facility is only being planned to handle Durham and York's residual waste after an initial (e.g., in 2011) diversion rate of 60% has been achieved. This rate will be reviewed prior to finally determining the initial size of the facility to ensure there will be no competition with diversion. In future years, this diversion rate will have to increase to higher rates to offset the effects of population growth in these rapidly growing regions. The proposed facility is being planned to have a maximum potential capacity of 400,000 tonnes per year to account for this increase in population, however the Regions will continue to invest in, encourage and promote diversion programs, such as recycling and composting, so that the established diversion targets can be met. If the diversion targets are met and exceeded, then the expansion to the full capacity of 400,000 tonnes of garbage per year will not be required.
To effectively reduce the risk to human health and the environment from energy-from-waste (EFW) plant emissions, wastes that contribute specifically to the risks should be removed from the residual waste stream prior to burning. Any municipality that ships residual waste to a Durham/York EFW plant must be required to implement comprehensive and conveniently accessible collection programs for: • Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) • Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment (WEEE) • Plastics that contribute to dioxins and furans To ensure that these collection programs are effective at reducing the risks associated with emissions from an EFW facility, ambitious collection targets for each material should be set, audits of the residual waste should be carried out on an on-going basis and continuous improvement measures implemented as required to meet or exceed the specified collection targets.	Direction of materials to the proper end-point is an important element of any waste management system. The primary method for removing contaminants, such as waste that contributes to the amount of chemicals and heavy metals in the waste stream, is Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and other stewardship 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 noted that the waste to be delivered to the proposed EFW facility is expected to consist of residual waste materials that cannot otherwise be included in the Blue Box, Green Bin or HHW programs. Your suggestions to ensure that these collection programs are effective at reducing the risks associated with emissions from the proposed EFW facility by setting ambitious collection targets for each material, conducting ongoing audits of the residual waste and implementing continuous improvement measures as required to meet or exceed the specified collection targets, are all good and will be considered as part of the ongoing EA process. 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.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
It should be noted that producer responsibility programs for MHSW and WEEE are under development in Ontario. Should these programs be approved, producers of these products would assume responsibility for end-of-life management, supporting collection programs and taking responsibility for processing the collected materials.	Extended producer responsibility for Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW) and Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment (WEEE), along with more stringent packaging laws are important issues, however they were not included in the scope of this project. As these programs are developed further, they may be included as a waste management option to help reduce the amount of residual waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility
The preferred site must be sized only for a specified maximum amount of residual waste taking into account optimized diversion programs, as outlined above.	As mentioned above, the proposed facility is only being designed to handle Durham and York's residual waste after 60% diversion has already been achieved. The maximum capacity for the facility could be up to 400,000 tonnes of waste per year. This maximum capacity was selected to ensure that future demands resulting from population increase in the two Regions can be met.
Studies show that garbage incineration raised the level of toxins and carcinogens dramatically. In my research, I have found far more evidence and arguments against incineration. Those who do support it are often somehow affiliated with the waste companies. Something to consider as well is that many of the studies are based out of Europe, where they have much stricter rules on garbage disposal and recycling. It does not accurately reflect what an incinerator in our region would do. It is also mentioned that the air reports do not take into consideration the burning of toxic materials, such as batteries, paint, plastics and so on. There is no way to guarantee that those toxic materials will not go into the incinerator. Since it is up to each individual to sort their garbage, there is no way to make sure that people are not throwing out things they shouldn't, especially since their waste is not being burnt in their town. We all know that too often, toxic waste (batteries, paint cans, chemical containers) and plastics of all kind ends up in the garbage. That is what will be burnt into our air that we breathe. There is no way to guarantee that those toxic materials are not included in the trash, and therefore making it's fumes more dangerous. The fact of this matter is that there is no way to prove that this will not be harmful to our health, and <u>any risk in unacceptable!</u>	Direction of materials to the proper end-point is an important element of any waste management system. The primary method for removing contaminants, such as waste that contributes to the amount of chemicals and heavy metals in the waste stream, is Household Hazardous Waste (HHW) and other stewardship 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 noted that the waste to be delivered to the proposed EFW facility is expected to consist of residual waste materials that cannot otherwise be included in the Blue Box, Green Bin or HHW programs. To ensure that these collection programs are effective at reducing the risks associated with emissions from the proposed EFW facility, ambitious collection targets for each material will be set and continuous improvement measures will be implemented as required to meet or exceed the specified collection targets. 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.
It is crucial that we begin to take serious steps towards sustainable waste management and look at changing product use and demand rather than building a big oven to replace the	Waste diversion is a high priority for both Durham and York Regions. As a result of public feedback through the consultation process, the proposed thermal treatment facility is only being planned to handle Durham and York's residual waste after an initial diversion rate of

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
big hole in the ground, and having to feed this monster with trash 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This type of band aid solution is not tackling the main problem: US! We need change our habits, and the time is now. Our disposable society is one of the main reasons we are so overwhelmed with garbage. Everything is prepackaged and clam wrapped. Most of the packaging is not recyclable. Just through it away and it disappears, right? What would we do if we had to keep our own garbage in our back yard? We would be much more careful and reuse, recycle, reuse and compost. There are many other options to incineration. Instead of giving in to the pressures of hosting an incinerator, please opt to be a real leader in our community. Take initiatives to resolve waste disposal issues in an environmentally sounder way. Increasing our recycling ability and extending the composting programs to schools and restaurants is one idea. Or why not make changes to hold companies who produce the clam packaging responsible to recycle it; sort of like the beer store principal. Each packaging would be worth a small deposit if brought back to the store. People return things if they get money for it. We can return the packaging to the store, and the company could reuse the plastic to make more plastic packaging... Perhaps you can launch a region wide contest to come up with ways to reduce waste in various communities, get the media involved and make a difference. It's is not only a great way to get tons of great ideas for solutions but also it would also create awareness, help change attitudes and get people involved. That is what a community leader who cares about his people is supposed to do!	60% has been achieved. This rate will be reviewed prior to finally determining the initial size of the facility to ensure there will be no competition with diversion. In future years, this diversion rate will have to increase to higher rates to offset the effects of population growth in these rapidly growing regions. The Regions will continue to invest in, encourage and promote diversion programs, such as recycling and composting, so that the established diversion targets can be met. Extended producer responsibility, along with more stringent packaging laws are important issues; however they were not included in the scope of this project. As these programs are developed further, they may be included as a waste management option to help reduce the amount of residual waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility. Your suggestions to implement a return incentive to recycle packaging and to hold a contest to increase awareness and develop new ways of reducing waste are good and will be passed on to the Region for consideration.
Over-packaging is a problem which can and should be dealt with. If manufacturers or retail outlets were forced to take back their packaging our garbage output could be majorly reduced. Why are our politicians not active on this front? Why are we now not recycling many recyclable plastics which used to be accepted in the Blue Bin? Look for a market if our usual acceptors have been lost! Are we just diverting these	Extended producer responsibility, along with more stringent packaging laws are important issues; however they were not included in the scope of this project. As these programs are developed further, they may be included as a waste management option to help reduce the amount of residual waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility. Plastics are not being removed from the list of recyclables accepted through the Blue Bin program in order to increase the amount of waste available to be processed by the proposed

