

DRAFT

**Report on Round Two
Public Consultation Process**

***Draft
Environmental Assessment
Terms of Reference***

**City of Toronto
Residual Waste Management Study**

March 2007

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Overview of the Terms of Reference Public Consultation Process	1
1.2 Public Consultation Completed in Round Two	1
1.3 Additional ToR Public Consultation Planned for 2007	1
2. Overview of Public Consultation.....	2
2.1 Dates, Times, Locations	2
2.2 Notification	2
2.2.1 Newspaper Advertising	2
2.2.2 Radio Advertising	3
2.2.3 Website.....	3
2.2.4 Flyer	3
2.2.5 Media Advisory.....	4
2.2.6 Email Alerts	4
2.3 Public Consultation Meeting Format	4
2.4 Project Team Members in Attendance.....	5
3. Information Presented.....	6
3.1 Display Boards	7
3.2 Presentation Slides.....	7
4. Resources Provided	7
5. Public Attendance	8
6. Collection of Comments	8
7. Summary of Input Round Two Public Consultation.....	8
8. Consultation with Government Agencies	9

Tables

Table 2.1	Dates and Locations of each Round Two public Consultation Meeting
Table 2.2.1	Newspaper Publications and Publication Dates
Table 2.4	Project Team Attendance at each Round Two
Table 5.0	Public Attendance at each Round Two Toronto
Table 7.0	Summary of Input Round Two Public Consultation Process
Table 8.0	Summary of Input from Government Agencies

Appendices

Appendix A	Newspaper Advertisement
Appendix B	Radio Advertisement
Appendix C	Flyer
Appendix D	Media Advisory
Appendix E	Email Alert
Appendix F	Display Boards
Appendix G	Presentation Slides
Appendix H	Resource Guide
Appendix I	Questionnaire
Appendix J	Comments Received

1. Introduction

The City of Toronto (the “City”) has initiated an Individual Environmental Assessment (“EA”) of a long-term post-diversion solid waste management system to address the residual waste remaining after re-use, recycling and composting programs are maximized by Toronto residents.

This EA is being undertaken in a collaborative mode with the Council appointed Community Environmental Assessment Team (“CEAT”), currently comprised of approximately twenty-one citizens.

1.1 Overview of the Terms of Reference Public Consultation Process

In accordance with the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, the EA Terms of Reference, which is submitted to the Minister of the Environment for review and approval, must include a record of the public consultation process.

The public consultation process for Toronto’s EA Terms of Reference (ToR) consist of three rounds of public consultations with interested members of the public and stakeholders within the City of Toronto. As part of Round One the City and CEAT hosted twelve public consultation meetings across Toronto to gain input on several key questions that will be answered through the EA Terms of Reference (the “ToR”) process. Additional consultation is scheduled to take place within Toronto on the remainder of the key questions and then on the draft ToR document. It was determined that public consultation outside of Toronto boundaries, in Ontario communities, would take place during the Environmental Assessment stage, as potential sites outside of Toronto are identified.

In addition, consultation with federal, provincial and municipal agencies will also be undertaken including initial notification regarding development of the EA ToR and consultation on the draft ToR document.

1.2 Public Consultation Completed in Round Two

Four public meetings were held in the City of Toronto from February 26 – March 5, 2007 as part of the Round Two public consultations for the development of the Terms of Reference. The purpose of these meetings was to receive public input on the following key elements of the Terms of Reference: alternative technologies, screening of technologies, evaluating technologies and sites, evaluating site-specific systems for Toronto and scope of the environmental assessment study. Additional comments were received from government agencies that were contacted on November 23, 2006. This Public Consultation Report documents the Round Two public consultation process.

1.3 Additional ToR Public Consultation Planned for 2007

Round Three public consultation meetings are being planned for the first week of April, 2007 to receive input on the draft ToR. In addition, the draft EA ToR will be circulated to government agencies for review

2. Overview of Public Consultation

2.1 Dates, Times, Locations

The City of Toronto and the Community Environmental Assessment Team conducted four public consultation meetings in the City of Toronto from Monday, February 26 to Monday, March 5, 2007. One meeting was held in each of the four main quadrants of the City: centre, east, north and west. All locations were wheelchair and TTC accessible. The following table lists the dates, times and locations of each meeting.

