

The Regional Municipalities of Durham and York

MINUTES of the JOINT WASTE MANAGEMENT GROUP (JWVG) for the DURHAM/YORK RESIDUAL WASTE STUDY

TUESDAY, MARCH 10, 2009

A meeting of the Joint Waste Management Group for the Durham/York Residual Waste Study was held on Tuesday, March 10, 2009 in the Lower Level Boardroom (LL-C), Durham Region Headquarters, 605 Rossland Road East, Whitby, Ontario, beginning at 1:00 p.m.

Present: Councillor C. Trim, Municipality of Clarington, Durham Region, Co-Chair
Councillor S. Crawford, Town of Ajax, Durham Region, attended the meeting at 1:06 p.m.
Councillor G. Emm, Town of Whitby, Durham Region
Councillor J. Heath, Town of Markham, York Region
Councillor R. Johnson, City of Pickering, Durham Region, attended the meeting at 1:06 p.m.
Councillor G. Landon, Town of Markham, York Region, left the meeting at 2:44 p.m.
L. Burt, Resident, Township of Scugog, Durham Environmental Advisory Committee, left the meeting at 4:12 p.m.
I. Gray, Resident, Town of Newmarket, Newmarket Environmental Advisory Committee
B. Mersey, Resident, Town of Markham, Markham Conservation Committee
S. Perrella, Resident, City of Vaughan, Vaughan CARES, attended the meeting at 1:15 p.m. and left the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Alternates

Present: Regional Chair Anderson, Durham Region
Councillor H. Herrema, Township of Uxbridge, Durham Region, left the meeting at 3:42 p.m.
Councillor N. Pidwerbecki, City of Oshawa, Durham Region

Absent: M. Evans, Resident, Township of Brock
Councillor M. Ferri, City of Vaughan, York Region, Co-Chair
J. McInnis, Resident, City of Pickering, Durham Conservation Centre
Councillor D. Wheeler, Town of Georgina, York Region

Also

Present: Councillor J. Abernethy, Municipality of Clarington, Durham Region, attended the meeting at 1:05 p.m.
Councillor A. Foster, Municipality of Clarington

Councillor M. Novak, Municipality of Clarington, Durham Region, attended the meeting at 1:09 p.m.

Staff

Present:

- G. Cubitt, Chief Administrative Officer, Durham Region
- C. Curtis, Commissioner of Works, Durham Region
- G. Anello, Manager of Waste Planning and Technical Services, Durham Region
- L. Carvelo, Program Manager, Solid Waste Operations, York Region
- A. Dipietro, Senior Public Health Inspector, Durham Region
- K. Gorman, Director of Environmental Health, Durham Region
- T. Laverty, Communications Officer, Durham Region
- N. MacDonald, Solid Waste Management, York Region
- L. MacDowell, Director, Environmental Promotion and Protection, York Region
- J. McKay, Jacques Whitford
- S. Munns-Audet, Director of Communications, Durham Region
- Dr. C. Ollson, Jacques Whitford
- D. Payne, Jacques Whitford
- M. Smart, Administrative Assistant, Durham Region
- M. Flammia, Administrative Assistant, Durham Region, attended for part of the meeting
- L. Fleury, Committee Clerk, Durham Region
- C. Bandel, Committee Clerk, Durham Region

Councillor C. Trim, Durham Region, Chaired the meeting. He commented on the importance of providing information regarding the Durham/York Residual Waste Study to the public in a timely manner either on the website, in paper form or on CD. He stated that if a commitment has been made to provide information at a certain time, it should be done so the public is kept informed on these issues.

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOVED by Councillor Emm,
"THAT the agenda, as presented, be approved."
CARRIED

2. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOVED by Councillor Johnson,
"THAT the minutes of the Joint Waste Management Group meeting held on November 4, 2008 be adopted."
CARRIED

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There was no business arising from the minutes.

5. DELEGATIONS

a) LINDA GASSER, RESIDENT, ORONO, REGARDING THE DURHAM/YORK ENERGY FROM WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY

Ms. Gasser appeared before the Committee to express her concerns with the Energy from Waste (EFW) project. She again asked that the Committee direct the Project Team to hold public consultation sessions.

Ms. Gasser cited an e-mail trail that was included in the agenda, consisting of correspondence between her and the project team illustrating the difficulties she encountered when attempting to retrieve answers to various questions with respect to public consultation sessions, documents not posted to the Project website, and links that were not working. She requested that the Project Team be asked to respond to enquiries within seventy-two hours as previously directed and that all documents be posted on the internet within twenty-four hours of the Committee members receiving them. She also suggested that all responses to public enquiries made by the Project Team be attached to the JWMG Agendas.

With respect to the Site Liaison Committee (SLC), Ms. Gasser noted that the Project Team appears to be directing public input via the SLC as indicated by the "Get Involved" page on the Project website. She believes that the members of the SLC are not fully versed in this role. She asked that the JWMG direct the Project Team and Durham staff to educate the citizen SLC members about conducting SLC business and amend their proposed meeting schedule to reflect the need to provide JWMG with timely advice at all stages for the duration of the EA study, as per their mandate.