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
plastics to residual waste since the plan is to augment our garbage anyway by shipping it in from other jurisdictions?	facility as implied. If they have been removed from the list, it is because there is no market for recycling them at this time. Please note that the approved Terms of Reference for the project do not permit large quantities of waste to be imported from outside Durham and York Regions.
SITING	
Where was the call made for "willing sellers" for public lands publicly announced? Was it only in local newspapers, or was there direct contact with other public agencies such as federal and provincial ministries and land-related agencies? Could it be possible that suitable sites owned by public agencies were omitted from the process?	The process for identifying potential sites is described in Section 5 of the document titled "Draft Report, Thermal Facility Site Selection Process, Results of Steps 1-5 Identification of the Short-List of Alternative Sites". This report can be found on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/FINAL_Draft_Steps_1-5_Report-March22-07.pdf. The activities undertaken to identify potential sites included discussions with Durham and York Region Real Estate and Economic Development Departments. In addition, a Request for Expressions of Interest on providing a site was widely distributed. This distribution included: • Area municipal Property Contacts, Planning and Public Works Directors, and Chief Administrative Officers/City Managers; • Commercial Realtors and Real Estate Boards operating in Durham and York Regions; • Ontario Industrial Associations with members in Durham and York Regions; • Chambers of Commerce; • Major energy users within Durham and York that may provide a potential market for heat and/or steam generated at the facility. These users were identified through a number of industrial directories and through the assistance of both Regions Economic Development departments; • Approximately 50 EFW technology vendors who have been identified throughout the EA study as potential respondents to a competitive process for the proposed facility; • Posting on the Region of Durham's Purchasing website; and • Public notification in local newspapers. This process identified a reasonable range of siting alternatives.
What is the minimum and maximum site size, and how big is	During the activities associated with identifying potential sites, a site size of approximately

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
the preferred site?	10 to 12 hectares was specified. The Clarington 01 site, identified as the preferred site by the study Consultants, has an area of approximately 12.4 hectares. In Annex H of the documentation supporting this recommendation, which can be found on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/study/consultants/Annex%20H%20-%20Report%20on%20Compatibility%20with%20Existing%20Infrastructure%20&%20Design%20Operational%20Flexibility.pdf, a minimum site size, excluding any area for storm water management facilities, of 7.3 hectares is identified. A specific maximum site size was not identified. In general, larger site sizes, beyond the minimum requirements provide an additional on-site buffer area.
Why did the site selection short list draft report not provide screening maps to show which parts of the study area were excluded under each of the criteria? Why did it not provide sufficient explanation of how each of the criteria were applied? The process does not seem traceable as described.	Screening maps identifying the areas eliminated under each of the criteria were not included as it was felt unnecessary to include this level of detail in the report when only the final result (e.g., the application of all criteria – Map 3-1 in Appendix 3) was what was carried through to the next step. This was a comment raised by the Peer Reviewers retained by Clarington, and after discussion, it was determined that in the EA submission to the Minister of the Environment, individual screening maps will be included for each of the criteria.
Why were not all federally regulated airports considered in the screening?	In the original screening process the Oshawa Airport was not identified as a federally regulated airport. This oversight will be corrected in the EA submission to the Minister of the Environment. A sensitivity analysis has been completed and it was determined that the inclusion of this airport does not impact the overall results of the siting process.
What affect will sites in the Clarington Energy Business Park have on the preferred site? I understand the sites in this park are being analyzed as part of a different economic study.	The proposed facility can provide district heating to other sites in the Energy Park. This provides both an economic and environmental benefit.
Why was Lake Ontario not considered in the preferred site? I cannot understand why a little stream (that is usually dry) was considered in the East Gwillimbury site, but Lake Ontario was not considered at all? Please explain.	The proposed facility is expected to have a minimal effect on Lake Ontario. This will be confirmed in the site-specific studies which will be conducted.
I know there are so many people unaware that this is about to happen. So close to prime agricultural land and Lake Ontario . Shame! Where is the wisdom and intellect in considering our future generations? I guess one could say we've already destroyed the area but with so many people expected to settle here and this is our only body of water. Once this is so toxic we don't get a second chance.	Efforts have been made to keep everyone informed of how this project is proceeding and the decisions that are being made. Over 64 public meetings have been held in both Durham and York Regions, all of which were publicized using a variety of media, including newspapers and radio. The proposed facility is expected to have a minimal effect on Lake Ontario and surrounding agricultural land. This will be confirmed in the site-specific studies.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
As outlined by peer reviewers, the site selection process must be transparent and well documented, and must consider all public lands, including provincial and federal lands, within the unconstrained areas.	The process for site selection was developed as part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) Terms of Reference. Additional details on the siting process beyond those in the approved Terms of Reference document, are provided in "Background Document 2-3 – Consideration of "Alternative Methods" of Implementing the Undertaking", available on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/study/Background_Document_2-3_Consideration_of_Alternative_Methods_of_Implementing_the_Undertaking.pdf This process has been followed to develop the Short-List of Sites and subsequently to select the Consultant's preferred site. This siting process, in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference is provided in the report titled "Thermal Facility Site Selection Process, Results of Steps 1-5, Identification of the "Short-List" of Alternative Sites". This document can be found on the website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/FINAL_Draft_Steps_1-5_Report-March22-07.pdf.
The human health and environmental risk assessment must take into consideration the preferred technology in order to accurately predict the risk from that technology. The preferred technology must, therefore, be selected before the site is selected, followed by a technology specific risk assessment for all short-listed sites, followed by selection of the preferred site. Selecting the site prior to, or in parallel with, selection of the technology is inconsistent with the principles of environmental assessment which are intended to identify the approach that results in the least harm and risk.	All thermal treatment technologies must meet the same regulatory requirements. The initial air dispersion modelling and risk assessment were done, and the initial site-specific air dispersion modelling and risk assessment will be done assuming emissions at these regulatory limits. In practice, all proven thermal treatment technologies can routinely operate with air emissions significantly below these regulatory limits. In addition, the assumptions regarding receptors employed in the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment are much more conservative than the actual potential receptors at any of the short-listed sites (e.g., First Nations community eating large quantities of fish from a water body located at the point of maximum impingement of contaminants). In summary, since any proven thermal treatment technology can be safely sited at any of the short-listed sites, it is not necessary to select a specific technology prior to selecting a site. This fact was also recognized by the Ministry of the Environment when they established Regulation 101/07. The premise for this "Environmental Screening Process" is that modern EFW facilities are expected to have minimal environmental effects and, therefore, such facilities can be safely located on sites selected by proponents outside of the historic EA process.
Why was the outdated data from 2000 (due to the climate change) for the air and precipitation used for site selection?	Response to come...
Why were the Tooley, Robinson and Darlington Creeks, Lake Ontario and Tooley Creek Wetland that are close or within the	Response to come...