Table 2.1 Dates and Locations of each Round Two Public Consultation Meetings

Round Two Public Consultation Meetings: February 26 – March 5, 2007		
Date	Time	Location
Monday, February 26/07	6:30 – 9:30 pm	Central YMCA (Auditorium) 20 Grosvenor Street
Wednesday, February 28/07	6:30 – 9:30 pm	Scarborough Civic Centre (Atrium) 150 Borough Drive
Thursday, March 1/07	6:30 – 9:30 pm	North York Memorial Community Hall (Burgundy Room) 5110 Yonge Street, Lower Level
Monday, March 5/07	6:30 – 9:30 pm	Etobicoke Collegiate Institute (Cafeteria) 89 Montgomery Road

2.2 Notification

Toronto citizens and stakeholders were notified of the four public consultation meetings through a variety of channels. Print and radio advertising, the internet, mailings and email, were the key notification tools used for Round Two public consultations. With the advertising campaign listed below, eighty percent of Torontonians were estimated to see or hear the ads an average of four times over a ten day campaign beginning on February 16.

2.2.1 Newspaper Advertising

A print ad was placed in the following newspapers alerting the public (residents, businesses, non-governmental organizations, etc.) of the public consultation meetings:

Table 2.2.1 Newspaper Publications and Publication Dates

Publication	Publication Date
The Beach Mirror	February 16
The East York Mirror	February 16
The North York Mirror	February 16

The Etobicoke Guardian	September 27
The Scarborough Mirror	February 16
NOW Magazine	February 16
The York Guardian	February 16
The City Centre Moment	February 16
York University Excalibur	February 16
University of Toronto Varsity	February 16
University of Scarborough, Underground	February 16
Ryerson Eyeopener	February 16
The Bloor West/ Annex	February 16
Hi-Rise	February 22 (March 2007 issue)

Please see Appendix A for a copy of the newspaper advertisement.

2.2.2 Radio Advertising

Radio advertisements ran a total of 560 times from Friday February 16 to Sunday February 25, 2007. A variety of AM and FM radio stations were used: CFTR 680 News, CFMJ – AM MOJO Radio, CJEZ FM – 97.3 Easy Rock, CILQ FM – Q107, CHUM-AM – 1050 CHUM, CHUM-FM – 104.5, CFNY – 102.1 The Edge, CFXJ – FLOW, CIUT-University of Toronto Radio, CKFM – The Mix 99.9, CJCL-AM – The Fan 590, CJAQ FM – JACK FM.

Please see Appendix B for a copy of the announcer-read radio advertisement.

2.2.3 Website

The City of Toronto used the City website to promote Round Two public consultation meetings. The newspaper advertisement, details on the public consultation meetings (e.g. times and locations), and the online questionnaire were available as of February 16, on the following City websites:

- Solid Waste Management Services portal (www.toronto.ca/garbage)
- The City of Toronto’s CEAT website (www.toronto.ca/ceat)
- “Get Involved” website (www.toronto.ca/involved)

Additional information including a resource guide, presentation and display boards were posted on the websites on February 23, 2007.

2.2.4 Flyer

A flyer version of the print advertisement with a map of meeting locations was mailed on February 16, 2007 to the following interested groups, organizations and members of the public to promote the public consultation meetings:

- Project mailing list that has been compiled since the beginning of this process

- Toronto Business Improvement Areas (BIAs)
- Community Associations and Ratepayer Associations
- Environmental Associations/ENGOS
- Professional Associations
- City of Toronto Agencies, Boards, Commissions & Divisions
- New & Emerging Technologies, Policies & Practices contacts database
- Multi-residential pilot program contacts database
- Toronto Public Libraries

Please see Appendix C for a copy of the flyer.

2.2.5 Media Advisory

A Media Advisory was distributed via the Canadian News Wire on February 22, 2007 to alert all radio/TV stations serving Toronto about the Round Two public consultation meetings.

Please see Appendix D for a copy of the Media Advisory.

2.2.6 Email Alerts

On February 20, 2007 City staff requested that Mayor Miller and Members of Council assist in the promotion of the Round Two public consultation meetings by forwarding the flyer to their constituent email distribution lists. Suggested text for an email invitation was included to assist Councillors in distributing the message. The multi-residential advisory email contacts database received the email invitation and CEAT members. CEAT was also encouraged to forward the email invitation and flyer to their own personal email lists.

Please see Appendix E for a copy of the suggested email invitation.

2.3 Public Consultation Meeting Format

The public consultation meeting format was the same for all four of the public consultations. The meetings were three hours in length and ran from 6:30 – 9:30 pm. Each meeting began with an informal 30-minute open house, which allowed participants to view display boards and to speak one-on-one with City staff, CEAT members, and project consultants. From 7:00 pm to 9:30 pm there were presentations and facilitated table discussions. Presentations were made by the CEAT Chair and Solid Waste Management Services.