Ms. Gasser questioned the origin of the report "Review of International Best Practices of Environmental Surveillance for Energy-from-Waste Facilities" based on a May 28, 2008 motion made at Regional Council. She asked that the Report be revised to reflect the direction actually provided and that the public be advised of this as soon as possible as there are several related meetings over the next few weeks. Ms. Gasser also questioned Jacques Whitford's membership in the Canadian Energy from Waste Coalition and stated that she believes they have an inherent conflict of interest.

Ms. Gasser cited a recent newspaper article regarding York Region's finances and asked the York Region Councillors to reconsider their support of the EFW business case as she does not believe it will financially benefit York Region.

Ms. Gasser responded to questions from the Committee.

b) ASHLEY BRIDGEMAN, RESIDENT, TOWN OF AJAX, REGARDING THE DURHAM/YORK ENERGY FROM WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT STUDY

Ms. Bridgeman appeared before the Committee to express her concerns with the Energy from Waste (EFW) project. Ms. Bridgeman stated that she has spoken to many residents of the Region with respect to the EFW Project and has found a large number that are uninformed, and in her view, this is unacceptable. She made reference to the EA Terms of Reference with respect to public consultation and suggested that more consultation is required. She does not believe that the SLC meetings are an ideal venue for this. She also would like to see EFW announcements publicized somewhere other than just in the local paper to ensure that more members of the public are informed about the Project.

Ms. Bridgeman responded to questions from the Committee.

6. PRESENTATIONS

a) MARGARET CLAYTON, SITE LIAISON COMMITTEE (SLC) VICE-CHAIR, TO PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON THE ENERGY-FROM-WASTE (EFW) SLC MEETINGS HELD ON NOVEMBER 25, 2008, JANUARY 14, 2009, AND MARCH 4, 2009

Ms. Clayton, Vice-Chair, Site Liaison Committee (SLC), advised that the purpose of her presentation was to outline what has occurred at the three SLC meetings held to date. She added that any opinions expressed were her own and not those of the SLC.

Ms. Clayton advised the first meeting of the SLC was held on November 25, 2008. She stated this involved the Committee members becoming acquainted with one another and staff; taking questions from the public; a review of the Terms of Reference for the Environmental Assessment (EA); as well as overviews of the Project background, EA process, Environmental Surveillance and RFP process.

Ms. Clayton advised that at the January 14, 2009 meeting of the SLC the Vice-Chair and Secretary Treasurer were elected; the EA submission timeline was presented by J. McKay; an overview was given of the site specific studies that are either completed or in the process of completion; committee members commented on various monitoring options including at the stack as well as at the periphery so emissions in the area are not attributed erroneously to the EFW facility; and

questions and comments from members of the public were received. Concerns regarding the venue for the meeting were also taken into consideration.

Ms. Clayton advised that at the March 4, 2009 meeting presentations were given on the following reports: Draft Natural Environment Impact Assessment; Draft Geotechnical Investigation; Draft Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and Built Heritage; Draft Environmental Baseline Study; and the Review of International Best Practices of Environmental Surveillance for Energy-from-Waste Facilities. She stated that no recommendations with respect to these reports were made at the meeting. She further stated the SLC members wanted time to follow-up and review the reports and will discuss these at a future meeting and reach a consensus prior to formulating a recommendation.

Ms. Clayton also advised that a number of delegations were heard at the March 4th meeting including Ms. Gasser who made various recommendations. Ms. Clayton outlined responses to Ms. Gasser's recommendations and added that a protocol for the posting of Draft SLC minutes was something that the SLC could consider. Ms. Clayton also outlined comments received from Mr. Bertrand with respect to bottom ash and public consultation; Ms. Bracken who has concerns with respect to health issues related to incineration, including the citing of two reports in this regard; and Mr. Richards who has concerns with respect to two bird species that could be "species of concern", and possible funding for peer review studies. Ms. Clayton also outlined comments received from other members of the public who were in attendance; and from a written submission. These included concerns regarding the operation of the facility; a question concerning the locations of soil sampling and why some parts of the site were not sampled; a question about the impact of the EFW facility filtering into the water table; and concerns that the MOE Certificate of Approval may allow for higher emissions than the criteria set by the Region.

Ms. Clayton responded to questions from the Committee members.

b) PRESENTATION BY JIM MCKAY, JACQUES WHITFORD, ON THE DRAFT
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT – CLARINGTON SITE 01

J. McKay, Jacques Whitford, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Natural Environment Impact Assessment. He stated the report is available on the project website and it has been circulated to various agencies responsible for different components of the assessment, such as the Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority (CLOCA) and the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). He stated they will be soliciting feedback from these agencies. He outlined the methodology followed during the assessment which included a review of results of the field assessments previously undertaken as well as some new assessments and surveys conducted. He provided an overview of the results of the assessment. It was noted that this site lies within an area already designated and zoned for industrial and commercial development. J. McKay advised that a concern was raised at the March 4, 2009 SLC meeting with respect to two species of birds that

could potentially be in the area that are candidate species of conservation concern. He stated this matter is being reviewed and discussions will be taking place with the local Conservation Authority.