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
sites in Courtice excluded from the list of natural features in site selection process?	
Why was the Cobourg chosen for the Wind Rose data identification for selection of sites in Courtice and Bowmanville?	The reason that we chose Coubourg was that it was the closest station to the short-listed sites that tracked the required wind information.
Why was the Oshawa and Bowmanville only chosen as climatological stations for the selection of site in Courtice?	These are existing meteorological stations that collect data that we felt would be most representative of the conditions at the short-listed sites. The site-specific data that we will continue collecting over the next few months will confirm or disprove this.
What happened to federally chosen 30 km stretch along the Lake from Whitby to Newcastle as an "endangered space" that was identified by the Wildlands League and Word Wildlife Fund on their Map 8?	Response to come...
Why is the Great Lakes Agreement between Canada and US and Canada and Ontario and Clean Water Act Regulations not being honoured by this EA?	Response to come...
How did you know (according to your TOR) that the sites in Courtice and Bowmanville were suitable as identified siting alternatives for the processing facility prior to studying data on these sites?	Response to come...
How can the site 01 in Courtice be chosen as preferred site when Species at Risk were identified directly on the site? Don't tell me that removal of these somewhere else is the mitigation, please! Reread the PPS Section 2, 2.1.1 and Species at Risk document.	Response to come...
PUBLIC CONSULTATION and the ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS	
What is the big idea of running an important meeting like this the day before an election? Doesn't it occur to anyone that the candidates might want to attend but can't because they have to be out canvassing? I have a lot of issues with that project and you need to hear them. I want to attend but there is no point trying to canvas at a Public Information Session where most of the attendees will be from outside my riding.	We are sorry that the timing of our meeting did not fit into your agenda. Our Environmental Assessment (EA) process has been ongoing since 2005 and since that time we have held over 64 public information sessions for the public and interested groups to attend in order to receive information on our project and to provide their comments, including one that was held on October 3, 2007. We will be holding additional sessions in the future and hope that you can attend one or more of those sessions. The dates of future public information sessions will be advertised through various means including the local papers and our website: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/. You don't have to attend our sessions in person in order to have your comments considered. You can provide your comments in writing and direct them to our website, where they will be received and become part of the record that will be

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	forwarded to the Ministry of the Environment, as part of our submission to receive approval of our EA project.
I understand that the time frame for public comment has been extended to December 10th, 2007. Has this been publicly announced in the newspapers and on Regional websites and the Durham/York waste site?	Yes, notification that the public comment period for the Consultants' Recommended Preferred Site Report has been extended to December 10, 2007 has been posted in the "What's New" section of the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca . Notification was also published in local newspapers throughout York and Durham Regions. An email notification was also sent out to residents on our contact list informing them of this extension.
Is it true that the process of selecting a preferred vendor/technology through the ongoing RFQ and future Request for Proposals may not meet EA Act requirements?	No, if the preferred technology cannot be shown to meet the EA Act requirements, the facility would not be developed.
I would like to know: 1) just to who we should speak out to... 2) if there is anyone else out there opposing this and that is willing to do some footwork with me, and even other's that don't want to lose their community and; 3) who do I send all the petitions and letters of oppositions to?!?	There are a number of options for submitting your comments (including questions, letters, petitions, etc). Comments may be submitted to the project website email address (info@durhamyorkwaste.ca) or via regular mail to the following address: P.O. Box 42009 2851 John Street Markham, Ontario L3R 5R0 All comments received will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process. Our Environmental Assessment process has been ongoing since 2005. Since that time over 64 public information sessions have been held for the public and interested groups to attend in order to receive information regarding the project and to provide their comments. We will be holding additional sessions in the future and invite you to attend. The dates of future public information sessions will be advertised through various means including local newspapers and the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/sessions.php.
I work for a public relations company in Ottawa and our firm is doing some research on the Durham/York waste management project. I would very much like it if you could provide me with the names or company information of the individuals who are leading the consultations and also let me know if it is possible to be added to their list in order to be kept informed on new information, consultation reports and newsletters going out to the public.	The Regions of Durham and York have hired two consulting firms, GENIVAR and Jacques Whitford Limited, to work on this project. Please let us know if you require any further information. We have added your name and contact information to our mailing list so you will be kept informed of new information and updates regarding the Durham York Residual Waste Study.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
What Alternatives did the Region of Durham pursue prior to settling on EFW as the only method suitable for waste disposal?	Alternative waste management options for residual waste were considered as part of the “Alternatives To” for the Environmental Assessment (EA). These alternatives were examined and discussed with the public through an extensive consultation process. The result of this process was the selection of thermal treatment as the preferred technology for the management of Durham/York’s residual waste. The process for arriving at this decision is outlined in the document titled “Evaluation of “Alternatives to” and Identification of the Preferred Residual Processing System”. This report is located on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/Final-Report-May30-06-no-e-signatures.pdf. As stated in Section ES-2 “Methodology for Evaluation of Alternative Systems” in the above mention report, “in determining the scope of alternative systems to be evaluated, the focus was on covering the range of options to recover resources, both materials and energy, from the residual waste stream rather than all possible combinations of the alternative approaches available for consideration. Resource recovery options included recovery of recyclable materials for sale to market, energy from biogas and energy from the thermal treatment of wastes or solid recovered fuel. The intent of the Study is to identify a preferred long-term alternative that maximizes the recovery of resources and minimizes the reliance on landfill as a primary method of disposal.” Also stated in Section ES-2 “Methodology for Evaluation of Alternative Systems” in the above mention report, “landfill facilities will be assumed to continue to play a role for the disposal of certain materials that cannot be otherwise processed or diverted. A landfill only system, whereby a new landfill site capable of managing all waste that remains after at-source diversion would not meet the purpose of the undertaking, and thus was not considered in this study.” The following four alternative systems were considered: System 1 - Mechanical and Biological Treatment with Biogas Recovery System 2 (a) - Thermal Treatment of Mixed Waste with Recovery of Materials from the Ash / Char System 2 (b) - Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel System 2 (c) - Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel with Biogas Recovery More details on these four systems can be found in Section ES-5 “Formulation and Evaluation of Alternative Systems” in the above referenced report.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	It should be noted that the term “thermal treatment” is not restricted to incineration. It includes combustion, gasification, pyrolysis and plasma gasification. During the upcoming procurement process, there will be a request for qualifications from vendors of different technologies, following which the preferred technology and vendor will be selected.
The process by which the region arrived at "Thermal Treatment" of waste seems highly secretive. Rather than presenting the final plan with chosen vendor and technology, the region has stretched out the public consultation into a process which has restricted the public's input to narrow stages: the generic EA for a hypothetical facility can't be attacked precisely because it doesn't represent a real scenario, the site selection information sessions attempted to divert the debate from "should there be an incinerator?" to "where should we site it?". Even the euphemism "thermal treatment" is disingenuous. Let's call it what it really is: burning garbage.	Alternative waste management options for residual waste were considered as part of the “Alternatives To” for the Environmental Assessment (EA). These alternatives were examined and discussed with the public through an extensive consultation process. The result of this process was the selection of thermal treatment as the preferred technology for the management of Durham/York’s residual waste. The process for arriving at this decision is outlined in the document titled “Evaluation of “Alternatives to” and Identification of the Preferred Residual Processing System”. This report is located on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/Final-Report-May30-06-no-e-signatures.pdf. As stated in Section ES-2 “Methodology for Evaluation of Alternative Systems” in the above mention report, “in determining the scope of alternative systems to be evaluated, the focus was on covering the range of options to recover resources, both materials and energy, from the residual waste stream rather than all possible combinations of the alternative approaches available for consideration. Resource recovery options included recovery of recyclable materials for sale to market, energy from biogas and energy from the thermal treatment of wastes or solid recovered fuel. The intent of the Study is to identify a preferred long-term alternative that maximizes the recovery of resources and minimizes the reliance on landfill as a primary method of disposal.” Also stated in Section ES-2 “Methodology for Evaluation of Alternative Systems” in the above mention report, “landfill facilities will be assumed to continue to play a role for the disposal of certain materials that cannot be otherwise processed or diverted. A landfill only system, whereby a new landfill site capable of managing all waste that remains after at-source diversion would not meet the purpose of the undertaking, and thus was not considered in this study.” The following four alternative systems were considered: • System 1 - Mechanical and Biological Treatment with Biogas Recovery • System 2(a) - Thermal Treatment of Mixed Waste with Recovery of Materials from the Ash / Char