The presentation from the CEAT Chair included background information, an overview of the Environmental Assessment and Terms of Reference Development, a summary of input from Round One public consultations and an overview of the purpose and questions for Round Two public consultations. Solid Waste Management Services' presentation was divided into five key sections: alternative technologies, screening of technologies, evaluating technologies and sites, evaluation of site-specific systems and scope of the environmental assessment study.

Each of the five sections presented was followed by a 10-20 minute facilitated table discussion.

The total table discussion time was 1 hour and 20 minutes. Each facilitated table discussion had six to eight participants and one facilitator to encourage discussion and record input.

The following agenda was used at each public consultation meeting:

- 6:30 – 7:00 pm Open House (view display boards)
- 7:00 – 7:05 pm Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Overview from Lead Facilitator
- 7:05 – 7:15 pm Background Presentation by CEAT Chair
- 7:15 – 9:25 pm Presentations by Solid Waste Management:
 - Section 1 – Alternative Technologies
 - Presentation & Facilitated Table Discussion
 - Section 2 – Screening of Technologies
 - Presentation & Facilitated Table Discussion
 - Section 3 – Evaluating Technologies and Sites
 - Presentation & Facilitated Table Discussion
 - Section 4 – Evaluating Site-Specific Systems
 - Presentation & Facilitated Table Discussion
 - Section 5 – Scope of the Environmental Assessment Study
 - Presentation & Facilitated Table Discussion
- 9:25 – 9:30 pm Closing Remarks

During the facilitated group discussions, Solid Waste Management Services staff, CEAT members and the consultants were available to answer questions posed by the participants.

2.4 Project Team Members in Attendance

Each Round Two Toronto public consultation meeting was supported by members of the project team, including City staff (Solid Waste Management Services staff & Public Consultation Unit staff), CEAT members, and project consultants. The following is an account of the project team members at each of the public consultation sessions.

Table 2.4 Project Team Attendance at each Round Two Public Consultation Meeting

Meeting Date	City Staff	CEAT Member	Consultant
Feb 26/07	SWMS*: Norman Lee Matthew Green Bob Kearse Jodi Callan Irene Ford Amanda Smith Public Consultation: Nancy Martins Katie Rabinowicz Josie Giordano	Philip Knox Lee Doran Tanya Atkinson Edward Lee Karen Buck Dan Boulos Yuri Huminilowycz Hanna Ziada Isabelle Faucher	Dave Merriman – MacViro Consultants Inc. David Walmsley – Jacques Whitford Ltd.

	David Nagler Shiri Pasternack Jennie Weller Robert Davis Louis Portelli Rea McDonald Fredelle Brief Tracey Ehl Communications Katie Herbert		
Feb 28/07	SWMS: Geoff Rathbone Matthew Green Amanda Smith Public Consultation: Nancy Martins Katie Rabinowicz Jennie Weller Shiri Pasternak Robert Davis Fredelle Brief	Philip Knox Edward Lee Tanya Atkinson Susan Williams	Dave Merriman – MacViro Consultants Inc.
March 1/07	SWMS: Norman Lee Bob Kears Public Consultation: Nancy Martins Katie Rabinowicz	Philip Knox Lee Doran Karen Buck Edward Lee Tanya Atkinson Heather Ducharme	
March 5/07	SWMS: Norman Lee Bob Kears Michelle Carruthers Public Consultation: Nancy Martins Katie Rabinowicz Louis Portelli Lisa Di Clement	Philip Knox Lee Doran Karen Buck Edward Lee Heather Ducharme Mike Moselhy Mohammed Jeewa Hanna Ziada	David Walmsley – Jacques Whitford Ltd.

* SWMS denotes Solid Waste Management Services

3. Information Presented

For the Round Two public consultation meetings, information was presented to the public via display boards and a formal power point presentation. The purpose of the display boards and presentation was to provide participants with the background information needed to discuss and provide input to key components of the EA draft Terms of Reference.

3.1 Display Boards

The display boards were used during the open house portion of the public meeting. Participants were given time to review the content of the display boards and ask questions of City staff, CEAT members, and project consultants. The display boards included the following:

- an explanation and examples of residual waste;
- information on CEAT
- summary of Round One public input;
- examples of alternative technologies;
- graphics on development of systems, screening and evaluating of technologies, sites and systems;
- information on waste diversion; and
- information on CEAT and their guiding principles.

A copy of the display boards can be found in Appendix F.

3.2 Presentation Slides

A formal presentation followed the open house portion of the public meeting. The Chair of CEAT began the presentation with an overview of the following:

- background information on the EA and waste management
- Terms of Reference development and timelines
- summary of Round One public consultation input

Solid Waste Management Services continued the presentation with information on the following:

- alternative technologies
- screening of technologies
- evaluating technologies and sites
- evaluating site-specific systems
- scope of the EA study

A copy of the presentation slides can be found in Appendix G.