J. McKay also provided an excerpt of a table found within the report that illustrates the existing conditions at the site; potential impacts; if there is a requirement for any mitigation and/or compensation; and, what the net effects are of developing on that site. He stated that some areas were flagged that require additional work and used aquatic habitat as an example. He stated that while there are no permanent watercourses identified on site, there is a drainage ditch that was identified. During Spring flooding it could produce enough volume so that bait fish could exist in the area. He advised that prior to the EA being submitted in June, a high level fish survey will be undertaken this Spring to ensure there are no fish in the area, and if there are, it will then be determined what mitigation measures need to be applied.

[The Draft Natural Environment Impact Assessment – Clarington Site 01 Report was considered later in the meeting. See page 12 of these minutes.]

c) **PRESENTATION BY JIM MCKAY, JACQUES WHITFORD, ON THE DRAFT GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION**

J. McKay, Jacques Whitford, provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Draft Geotechnical Investigation. He stated this investigation was completed a year ago and the information gathered was included in the Request For Proposals (RFP) so the vendors have an idea of what the soil structure is at the site. This in turn allows them to have an idea of what kind of foundation and structures would have to be put in place in order to build their facility.

J. McKay outlined the methodology followed during the investigation which included drilling a series of 17 boreholes to assess the subsurface soil and groundwater conditions. He provided an overview of the results of the investigation. He noted that groundwater was encountered in 10 of the boreholes at depths ranging from 0.9 m to 7.2 m below the existing ground surface. He also pointed out that there are groundwater monitoring wells from the waste water treatment plant which will provide a better idea of what they are dealing with and if there may be a seasonal variation to the levels. J. McKay stated there is a need for further geotechnical investigations to satisfy specific requirements for the proposed vendor. He also noted that once the vendor has their designs finalized and they know what the configuration of the facility will be, the vendor will have to identify appropriate construction management techniques to manage the soil conditions.

J. McKay responded to questions regarding the depth that groundwater was located and if this will pose a problem during construction.

[The Draft Geotechnical Investigation Assessment Report was considered later in the meeting. See page 13 of these minutes.]

d) PRESENTATION BY J. MCKAY, JACQUES WHITFORD, ON THE DRAFT STAGE 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT AND BUILT HERITAGE

J. McKay, Jacques Whitford, provided a Power Point presentation on the Draft Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and Built Heritage. He outlined the methodology followed for the Archaeological Assessments. He stated that Stage 1 and Stage 2 Archaeological and Built Heritage Assessments were conducted. He pointed out that a Stage 2 assessment only had to be conducted at the north half of the site, as the south half had been completed during the establishment of the Courtice Water Pollution Control Plant (WPCP). He also pointed out that there is a section through the middle of the site which they could not assess due to the ground being frozen and this section will have to be evaluated in the Spring.

J. McKay provided an overview of the results of the investigation. He stated the Stage 1 assessment did identify the elevated potential for the presence of archaeological sites, however the pedestrian survey done at the time did not identify any artifacts and there are no significant built heritage features on the site. He stated that if the lack of archaeological resources is confirmed, the site will be considered to be cleared of archaeological conditions. The information gathered during the Stage 2 investigation will be sent to the Ministry of Culture who will then clear the site for development. If there are any significant intact archaeological resources encountered during construction, there will be appropriate mitigation and management measures put in place to deal with those.

J. McKay responded to questions regarding consultation that has taken place with various native groups with respect to this project.

[The Draft Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and Built Heritage Report was considered later in the meeting. See page 13 of these minutes.]

e) PRESENTATION BY DR. C. OLLSON, JACQUES WHITFORD, ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL BIOMONITORING PROGRAM

Dr. C. Ollson, Jacques Whitford, provided a Power Point presentation on the Draft Environmental Biomonitoring Program. He provided an overview of the chemical baseline information found at the Clarington 01 Site, as contained in the Environmental Biomonitoring report. He also outlined the chemicals for which baseline concentrations were established for various media which includes soil, plant life, small mammals, and surface water. He provided a schematic of the various sampling locations found within 1 km of the proposed facility and it was noted that samples were not obtained from a southeast portion of the site due to safety concerns. Dr. Ollson also provided a schematic which illustrated the areas where produce sampling was done.

Dr. Ollson stated that a very good baseline has been characterized in this area. He further stated that they reviewed a number of baseline reports for EFW facilities in other jurisdictions, and the report they have produced is on par, if not better than what has been documented in the literature in the past.

Dr. Ollson provided an example of a table that can found within the report. He explained how various baseline concentrations are analyzed and stated there is nothing in the baseline report that is surprising. He advised that the baseline chemical concentrations were compared to the Province of Ontario Soil, Ground Water and Sediment Standards, the Provincial Water Quality Guidelines, and Federal guidelines from the Canadian Council of Minister of Environment.