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	• System 2(b) - Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel • System 2(c) - Thermal Treatment of Solid Recovered Fuel with Biogas Recovery More details on these four systems can be found in Section ES-5 “Formulation and Evaluation of Alternative Systems” in the above referenced report. It should be noted that the term “thermal treatment” is not restricted to incineration. It includes combustion, gasification, pyrolysis and plasma gasification. During the upcoming procurement process, there will first be a request for qualifications from vendors of different technologies, followed by a request for proposals from qualified vendors. Through this competitive procurement process the preferred technology and vendor will be selected. The Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment was conducted to provide a preliminary review of health risk in advance of the site-specific health risk assessment, which will be carried out when a site (Clarington 01) and technology vendor are chosen. No site-specific data was included in the risk assessment because it was a generic study meant as a preliminary feasibility study, in preparation of the site-specific risk assessment. It identified generic issues that will need to be taken into account during the site-specific assessment.
Instead, I propose that the region immediately begin work on alternatives: * embark on an aggressive public information campaign to improve awareness of the blue box, green bin and yard waste programs; *audit internal waste reduction and diversion programs at the many industrial, commercial and institutional sites in the region. Notably, help small and medium businesses achieve high diversion rates, since those are the businesses least able to assign staff to work on waste reduction. *Make sure all Durham region constituent municipalities have the best waste reduction measures in place	Durham and York Regions currently have aggressive public information campaigns underway to educate the public regarding their many waste diversion programs. A Waste Fair was held in Durham Region on November 10, 2007 to help improve awareness. Conducting ongoing audits of waste reduction and diversion programs is a good suggestion and may be considered as part of ongoing Regional activities. Durham and York Regions are working to ensure that these collection programs are effective by setting ambitious collection targets for each material and implementing continuous improvement measures as required to meet or exceed the specified collection targets.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
* begin a RFQ/RFP process for a properly managed landfill with state of the art leachate and methane collection for the residual waste. * lobby the provincial and federal governments to enact extended producer responsibility laws and offer carrot & stick tax measures to encourage manufacturers and retailers to use less packaging and offer refillable containers.	As mentioned above, a landfill only system, whereby a new landfill site capable of managing all waste that remains after at-source diversion would not meet the purpose of this project, and thus was not nor will it be considered in this study. Extended producer responsibility, along with more stringent packaging laws are important issues that may be looked into further in the future, however they were not included in the scope of this project. As these programs are developed further, they may be included as a waste management option to help reduce the amount of residual waste requiring disposal at the proposed facility.
The RA was timed so as to be the least beneficial to the public consultation and decision-making process, after a short list of sites were chosen and after a preferred "thermal treatment" was selected.	The timing of the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Study was selected to provide a preliminary review of health risk, well in advance of the site-specific health risk assessment that will be carried out when a site and vendor are chosen. The only meaningful way to perform the Generic Risk Assessment was to have it done at a time when the number of possible sites had been reduced to a short list in order to provide information at this stage of the EA process to the public in advance of the consultant's recommendation of a preferred site and the completion of a site-specific risk assessment. While not a specific requirement of the EA study, the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment Study was conducted to provide an important preliminary understanding of the potential for health risks. The generic study was performed as a preliminary feasibility study and was carried out in anticipation of conducting a site-specific risk assessment. It identified generic issues that will need to be taken into account during the site-specific assessment and was a useful tool at this stage for providing interim information regarding this study.
It is late Sat. night and I'm aware there is a deadline re. responding about the incinerator.	Please note that the deadline for receiving public comments regarding the Preferred Site Report, which is located on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/consultants_prefsite.php, has been extended to December 10, 2007. Notification of this extension has been posted on the project website, published in local papers and was sent out via email to residents on our contact list. This Environmental Assessment (EA) is ongoing and there will continue to be ample opportunity for public involvement in the EA process. It should be noted that the public is welcome to submit comments on any aspect of the project at any time, even beyond this December 10, 2007 deadline for comments on the site selection issue.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
The Port Darlington community is the closest residential community down wind from the proposed site. Will representatives of the Residual Waste Study project agree to participate in a public meeting hosted by the Port Darlington Community Association in November 2007?	We appreciate your interest in this project however we cannot accommodate your request at this time. We have demanding timelines that we need to adhere to in order to keep the Project on schedule so that we have a solution for the management of Durham/York waste once the Michigan border is closed at the end of 2010. We recognize that public participation is a very important component of the EFW Project and accordingly have held over 64 public information sessions since the project started, in order to garner public comments and to provide information. We plan to have more Public Information Sessions in the future and welcome both you and the Port Darlington Community Association to attend and participate in the future sessions. All of our future information sessions will be advertised through many venues including the Durham/York website. http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/sessions.php. Thank you again for submitting your questions regarding the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process.
In fairness to Durham residents/taxpayers who are most directly impacted, you need to hold the January 8th, 2008 meeting in Durham Region.	Thank you for your email. Unfortunately, the venues for the Joint Waste Management Group (JWMG) meetings have been established for 2007, including the meeting scheduled for January 8, 2008. As such, the upcoming meeting will be taking place in York Region. We will take your comments into consideration when planning the schedule for the JWMG meetings for 2008.
I realize that I am cutting it close with the December 10th deadline, but I am hoping that my letter can still be considered, since it is still December 10th.	We have received your emails and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Thank you for submitting your comments regarding this project. Even though the formal deadline for receiving public comments regarding the Preferred Site Report was December 10th, comments will still be received and reviewed past this date. This study is ongoing and comments can be submitted at any time until the end of the project.
I have not been able to find any notification on any of the websites yet and today is the previous deadline for comment on the Preferred Site Report. Nor have I received any written notice to date. Can you confirm that the date has been extended to December 10 and that notification is on the websites and has been or will be sent to everyone in your database? I believe I should be on that database as I have attended numerous PICs and asked questions.	The public comment period regarding the Consultant's Recommended Preferred Site Report has indeed been extended to December 10, 2007. Notification of this is posted on the project website in the "What's New" section located at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/. Also, notification was sent out via email to everyone on our contact list. A copy of the notification was sent to your email address, however it appears to have not been delivered. I will resend a copy of the email to you.
In addition to the consultation opportunities provided by the	As noted above, the technology vendor ultimately selected through the Regions'