Dr. Ollson concluded by providing a summary of the report findings and stated that existing conditions have been adequately assessed to conduct cumulative effects modeling for the site specific risk assessment, and a good chemical baseline in environmental media has been collected for Pre-Operational conditions of the proposed EFW Facility.

Dr. Ollson responded to questions from the Committee regarding the baseline concentrations and how these values are used to calculate the total cumulative impact of having an EFW facility in this area of the world, and how the emission values provided by the vendors are verified through air modeling.

Discussion also ensued regarding the evaluation process for the preferred vendor. C. Curtis stated that only air emissions are being used for the Request For Proposals (RFP) evaluation. The proposals are evaluated on what was submitted with the proposal. Each of the proponents had a minimum standard they were required to meet, which was the emission criteria set forward by Council, and which is below the Provincial Guidelines. If the proponent's emissions are lower than the approved criteria, they get additional points in their evaluation.

[The Draft Environmental Baseline Study was considered later in the meeting. See pages 13 and 14 of these minutes.]

f) **PRESENTATION BY DR. C. OLLSON, JACQUES WHITFORD, ON THE REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL BEST PRACTICES OF ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEILLANCE FOR ENERGY-FROM-WASTE FACILITIES**

Dr. C. Ollson, Jacques Whitford, provided a Power Point presentation on the Review of International Best Practices of Environmental Surveillance for Energy-From-Waste Facilities. He stated Durham Regional Council directed that a review of best practices of environmental monitoring programs be undertaken and this direction provided the roadmap for the report. He stated that the objective of the study team was that the consultant's recommended option for an environmental surveillance program for the proposed Durham/York Residual EFW facility is based

on the fundamental tenet that the program must ensure the protection of public and environmental health.

Dr. Ollson outlined the study team's recommendations, as follows:

i) Option 1 a): Compliance with Ontario MOE Guideline A-7

This includes a minimum level of compliance surveillance and monitoring to which the EFW facility must commit; and, a continuous stack monitoring of gases, in combination with annual source testing to ensure chemical concentrations used in the risk assessment are being achieved. This level of environmental surveillance was found to be in place at all incineration facilities in the European Union (EU), United States and Canada.

ii) Option 1 b): Establishment of More Stringent Stack Chemical Emissions Standards than Provided in MOE Guideline A-7

The establishment of more stringent stack emissions came about based on public input, and as directed by Council. This adds an extra level of protection to both human and ecological health in the area.

iii) Option 1 c): Inclusion of New Stack Sampling Technology for Dioxins and Furans

This option was also as a result of direction from Committee and Council. Technology now exists for continuous sampling (not monitoring) of dioxins and furans in stacks and this requirement is included in the RFP. The advantage of this technology is that more frequent sampling results for dioxins and furans can be collected and analyzed for an EFW facility.

iv) That a Site Liaison Committee (SLC) should be charged, in part, with review of any environmental surveillance program being undertaken for the Durham/York EFW facility. This would ensure public participation in the environmental surveillance program and evaluation of its efficacy in protecting public and environmental health.

Dr. Ollson stated that there are additional environmental surveillance options being employed around the world at individual incineration facilities. He gave an overview of the additional levels of environmental surveillance not recommended by the Study Team, which includes: Option 2: Ambient Air Monitoring; Option 3: Environmental Monitoring (soil, vegetation, agricultural products); and, Option 4: Human Biomonitoring. He stated these environmental surveillance programs were reported to be conducted based on a combination of academic interest and/or a heightened level of public concern surrounding an individual facility. The recommendation of these options was not supported by this scientific review.

Dr. Ollson explained the process involved with the review of the scientific literature. He stated that the literature supports the importance of conducting a chemical baseline investigation to provide a benchmark against which any samples collected during the facility's operation would be evaluated, which Durham and York Regions are in the process of finalizing.

With respect to ambient air monitoring studies, soil quality monitoring studies, vegetation monitoring studies, and agricultural products monitoring studies, Dr. Ollson stated that the study team found that facilities that had an upgraded or modern pollution control technology do not appear to be a significant source of chemicals detected in the area surrounding an incineration facility. Therefore, ongoing monitoring programs of these environmental media would not be required to ensure the protection of human or ecological health.

Regarding Human Biomonitoring of residents, Dr. Ollson stated that results do not indicate a significant relationship between exposure to chemical emissions from incineration and measured chemical levels in human media such as blood, urine, breast milk and hair. He further stated that of the numerous papers researched on this topic there was only one study that identified significantly elevated dioxin and furan levels in humans. This was in the residents of a rural area containing an older municipal waste incinerator which for nearly 20 years, emitted dioxins at levels 500 times greater than the current emissions limit in the European Union or the Ontario Guideline A-7 allowable limits.

Dr. Ollson gave an overview of the grey literature review and stated that documents were found in support of the scientific literature. He also provided an overview of the external contact reviews conducted and stated that the information obtained widely supported the knowledge already gained through the scientific and grey literature reviews.

Dr. Ollson also provided a summary of global environmental surveillance requirements for EFW facilities. He pointed out that environmental surveillance is done in Spain and human biomonitoring is done in Portugal, mainly due to public concern around these facilities. He stated that the study team is recommending that this level of environmental surveillance not be adopted for the proposed EFW facility. Dr. Ollson further stated that a feasible alternative to a human biomonitoring program would be that Health Department staff, under the direction of Dr. Kyle, should follow and monitor the health studies on these facilities in Spain and Portugal over the years as well as maintain contact with the researchers in this area. This would provide a sufficient period of observation of human biomonitoring activities in other jurisdictions prior to the Durham/York EFW facility becoming operational.

Dr. Ollson responded to questions from the Committee regarding continuous monitoring. He stated that while continuous monitoring can happen the technology is not there for the continuous monitoring for dioxins and furans.

Questions were also raised regarding what indicators there are that show that the level of chemicals is elevated. Dr. Ollson stated that the levels of particulate matter give you a good indication that everything is working as it should and if there is an increase in these levels, this could be an indication that some of the other contaminants could also be elevated. D. Payne, Jacques Whitford, also stated that the people operating the plant, through experience, know the types of parameters they should be seeing in terms of temperature, air flow, combustion, etc. If there is a spike to any of these parameters, it could also be an indication that other levels, such as dioxins, are elevated and that appropriate measures need to be taken.

It was questioned if there would be a higher level of surveillance during the first five (5) years of operation of the facility. C. Curtis advised that it is common to have more rigorous testing/sampling during the first few years of operation. He further advised that a sampling program will be developed as part of the Certificate of Approval with the Ministry of the Environment (MOE).

Discussion ensued regarding real-time emission levels being displayed on an electronic board outside of the facility. D. Payne advised that this can be done for those chemicals that can be continuously monitored. However, it has to be made clear that dioxins cannot be monitored by the moment. If a number was displayed for dioxins, it would be a number that would have been obtained over a period of time. He further stated that the electronic screen with this information can then be duplicated on the website and duplicated by a connection to the regulatory authority.

Discussion also ensued regarding how often dioxins would be sampled. It was stated that the RFP stipulates that dioxins must be sampled at a minimum of monthly. The RFP also includes the establishment of more stringent stack chemical emissions standards than provided in MOE Guideline A-7, and the inclusion of new stack sampling technology for dioxins and furans.

Dr. Ollson also responded to questions regarding soil monitoring. He stated that if soil monitoring was to be done, he would recommend soil sampling be done every three (3) years at 10 - 15 locations near the facility for all relevant chemical parameters. Discussion also ensued regarding ambient air monitoring and if this should be done at the York/Durham EFW facility, and the costs of an air monitoring program. Dr. Ollson stated that the study team believes it is more appropriate to look at this recommendation within the EA recommendations. He further stated that one year's worth of ambient air data on the continuous monitoring of air emissions, and monthly testing of dioxins, etc. would cost approximately \$270,000.

Discussion ensued regarding amending the study team's recommendation to include the provision of a visible, continuous monitoring sign which can also be accessed on the website, as well as soil and ambient air monitoring. Dr. Ollson stated these recommendations go that extra step toward protection and surveillance, however, the study team does caution against human biomonitoring. He also stated that the report can be revised to incorporate the additional recommendations.

Further discussion ensued regarding soil testing. It was questioned how the results of soil testing are correlated back to a source. Dr. Ollson stated that a combination of having a complete baseline, of understanding what is coming out of the facility and where its deposition will be, and then doing the soil sampling, are all used to determine if there has been an impact to the soil or air in the area. It was also questioned if there is any way to determine the level of impact from other industries moving into the area. Dr. Ollson stated that because the land is designated as industrial/commercial there is the potential that another industry could move in that has similar emissions to the EFW facility. He stated that as other facilities move in, it is important that the potential impacts from the EFW are identified so there is a good baseline in order to determine if elevated concentrations of chemicals are from the EFW or from another source.

[The Review of International Best Practices of Environmental Surveillance for Energy-From-Waste Facilities was considered later in the meeting. See pages 14 to 16 of these minutes.]

7. REPORTS

a) REPORT ON THE DRAFT NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT – CLARINGTON SITE 01

The Draft Natural Environment Impact Assessment – Clarington Site 01 Report was received. [A presentation was heard earlier in the meeting. See pages 5 and 6 of these minutes.]

MOVED by Councillor Johnson,

"THAT the Joint Waste Management Group recommends to the Durham Region Works Committee and the York Region Solid Waste Management Committee for their approval and subsequent recommendation to their respective Regional Councils:

THAT the Draft Natural Environment Impact Assessment – Clarington Site 01 Report be received for information."

CARRIED

This matter will be considered by the Works Committee on Tuesday, March 24, 2009 and will be presented to Regional Council on Wednesday, April 1, 2009.

b) REPORT ON THE DRAFT GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

The Draft Geotechnical Investigation Assessment Report was received. [A presentation was heard earlier in the meeting. See page 6 of these minutes.]