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
Regions of Durham and York as part of the EA process, I suggest that residents living in the area of the shortlisted sites should be invited to participate in an advisory committee to review the submissions received in response to the Request for Qualifications, the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) from technology providers and the submissions received as a result of this RFP and data used to support the final site selection process. If confidentiality of commercially sensitive information is a concern, residents can be required to sign confidentiality agreements prior to their membership on the committee.	procurement process must comply with all regulatory requirements. These regulatory requirements are established to protect public health and safety. Unfortunately, submissions received in response to the Request for Qualifications and the Request for Proposals will not be made available to the public due to their confidential nature and the nature of the established procurement process. However, as mentioned before, the criteria used in the site selection process has been made available on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/FINAL_Draft_Steps_1-5_Report-March22-07.pdf. Also, all data collected as part of the Short-List Evaluation Studies and used by the Consultants to reach a decision on their recommended preferred site can be found on the website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/consultants_prefsite.php.
If an EFW facility is sited in Clarington, I suggest that a community relations committee be established to monitor on-going plant operations, emissions, human health studies and environmental impacts and to ensure that these data are public and fully transparent.	At the outset of the EA it was decided to incorporate the function of a Public Advisory Committee in the overall direction and management of the study by including six members of the public (three from Durham and three from York) along with elected officials from both Regions on the Joint Waste Management Group (JWMG), which directs and oversees the study. This approach provides representation of a broad range of interests across the study area community and a focus for public input to the study. Following determination of the location of the preferred site (Clarington 01), a Public Liaison Committee (PLC) comprised of local residents and businesses will be established to provide a liaison between the local community and the Energy from Waste facility during development and operation of the proposed facility. The Terms of Reference regarding the establishment of this PLC should be drafted by the end of the year. It should be noted that documentation regarding any past and future studies related to this project, including all human health studies, will be posted on the project website and public comments regarding these studies will be sought. This Environmental Assessment (EA) is ongoing and there will continue to be ample opportunity for public involvement in the EA process. It should be noted that the public is welcome to submit comments on any aspect of the project at any time.
Also, while this letter is not submitted representing the Port Darlington Community Association (PDCA), I do support the suggestion in the staff report presented to GP&A Committee (Item 3.2.1) that a meeting be held with PDCA to discuss the Durham/York Residual Waste EA process. I offer my assistance in setting up this meeting.	As mentioned in my previous email, we appreciate your interest in this project however we cannot accommodate your request at this time. We have demanding timelines that we need to adhere to in order to keep the Project on schedule so that we have a solution for the management of Durham/York waste once the Michigan border is closed at the end of 2010. We recognize that public participation is a very important component of the EFW Project and accordingly have held over 64 public information sessions since the project started, in order to garner public comments and to provide information. We plan to have more Public Information Sessions in the future and welcome both you and the Port Darlington