MOVED by Councillor Johnson,

"THAT the Joint Waste Management Group recommends to the Durham Region Works Committee and the York Region Solid Waste Management Committee for their approval and subsequent recommendation to their respective Regional Councils:

THAT the Draft Geotechnical Investigation Assessment Report be received for information."

CARRIED

This matter will be considered by the Works Committee on Tuesday, March 24, 2009 and will be presented to Regional Council on Wednesday, April 1, 2009.

c) REPORT ON THE DRAFT STAGE 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT AND BUILT HERITAGE

The Draft Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and Built Heritage Report was received. [A presentation was heard earlier in the meeting. See page 7 of these minutes.]

MOVED by Councillor Johnson,

"THAT the Joint Waste Management Group recommends to the Durham Region Works Committee and the York Region Solid Waste Management Committee for their approval and subsequent recommendation to their respective Regional Councils:

THAT the Draft Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment and Built Heritage Report be received for information."

CARRIED

This matter will be considered by the Works Committee on Tuesday, March 24, 2009 and will be presented to Regional Council on Wednesday, April 1, 2009.

d) REPORT ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE STUDY

The Draft Environmental Baseline Study Report was received. [A presentation was heard earlier in the meeting. See pages 7 and 8 of these minutes.]

MOVED by Councillor Johnson,

"THAT the Joint Waste Management Group recommends to the Durham Region Works Committee and the York Region Solid Waste Management Committee for their approval and subsequent recommendation to their respective Regional Councils:

THAT the Draft Environmental Baseline Study Report be received for information."
CARRIED

This matter will be considered by the Works Committee on Tuesday, March 24, 2009 and will be presented to Regional Council on Wednesday, April 1, 2009.

e) **REPORT ON THE REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL BEST PRACTICES OF ENVIRONMENTAL SURVEILLANCE FOR ENERGY-FROM-WASTE FACILITIES**

The Final Report on the Review on International Best Practices Environmental Surveillance for Energy-From Waste Facilities was received. [A presentation was heard earlier in the meeting. See pages 8 to 12 of these minutes.]

MOVED by Councillor Heath,

"THAT the Joint Waste Management Group recommends to the Durham Region Joint Works and Health & Social Services Committee and the York Region Solid Waste Management Committee for their approval and subsequent recommendation to their respective Regional Councils:

- a) THAT the consultant's recommendations contained in the Final Report on the Review of International Best Practices of Environmental Surveillance for Energy-From-Waste Facilities, as follows, be endorsed:
- i) Option 1 a) - Compliance with Ontario Guideline A-7 Combustion and Air Pollution Control Requirements for new Municipal Waste Incinerators;
 - ii) Option 1 b) - Establishment of More Stringent Stack Chemical Emissions Standards than Provided in MOE Guideline A-7;
 - iii) Option 1 c) - Inclusion of New Stack Sampling Technology for Dioxins and Furans not Routinely Implemented in Ontario EFW or Incineration Facilities; and
 - iv) THAT a Site Liaison Committee (SLC) should be charged, in part, with the review of any environmental surveillance program being undertaken for the Durham/York EFW Facility;

- b) THAT current time air emission data be made available to the public on an electronic board; and
- c) THAT, in addition to the practices outlined in part a), soil monitoring and ambient air monitoring be done on an annual basis in accordance with best practices."

PARTS a) AND b) WERE CARRIED
LATER IN THE MEETING
PART c) PERTAINING TO SOIL
MONITORING WAS CARRIED LATER IN
THE MEETING
PART c) PERTAINING TO AMBIENT AIR
MONITORING WAS DEFEATED LATER IN
THE MEETING

Discussion ensued regarding the need for both soil monitoring and ambient air monitoring being done in accordance with best practices. Dr. Ollson advised these are options that could be done at the start of the process and which could be discontinued at any time. He also pointed out that it is the study team's recommendation that instead of ambient air monitoring only stack monitoring is required.

MOVED by Regional Chair Anderson,

"THAT the words 'soil monitoring' be divided from the words 'ambient air monitoring' in part c) of the foregoing motion of Councillor Heath and voted on separately."

CARRIED

Parts a) and b) of the motion of Councillor Heath were then put to a vote and CARRIED.

Part c) of the motion of Councillor Heath pertaining to soil monitoring on an annual basis in accordance with best practices was then put to a vote and CARRIED.

Part c) of the motion of Councillor Heath pertaining to ambient air monitoring on an annual basis in accordance with best practices was then put to a vote and DEFEATED.

The main motion of Councillor Heath now reads as follows:

- a) THAT the consultant's recommendations contained in the Final Report on the Review of International Best Practices of Environmental Surveillance for Energy-From-Waste Facilities, as follows, be endorsed:

- i) Option 1 a) - Compliance with Ontario Guideline A-7 Combustion and Air Pollution Control Requirements for new Municipal Waste Incinerators;
 - ii) Option 1 b) - Establishment of More Stringent Stack Chemical Emissions Standards than Provided in MOE Guideline A-7;
 - iii) Option 1 c) - Inclusion of New Stack Sampling Technology for Dioxins and Furans not Routinely Implemented in Ontario EFW or Incineration Facilities; and
 - iv) THAT a Site Liaison Committee (SLC) should be charged, in part, with the review of any environmental surveillance program being undertaken for the Durham/York EFW Facility;
- b) THAT current time air emission data be made available to the public on an electronic board; and
 - c) THAT, in addition to the practices outlined in part a), soil monitoring be done on an annual basis in accordance with best practices.

This matter will be considered by the Joint Works and Health & Social Services Committee on Tuesday, March 24, 2009 and will be presented to Regional Council on Wednesday, April 1, 2009.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

The following correspondence regarding the Durham/York Energy from Waste Facility was presented:

- a. Pat Mackay – Undated
- b. Nathaniel and Matthew Ali – Undated
- c. William G. Cross – February 13, 2009
- d. Sherry Brown - February 12, 2009
- e. Chris White - February 12, 2009
- f. Nahid Almashi - February 14, 2009
- g. Paul Kuebler - February 12, 2009
- h. Valerie Cross - February 13, 2009
- i. Eric Kuebler - February 12, 2009
- j. Patricia Kuebler - February 13, 2009
- k. Donna Sweet - February 17, 2009
- l. Karen and Chris Henry - February 2, 2009
- m. Lori Allin – November 16, 2008
- n. Duane Cook - November 28, 2008
- o. Carol Hooper – December 12, 2008
- p. Linda Gasser – January 23, 2009

q. Valerie Cross - February 13, 2009
r. Sam Putos - February 12, 2009
s. Sam Putos - February 12, 2009
t. Kathi Bracken - February 12, 2009
u. Mary Jo Cullen - February 17, 2009
v. Richard Tyssen - February 17, 2009
w. Julie Scott - February 17, 2009
x. Lorna McSwan - February 17, 2009
y. Angel Nadia - February 19, 2009
z. Sheilah Donahue - February 19, 2009
aa. Brenda Cross - February 20, 2009
bb. Wendy Bracken - February 20, 2009
cc. Jennifer Dryswak - February 22, 2009
dd. Katie Clark - February 23, 2009
ee. Elissa Crouse - February 20, 2009
ff. Liam Quan - February 20, 2009
gg. Andrew Da Silva - February 20, 2009
hh. Heather Vickers - February 18, 2009
ii. Sherri Richards – Undated
jj. Lanny Joseph – Undated
kk. Jim Richards – Undated
ll. Unnamed – Undated
mm. P.M. Lee – February 13, 2009
nn. Roger Nichol - February 15, 2009
oo. Karen Nichol - February 15, 2009
pp. Mario Laurito - February 18, 2009
qq. Rabecka M. Dreve - February 13, 2009
rr. Bobby Croan - February 14, 2009
ss. Frazer Rife - February 13, 2009
tt. Bruce Wood – Undated
uu. Brent Williams - February 13, 2009
vv. Richard Owen - February 13, 2009
ww. Kristy Weir - February 18, 2009
xx. Leon Michaud - February 19, 2009
yy. Derek Collins - February 13, 2009
zz. Wendy B. Robinson - February 17, 2009
aaa. Jason Dryswak - February 20, 2009
bbb. Pamela Cresswell - February 17, 2009
ccc. Christine Amsden - February 22, 2009
ddd. Clayton Amsden - February 22, 2009
eee. Kevin Amsden - February 22, 2009
fff. Matthew Ali - February 18, 2009
ggg. Wendy J. Bracken - February 20, 2009
hhh. Lorna McSwan - February 17, 2009
iii. Lynn Jacklin - February 14, 2009
jjj. Veronica Marina Livingstone – Undated