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	Community Association to attend and participate in the future sessions. All of our future information sessions will be advertised through many venues including the Durham/York website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/sessions.php .
In addition to the peer review consultants already retained by Clarington, I encourage you to consider retaining an expert in waste management planning and thermal treatment technologies to support your assessment of such critical issues as the quantity and quality of the residual waste stream and technology assessment and evaluation.	The option of retaining an additional independent peer reviewer will be considered as the study continues.
We respectfully request that you formally commit to holding all future JWMG meetings in Durham Region to allow to those most directly impacted, the Durham residents, the opportunity to attend. Please commit to holding the January 8 th , 2008 JWMG meeting in Durham Region.	We have received your email and your comments have been noted.
Who is our contact at MOE? I need his or/her email to send my comments on this EA. The information on MOE contact that was given to me was incorrect; hopefully, Mr. Battarino will be correct MOE contact.	The correct MOE contact for the Durham York Residual Waste Project is Mr. Gavin Battarino. His email address is Gavin.Battarino@ontario.ca .
Apparently the groups of politicians, on their excursions to Europe, found that in some cases incineration is working well. Establishments which are not meeting government regulations are being shut down, and the 'top of the line' ones are meeting government regulations. Anyone who is familiar with Europe will know that they tend to have much more stringent regulations about health and environmental issues than we have. We could build something here which would meet current local standards, but which would not adequately protect us from toxic emissions.	A comparison of regulatory requirements for air emissions from EFW facilities can be found on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/study/reference/Emission_Limits_Comparison_July-7-06_and_EFW.pdf . The A-7 Guidelines used in Ontario are comparable to those used in Europe and these regulatory limits were set to ensure the protection of public health. If the emissions to the environment from the proposed facility are shown to exceed the prescribed regulatory limits, the facility would not be built.
GENERAL / MISCELLANEOUS	
I have just read the Toronto Star article which indicated that, at this web site, there is a procedure for emailing opinions. Yet, going through the site menus, I can find no such thing. Oh yes, I can get "info" I assume at this email address, but where is the area that solicits opinions from the public? Perhaps that is something Durham and York do not wish to receive? My wife and I, Bowmanville residents, would go on the record, should the opportunity arise, in opposing an incinerator facility. I beg	The email address that you found posted on the Durham York Residual Waste Study website (info@durhamyorkwaste.ca) is the correct email address to use to submit your opinions and comments regarding this study. As mentioned in my previous email, any further comments or concerns should be sent to this address. Public opinions are very important to both Durham and York Regions. Your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
your pardon - an EFW facility.	
If we all agree that the Brampton EFW is not a good representation of an EFW, why are they allowed to continue its operation?	The emissions from the Brampton facility are very low and are comparable with some of the best facilities in the world. The premise on which this question is based is incorrect.
It was stated at the public information session that the consultants do not want to put the EFW in an agricultural site or in a residential area. Why is that?	Unfortunately this appears to be a miscommunication that has occurred. The health team was merely identifying that any site-specific risk assessment, in this case for the Clarington 01 site, would need to take into consideration the local land uses surrounding the proposed facility.
Regarding the following question/answer: Q: If we all agree that the Brampton EFW is not a good representation of an EFW, why are they allowed to continue its operation? A: The emissions from the Brampton facility are very low and are comparable with some of the best facilities in the world. The premise on which this question is based is incorrect. The reason I asked this question was because a member of the Durham Region Waste Team TOLD me that the Brampton EFW has not done the retrofitting that should be done. This person was present (and publicly answering questions during the Q & A period) at both Public Information Sessions in Clarington, and I spoke with this person personally after both meetings. I do not want to mention names, because I certainly do not want to get anyone in trouble. I suppose I was pointed in the wrong direction by this member of the Durham Regional Waste Team, because I certainly would not base a question on information that I thought was incorrect. I believed that my source could be trusted. From now on, I will take all that I am told by the department with 'a grain of salt'. Very unfortunate.	We suggest that there has been some misunderstanding regarding the Brampton EFW facility. It is approximately 15 years old and some components are being repaired and replaced. Perhaps more importantly, it is a private sector industrial facility that was never designed or intended to be an "open and welcoming" show place for the community. In that regard it is not a good representation, compared to facilities visited in Europe, of what is being proposed for Durham and York.
What is the maximum, a range or an actual proposed capacity for the EFW facility? I understand that York region has reduced its level of involvement, but still wants the option to expand the facility if required.	The proposed facility is being designed for an initial capacity of 150,000 or 250,000 tonnes of waste per year and a maximum capacity of 400,000 tonnes of waste per year. This is to allow for the Regions' increasing waste management demands as a result of population growth.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
I understood that the waste created in Durham would be dealt with a 'made in Durham' solution. Why is it that we now are asking for other regions waste for our 'made in Durham' solution?	Historically, Durham and York have partnered on a variety of infrastructure developments. They have partnered to date (starting with the preparation of the EA Terms of Reference in 2005) on this project in order to share the EA planning costs. As York has recently obtained additional waste disposal capacity, the proposed facility will initially primarily serve Durham's needs.
Can you tell the residents of Durham how much this will cost the individual taxpayer?	Relative to current export landfill, the proposed facility is expected to cost in the order of an additional \$75/tonne. A typical household generates about 0.4 tonnes of waste per year. On the basis of these assumptions, the cost to the typical household will be approximately an additional \$30 per year. Detailed calculations regarding costs to the individual taxpayer have not been addressed as of yet. They will be looked into as part of the site-specific study.
The durham/york study says that the "Ont MOE is using 2 separate regulatory requirements to address air emissions from thermal treatment facilities in Ontario: Guideline A-7 and Ontario Regulation 419/05 with Point of Impingement (POI) guidelines and Ambient Air Quality Criteria" (reference http://durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/processing/Annex-E-6-Generic-Air-Dispersion-Analysis.pdf). However, the Ont gov't website (http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/envision/cws/index.htm#combustors) states: New facilities: Ontario's overall approach to new and expanded (incinerators, smelters) facilities is to incorporate the CWS for both mercury and dioxins and furans into Certificates of Approvals that are legal instruments. Any new municipal solid waste incineration facilities must also comply with Guidelines A-7 and A-8 that incorporate the CWS. Ontario has an updated guideline for new and existing hospital incinerators that includes the CWS. My question is: Why does the Durham/York study not quote A-8? Does 419/05 encompass A-8, and if so, why is 419/05 not listed on the Govt of Ont website?	Guideline A-8 was introduced to implement the Canada wide standard for Mercury and Dioxins in Ontario. Guideline A-7 was ammended to incorporate these standards. It is not necessary to refer to A-8 because the limits in A-7 are the same as those in A-8 for the contaminants specified in A-8. A-7 and A-8 are guidelines that address the concentration of specified pollutants in a stack prior to their release to the environment. Regulation 419/05 deals with the modeled concentrations of pollutants at the point of impingement of these pollutants on the environment, typically the facility property boundary or beyond. To demonstrate compliance with A-7, A-8 or other Certificate of Approval requirements, stack sampling of specified pollutants at the existing facility is preferred and the resulting samples are analyzed to ensure that the concentrations are below the specified limits. Typically Regulation 419/05 deals with obtaining approvals for new facilities prior to their construction. Stack emissions, typically assuming in-stack pollutant concentrations below the A-7 limits, are modeled using a dispersion model approved by the Ministry of the Environment (MOE). To obtain a permit from the MOE the modelling must show that the concentration of the specified pollutants at the point off-site of maximum concentration, typically at the property boundary or beyond, are less than the limits specified in Regulation 419/05. Information on Regulation 419/05 can be found on the MOE website at: http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/envision/gp/2424e04.pdf.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
I know that our Clarington Council in the recent past sent a resolution to Durham Region asking exactly WHAT the benefits of naming ourselves a willing host to the proposed incinerator would be. I would like to know what the answer(s) were to this please, and would like a copy of the answer.	I have attached a copy of the response from Durham Region with regards to the resolution from Clarington Council. Please let me know if you have any further questions.
I am for the incinerator	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process.
Also at the meeting in Courtice, I was informed that there were no handouts in regards to the Air Emissions from the incinerator because they got wet at the last meeting. With something as important as this, why were more copies not made up so the people could take the material home to study?	Regrettably, we ran out of the Air Emissions Comparison Table hand-out at the Courtice Public Information Session. We are sending you a copy of the flyer you requested. Please find it attached to this email.
Why were the European guidelines not used on the Air Emissions handout? The councillors travelled to Europe to see incinerators, but on the handout, the US guidelines are listed. What are the guidelines for the European Incinerators?	The table comparing European emission standards with Ontario guidelines is available on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/study/refrence/Emission_Limits_Comparison_July-7-06_and_EFW.pdf. This is the same table that we have included in this email. The European standards are very similar to the Ontario Guideline A-7.
After reading information on your web site and articles in my local paper I would like to express that I am strongly opposed to the thermal treatment facility being built. Our environment is fragile enough without more stresses being added to it.	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process. Please continue to visit our website for updates regarding this project. www.durhamyorkwaste.ca.
The promotion of the project seems very biased. A tour of European facilities by regional council members seems to have been arranged by industry PR staff. This trip was a complete waste of taxpayer funds since it only presented the view of the industry. Since the eventual bid winner stands to gain in a very lucrative contract, their sincerity is highly questionable. They	The most recent European trip was organized with the assistance of an Independent European Consultant, Ramboll. Previous tours were organized by our project Consultants, GENIVAR (formerly named MacViro). The tours included meetings with local elected officials, government officials and industry organizations as well as tours of facilities. Most of the facilities visited are owned and operated under the authority of the municipalities that they serve.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
would reap the profits, and we would be stuck with the health consequences.	
Garbage doesn't burn by itself. You need gas or electricity to achieve the temperatures required for proper incineration. Now that we have reached Hubbert's peak for oil that's "easy" to extract, the shift to getting oil from tar sands will consume more and more natural gas, raising the price of operating the incinerator. If an electric heater is used instead, the cost would increase faster since producing electricity from primary sources (oil, gas, coal or nuclear) is inefficient. Since it is difficult to predict future energy prices, it is impossible to budget for the annual operating cost of the incinerator, and unexpected tax hikes would likely be needed.	Garbage does in fact burn by itself once the facility reaches proper operating temperatures. Generally, for EFW plants, natural gas is used to get them going, and then they are self sustaining.
The point about the cost of energy to operate the incinerator also addresses the myth of "Energy From Waste". From the energy in vs. out, the facility would always be operating at a net loss.	As noted above a relatively small amount of auxiliary fuel, generally natural gas, is required to bring the facility up to operating temperature prior to introducing any waste. Once stable operating conditions are reached, auxiliary fuel is not required. Typically these facilities produce about 600 kilowatt-hours of electricity for sale to the electrical grid per tonne of waste processed.
I am in full agreement that an incinerator is a very good idea for north Durham and elsewhere.	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process.
Here is a copy of my delegation to Clarington Council Monday November 12 2007, presenting several reports from France on the risks of incineration, and two European Union documents on incineration and waste management policy. The presentation slides are included in this email.	I was able to access the documents in the zip file and have passed them on to the appropriate people for review. A copy of the documents will be kept in the public record and will be sent to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process. Thank you for your continued interest in this project.
My presentation today will be very short. Most of you here today are well aware of my opposition to the proposed thermal treatment /incinerator. My opposition is based on the potential serious health effects, green house gas emissions, and the unacceptable financial risks.	

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
To digress for a moment, last week when my daughter and I were returning to Newcastle from the Region Council meeting, albeit it was a smog alert day. We were driving east on 401 and on the approach to GM headquarters we could see a well defined layer of smog hanging over east Oshawa and Clarington. It is uncomprehensible to me that we are going down this route and adding more smog producing, health depriving emissions to this already over polluted area. The whole world is talking about reducing green house gases, etc.. How can we justify an incinerator? For anyone who has followed the EA process to date, the selection of Clarington 01 as the consultants' preferred sight comes as no surprise. What concerns me is that the independent peer review carried out for Clarington by Steven Rowe identified several flaws and short comings in the short list selection process. I won't attempt to list all of them but here are a few: 1. The site selection short list draft report did not provide screening maps nor did it provide sufficient explanation of how each of the criteria were applied: 2. The short list does not describe a comprehensive approach to the identification of public lands and therefore were not directly approached as part of the process. 3. There may be other potential sites in the Greenbelt that have not been identified. 4. The proponents propose to identify a recommended preferred site and to submit an interim environmental assessment planning document to the MOE before a preferred vendor and the exact thermal technology has been identified. 5. The municipality's peer review consultants did not have access to the other background studies. In your possession today is a copy of a resolution approved by Clarington Council September 4th. It includes the following " That Clarington request that the Region provide the other reports; including the Traffic Impact	