kkk. Nathaniel Ali - February 18, 2009
lll. Barbara North - February 18, 2009
mmm. Mr. & Mrs. Frattini - February 18, 2009
nnn. Josee Blanchet - February 11, 2009
ooo. Antonietta & Giuseppe Mazzatta - February 17, 2009
ppp. Kathryn Bracken - February 16, 2009
qqq. Linda Gasser - February 16, 2009
rrr. Adel Majd - February 14, 2009
sss. Cinzia Porco - February 17, 2009
ttt. Wayne Ellis - February 16, 2009
uuu. Ross Fleming - February 17, 2009
vvv. David Gifford - February 19, 2009
www. Barb Spencer - February 20, 2009
xxx. Mary Lou Noonan – Undated
yyy. Shawn Williamson - February 23, 2009
zzz. William G. Cross - February 18, 2009
aaaa. Louis Bertrand - February 20, 2009
bbbb. Elizabeth Yanow - February 17, 2009
cccc. Harvey Quan - February 17, 2009
dddd. Monica Williamson - February 12, 2009
eeee. Brenda Cross - February 20, 2009
ffff. Yongwook Lee - February 17, 2009
gggg. Meredith Szabo - February 17, 2009
hhhh. Rose Planeta - February 20, 2009
iiii. Jeanette van Loon - February 20, 2009
jjjj. Valerie Cross - February 18, 2009
kkkk. Unnamed - Undated
llll. Jennifer Dryswak - February 20, 2009
mmmm. Lindsay and Tom M'Gee - February 14, 2009
nnnn. Barb Taylor - February 17, 2009
oooo. Angela Bihuniak - February 22, 2009
pppp. Tom Amsden – Undated
qqqq. Trevor Bannister - February 20, 2009
rrrr. Annie Gifford - February 19, 2009
ssss. Andrew Gifford - February 19, 2009
tttt. Maria Dryswak - February 23, 2009
uuuu. Christine Amsden - February 23, 2009
vvvv. Coleen Fodor - February 23, 2009
wwww. Jordan Clements - February 24, 2009
xxxx. David Farrell - February 24, 2009
yyyy. Angela Bihuniak - February 26, 2009
zzzz. Tom Amsden - February 25, 2009
aaaaa. Jennifer Farrell - February 24, 2009
bbbbb. Gina Mazzotta - February 22, 2009
ccccc. Chen Xu - February 17, 2009
ddddd. Lynda Clements - February 22, 2009

eeee. Maria & Walter Dryswak - February 23, 2009
ffff. Gavin Battarino - February 24, 2009
ggggg. Debbie Welygan - February 27, 2009
hhhhh. Ella M. Kerr - February 24, 2009
iiii. Bruce Clements - February 22, 2009
jjjj. Unnamed – Undated
kkkkk. Carmela Cupelli - February 24, 2009
llll. Brett Amsden - February 23, 2009
mmmmm. Tom & Pat Lawson - February 23, 2009
nnnnn. Colleen Flaherty - February 17, 2009
oooo. Jennifer Davis - February 23, 2009
ppppp. Richard John Lindsay - February 26, 2009
qqqqq. Carleen DeVan - February 25, 2009
rrrrr. Kristin Gifford - February 20, 2009
sssss. Grace P. Bozzo - February 24, 2009
tttt. Ian G. Sutherland - February 20, 2009
uuuuu. Barb Murphy – Undated
vvvvv. Sheilah Donahue – Undated
wwwww. Kaitlyn Irving - February 19, 2009
xxxxx. Mike Bianchi – Undated
yyyyy. Julie Scott - February 17, 2009
zzzzz. Catrina Chen - February 17, 2009
aaaaaa. Michael Laramée - February 18, 2009
bbbbbb. Sarah Kathleen Ovcjak - February 18, 2009
cccccc. Nadia Isopardi – February 19, 2009
dddddd. Alex Vass - February 19, 2009
eeeeee. Max C. Yule – Undated
ffffff. Brent Foden - February 18, 2009
gggggg. Vania Branker - February 16, 2009
hhhhhh. Jaynell Rosario - February 19, 2009
iiiiii. Kristian Gilbert - February 17, 2009
jjjjj. Josie Abate – Undated
kkkkkk. Jonathan R. S. Clayton - February 19, 2009
lllll. Roxanne Choy - February 17, 2009
mmmmmm. Brian Thompson - February 17, 2009
nnnnnn. Michael Drimba - February 17, 2009
oooooo. Frank J. Robinson - February 17, 2009
pppppp. Nadine Francis - February 28, 2009
qqqqqq. Omeed M. Neekon – March 3, 2009
rrrrrr. Email from Linda Gasser – March 5, 2009

MOVED by Councillor Emm,

"THAT Correspondence Items a. to rrrrrr., inclusive, be received for information."

CARRIED

9. OTHER BUSINESS

a) PROPOSED 2009 JOINT WASTE MANAGEMENT GROUP MEETING SCHEDULE

Discussion ensued regarding the dates and locations of the 2009 Joint Waste Management Group (JWMG) meetings. Discussion also ensued regarding the report recommending a preferred vendor. It was suggested that the report be available for the JWMG to review prior to it being considered at the Joint Finance & Administration and Works Committee meeting. It was stated that while the selection of a vendor is a tender process and not part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) process, this would at least provide the members of the JWMG with the information in order to answer any questions from the public. C. Curtis stated the Joint Finance & Administration and Works Committee meeting would have to be rescheduled in order to give the JWMG the opportunity to meet prior to it being considered at the Joint meeting. Discussion also ensued regarding the need for meetings in the Fall. C. Curtis advised that these are contingency meetings to deal with issues that may arise until the EA is approved by the Minister. Based on the discussions the following motion was made:

MOVED by Regional Chair Anderson:

"THAT the April 7, 2009 Joint Waste Management Group (JWMG) meeting be changed to April 14, 2009 with the location to be held in Durham Region and that the remaining JWMG meetings as outlined in the attached Proposed 2009 Meeting Schedule, be approved with the meetings to be held in Durham Region."

CARRIED

10. ADJOURNMENT

MOVED by Councillor Crawford,

"THAT the meeting be adjourned."

CARRIED

The meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.