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
Analysis, Archeological Assessment, Air and Groundwater Monitoring, Environmental Impact Study; Land Use, and Infrastructure and Servicing Assessments; <u>with sufficient time given to the Municipality and others to review and comment, prior to completing their analysis and selecting a preferred site</u>". These reports were only made available last Friday. I could go on but let me conclude with one last statement from Mr. Rowe's report and I quote "It is possible unresolved issues in the process will undermine the validity of the process as a whole." This to me speaks volumes. All of the above makes me wonder. Would we be announcing a different site today if the analysis had been done properly in the first place? (See tentative insert below to be used if no questions are asked by committee members regarding the errors and omissions) The last thing I want to comment on is the planned Public Information Session on October 3rd at the Rickard Recreation Complex. In particular I draw your attention to the time for the formal presentation segment – 9 P.M. to 11 P.M.. It looks to me that the consultants are hoping that by that hour of the night very few people will be in attendance to ask some possibly embarrassing questions. In York, where everyone is breathing a sigh of relief, the formal presentation is scheduled for 7P.M.. Is this the consultants' idea of transparency Tentative Insert – I find it ludicrous and shameful today that no one has asked the consultants to respond to the criticisms brought forward in Mr. Rowe's report. Presumably you here to represent the concerns of residents, that doesn't seem to be happening.	

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
Mr Mayor-why couldn't you be like the Ajax mayor and take a stand against incineration? Since this topic has become more heated , you continually stand back saying little. We know by not speaking out that you have made your stand. I am very disappointed not only in you but our regional councillors.	Unfortunately we cannot speak for the Mayor. If you would like to speak with him regarding this issue, you may send him an email at the following address: jabernethy@clarington.net .
Add me, to the against list.	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process. Please continue to check the project website for updates to the study. www.durhamyorkwaste.ca .
I think it is a spectacular idea to have an incinerator in our region, should have been done years ago. Thank you for thinking of our environment.....land fills should be a thing of the past.	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process.
1. I would like to be added to the mailing/contact list for updates to the Durham/York Residual Waste Study. 2. I forgot to ask previously, but could I request a hard copy of the Residual Waste Study? 3. I was hoping to get a hard copy of the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and Identification of Consultant's Recommended Preferred Site. Is this available in a hard copy format?	1. We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. I have added your name and contact information to our mailing list. Please continue to check the project website for updates to this study at: www.durhamyorkwaste.ca . 2. A number of studies have been completed as part of the Durham York Residual Waste Study. All of these study reports are available on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/study_doc.php . 3. I can send you a hard copy of the summary report titled "Results of Step 7: Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and Identification of Consultants Recommended Preferred Site". Unfortunately we are unable to send out hard copies of the individual short-list evaluation studies, however a CD will be included with the summary report that contains all of these study documents. They are all the same documents that are available on the website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/consultants_prefsite.php . I will send the report and CD out by mail today.
Will there be a reduction in Property taxes to make for the drop in resale of homes? Why should I pay the same as everyone else when your burning there garbage in my backyard.	Experience in other jurisdictions, such as the Region of Peel, indicates that the presence of an EFW facility does not have an impact on broader host community property values. This issue will be considered further as part of the site-specific studies to be conducted following

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	the selection, by Regional Council, of the preferred site for the facility and the technology vendor.
What happens when this is down for maintenance. Where do you put the backlog of garbage?	During periods when the facility is shut down, arrangements will be made to dispose of the waste in landfill or another licensed facility.
Could you please send me a copy of the Lifecycle Comparison report?	Further to your phone call with David Merriman, please find attached a copy of the document titled "Supplement to Annex E-5: Comparative Analysis of Thermal Treatment and Remote Landfill on a Lifecycle Basis". If you have any further questions, please give us a call.
Could you please send me the 'Needs' study done prior to the EA undertaking for the proposed EFW in Clarington?	Thank you for your email. Minister of the Environment approved need for the facility has been established in the approved EA Terms of Reference. Details on the purpose and need of the undertaking are provided in the attached background document to the approved EA Terms of Reference.
I am for the incinerator.	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process.
As there is an adjacent CN Rail line, will there be a rail connection possible or planned to make use of a superior transport media for the Incinerator that may displace heavy vehicle traffic off the 401 so as to invite refuse from elsewhere in Ontario? That might reduce the cross-border traffic to some degree, wouldn't you agree?	Rail haul was considered as a part of this project, but was not studied in detail because it is best suited for long haul application and has the following disadvantages in the Durham/York situation: • A rail haul option would require the construction of transfer stations to receive the waste and load it onto and off of the rail cars. The additional loading and unloading operation adds additional operating costs. The truck haul transfer stations are already in place and are currently used in the shipment of waste to remote landfills. • Even if the truck rail transfer stations were developed, a significant amount of truck haul (and the associated environmental effects) would be required to deliver the waste from the points of generation to these transfer stations. • The current rail infrastructure within the GTA is highly utilized and shipping waste by rail would likely require complex negotiations with the railways and the constructions of additional costly rail infrastructure to accommodate this cargo. Rail transport is very costly for transporting the relatively small quantities of waste being considered by Durham and York Regions. In summary, rail haul was not considered in detail because it was deemed to be much more costly than truck haul and provide relatively minor benefits in return. We also note that the approved Terms of Reference for the project do not permit large quantities of waste to be

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	imported from outside Durham and York Regions.
I'm having difficulties getting a contact name for the project office that is overseeing the competitive process for selecting a proponent to build the EFW plant. I am a member of one of the applicant teams and I would appreciate a quick call or e-mail to receive some contact information.	As mentioned in my phone message yesterday afternoon, all questions regarding the RFQ should be directed to Bob Gallant in the Purchasing Department in Durham Region. He can be reached at 905-668-7711. We apologize for the difficulties you have had in obtaining this information.
The Agency Contacts and Distribution List is on the website twice, once as it should be and the other time under the heading of "List of Consultation Events". Please correct the website and let me know when you have so that I can access this information. thanks	The "List of Consultation Events" document has been posted on the website. http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/study/1_3_List_of_Consultation_Events.pdf Thank you for bringing that to our attention.
I understand that there will be waste water discharges from the cleaning of exhaust gases in an incinerator. Where will the facilities for the disposal of quenching and scrubbing water be? How is this water disposed of?	Significant quantities of water are reused within the process. Facilities can be designed to have "zero" waste process waste water. In these facilities the waste water is evaporated and discharged with the stack exhaust gases. If this is not done then waste water may be treated to ensure compliance with sewer use by-laws and then is discharged into the sanitary sewer.
The Physician Recruitment Committee is actively working to attract much needed doctors to our community. It's going to be a tough sell though. How many doctors will consider relocating their young families here? The proposed incinerator looms over us, further threatening our health and discouraging the new doctors that we so desperately need. A poor prognosis indeed.	The Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment indicated that the proposed facility would likely not create any unacceptable risks. This will be confirmed through the site-specific studies to be completed following selection of the preferred site. We do not expect that the development of the proposed facility will have any effect on efforts to attract Physicians to the community.
You have made a mistake recommending the incinerator as the solution to Durham and York's trash problems. It's obvious you didn't look at all the facts before you decided on an unhealthy, and massively expensive project. Time to stop it is now. Put the incinerator on hold until you get a truly INDEPENDENT study on the incinerator. All other studies have been done by people who want it. Time to get a study done by a person or company who has absolutely NO interest in it. That's the way it'll be fair.	We have received your email and would like to thank you for submitting your concerns regarding the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process.
Yes we must incinerate in Brock township! It works in other countries and will work here.	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. Please note that your comments, along with others received, will become part of the public record and will be included in the documentation submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for review during the approvals process. Please continue to check the project website for updates to the study.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
	www.durhamyorkwaste.ca .
In view of your plans to build an incinerator in Durham County, please look up the following website, which gives successful alternatives to dealing with waste. zerowaste.co.nz	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study. We will take a look at the link provided. Thank you again.
How are you going to manage the 425 exit and entrance traffic to 401 from the sewage plant, the garbage plant, the 407 link, the local traffic and the future Industrial Park? Also this is the only access for Courtice residences and the Darlington Provincial Park.	Based on the results of the Traffic Study carried out on the short-listed sites, it was determined that trucks coming to and from the proposed energy from waste facility would not have a significant impact on the surrounding roads, including the 401 entrance. The results of this Traffic Study are included in "Annex F - Report on Potential Traffic Impacts" posted on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/consultants_prefsite.php . A site specific traffic study will be carried out in the future and the results of this study will also be made available to the public at that time.
As a Newmarket resident and taxpayer, I fully support HARMLESS incineration... harmless for the populace and the environment. Personally, I hail from Germany where my hometown in the southwest, Goeppingen, has hugely benefitted from the electricity and hot steam with which a closely situated Hospital benefits, along with a large section of the town (80 000) where electricity is distributed. There is no danger with respect to poisonous gases or other garbage normally associated with burning. Should you want to view a folder with description / data, I would be willing to visit with you. At which time I further could give you reliable contacts in Germany. I could be your translator.	We have received your email and would like to thank you for your interest in the Durham York Residual Waste Study and for your offer of assistance. We do have significant information on European facilities. Ramboll, a Danish consulting firm, is a part of our consulting team and we have visited a number of European facilities. We have also been in contact with the German EFW Industry Association iTAD. If we require additional assistance we will contact you. Thank you again for your offer.
There is also the issue of property values. Courtice has already suffered a slight loss in the real estate market in the past few years and adding another monster industry on our lake front will only add to its decline. According to real estate specialists, house value stands to go down from 10 to 20%. Courtice is also a town with many farm lands. Hosting this Incinerator will not only lower house values, but will also affect the local farming market. Whether it be their land value, the health of their animals, or the quality of the produce they raise, farmers will definitely feel the impact if this plan goes ahead.	There is no indication that existing facilities in other jurisdictions have an adverse impact on host community property values. These issues will be considered further in the upcoming site-specific studies.

Table 1A: Written Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
Finally, what about the added traffic? There will be a constant flow of garbage trucks that will be lining up to drop off their load full of TONS of waste. The infrastructure of our area cannot support this kind of volume, nor do we want to have such streams of massive vehicles invading our streets. Not to mention the added air pollutants from all of the idling trucks waiting to dump.	Potential traffic impacts as a result of the proposed facility were considered as part of the Short-List Evaluation Studies. The results of this study can be found in the document titled “Annex F – Report on Potential Traffic Impacts” located on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/consultants_prefsite.php.
While we consider the impact of this on our community, what about the additional traffic congestion and pollution due to extra traffic on the 401?	Potential traffic impacts as a result of the proposed facility were considered as part of the Short-List Evaluation Studies. The results of this study can be found in the document titled “Annex F – Report on Potential Traffic Impacts” located on the project website at: http://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/pdfs/study/consultants/Annex%20F%20-%20Report%20on%20Potential%20Traffic%20Impacts.pdf.
What about real estate values?	There is no indication that existing facilities in other jurisdictions have an adverse impact on host community property values. These issues will be considered further in the upcoming site-specific studies.

Table 1B: Telephone Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
ENVIRONMENT	
No comments received	
HEALTH	
Clarington Papers say local doctors say the facility will pose a health risk. Is this true?	Generic health risk assessment said it was safe. This will be confirmed in the site specific health reassessment. If it is not safe medical officer of health would speak up and MOE would not approve it. Respondent said, they were not sure that the Doctors who signed the petition really understood the actual health risks. They saw it as a new source of pollution and any new source of pollution is bad.
Wanted to know about the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment and if the facility was safe.	Advised that the results of the study was posted on the project website. The results of the Generic Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment indicate that the facility would be safe.
DIVERSION	
No comments received	
SITING	
Question regarding selection of site	Consultants have recommended Clarington 01 site. Three public meetings have been held. Committees and Councils of Durham and York will make a decision on Site at First meeting in January 08. Advised to check website for meeting dates.
PUBLIC CONSULTATION and the ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS	
Asked about survey as questionnaire at a public information session.	Will be done by polling like last time around. Consists of 400 random sample. Not decided how or in what format. Last time Ipsos Reid did the polling. Durham Region has hired a communications consultant. For more information see Documents and Publications/Preferred residuals processing system Annex F Appendices for polling results, which can be found on the Durham York Study website.
Question regarding choice of vendor technology	Thermal treatment processing system selected in spring of 2006. All thermal treatment are similar with respect to impacts (air emissions, requirements, #trucks, size of facility). A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) has been issued to vendors earlier this year and it closed several weeks ago (Oct 11/07). Qualified vendors will be selected from the submissions received. Only those that qualify will receive an RFP (Request for Proposal). The RFQ is based on the provision of proven technology.
GENERAL / MISCELLANEOUS	
Asked how many trucks and asked about Annex F Traffic and quoted from Tables 6 and 7 of Appendix P.	We estimate 28 incoming trucks plus 8 additional trucks for a total of 36 trucks per day
Asked what chemicals trucks are carrying	Lime and PAC (powdered activated carbon) for pollution control systems
Darlington Nuclear Power Plant had massive cost overruns that are still being paid for by the people of Ontario. Will the same thing happen with this facility?	The construction period for this facility is only about 2 years. It is up to 10 for a Nuclear plant. This facility is much less complicated than a nuclear plant. Given the differences coupled with the record of constructing these facilities in the US and Europe, we don't expect major cost overruns to occur.

Table 1B: Telephone Comment and Response Table on the Evaluation of Short-List of Sites and the Identification of Consultant's Preferred Site
Comments Received from September 25, 2007 to December 13, 2007

Comment	Response
Commented that the recent Durham Newsletter spoke about the importance of removing household hazardous waste (HHW) from the residual waste stream. Supports this approach but is concerned that the traffic flow pattern at the Oshawa Ritson Rd. drop off facility causes unnecessary delays and that these delays cause people not to bother taking their HHW to the facility. Point is that after dropping off HHW residents still have to line up and drive through the exit check point and weight scales, where they are waived through. Typically it takes 15-25 minutes to go through the incoming check point, drop off HHW and go through the exit check point. Believes that more HHW would be diverted via the Ritson Rd. facility if the efficiency of the depot were improved by changing the road to allow cars to exit directly from the HHW drop off area.	Comment will be passed on to Durham Region staff.
Wanted to know about the capacity of the facility	The capacity is estimated to be about 150,000 to 250,000 tpy up to a maximum of 400,000 tpy.
In favour of the incinerator. Believes that burning our garbage is a much better solution than landfilling.	Comments noted.