4. Resources Provided

CEAT members, City staff and the project consultants created a Resource Guide that provided participants with the information needed to understand the questions posed in Round Two public consultations. The Resource Guide was distributed to each participant at the public consultation meetings as well as a questionnaire. The questionnaire could be submitted at the end of the meeting. Appendix H includes a copy of the Resource Guide. Appendix I includes a copy of the Questionnaire.

5. Public Attendance

A total of 133 people attended the four Round Two public consultation meetings. The following table displays the attendance for each of the public consultation meetings:

Table 5.0 Public Attendance at each Round Two Public Consultation Meeting

Date	Number of Attendees	Number of Attendees Signed-in
February 26/07	65	64
February 28/07	21	20
March 1/07 (winter storm)	14	8
March 5/07	38	37

6. Collection of Comments

Comments were collected from the facilitated discussions and questionnaires at the public consultation meetings, through the online questionnaire, through the registration phone line (416-392-9365) and dedicated project phone line (416-392-6000). It was very important to capture the citizens' input by March 6, 2007 so that comments could be considered in the preparation of the draft Terms of Reference.

The primary source for public comments came from the breakout group discussions at each public consultation meeting. Participants sat in groups of 6-8 participants and one facilitator, whose role was to encourage participation, keep the discussions on topic and on time, and record input. The small breakout group format allowed participants the opportunity to provide input on the key questions the project team was seeking comment on.

An online version of the questionnaire was available on the City of Toronto's website from February 16 to March 6. Anyone interested could complete the questionnaire online.

In addition to receiving registrations for the various events, the event registration line had an option to allow the public to leave comments on the project. As well, the Resource Guide distributed at the public meetings and posted on the City's website advertised the project phone line (416-392-6000), for citizens who may wish to provide additional comments.

All the input and questionnaire responses were stored on a spreadsheet. A copy of the input and comments received is found in Appendix J.

7. Summary of Input Round Two Public Consultation

A summary table of the input received in Round One is found in Table 7.0. The table includes: a synthesis statement that summarises the input received on each question; an explanation from the project team on how the input may be addressed in the draft Terms of Reference; and the proposed rationale for addressing the matter in the Terms of Reference.

8. Consultation with Government Agencies

On November 23, 2006 a letter was issued to government agencies, to notify them that the City of Toronto had initiated the development of Environmental Assessment Terms of Reference to conduct a study to evaluate alternatives to manage the City's post-diversion residual solid waste. Agencies were not circulated any additional notices regarding Round 2 consultation, however, some agencies did contact the City to provide input to the Round 2 consultation process. Table 8.0 provides a summary of the comments received from government agencies. The table includes: the input received; an explanation from the project team on how the input may be addressed in the draft Terms of Reference; and the proposed rationale for addressing the matter in the Terms of Reference.

Table 7.0 Summary of Input, Round Two Toronto Public Consultation Process

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
<p>Q1a: Are there other technologies or approaches that should be considered for the treatment of the residual waste that remains after Toronto's waste reduction and diversion programs? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, please give examples:</p>		
<p>Participants provided mixed responses to this question. Some agreed that the list was complete, while others felt that some technologies were not addressed.</p> <p>The range of comments included the need to recover materials, reduce use of landfill, and consider all potential technologies. Technologies that were listed by participants included: plasma, bio-drying, steam treatment, anaerobic digestion, thermal oxidization, acid treatment and use of labour.</p>	<p>The Draft EA Terms of Reference ("Draft ToR") provides broad categories of processing technologies that include mechanical, biological, chemical and thermal treatment.</p> <p><i>Background Document 2: Identification of Alternative Technologies</i> provides detailed descriptions of many types of technologies that fit within these broad categories. The technologies identified by participants will, for the most part, fall within one of the categories provided in the Draft ToR and detailed in Background Document 2.</p>	<p>The City of Toronto will consider a wide range of technologies to ensure that reasonable approaches for meeting Its long-term residual waste processing requirements are addressed. Each of the technologies identified in the Draft ToR and <i>Background Document 2</i>, has differing capacities to recover resources and would exhibit different advantages and disadvantages.</p>
<p>Q1b: Are there technologies or approaches that should not be considered for the treatment of the residual waste that remains after Toronto's waste reduction and diversion programs? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, please give examples:</p>		

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
<p>Opinion from participants was split, with some noting the need to consider all technologies and others expressing concern regarding some approaches. The technologies considered by some participants as ones that should not be considered included chemical processing, thermal processing and landfill.</p>	<p>The Draft ToR (Section 4) will consider all reasonable technologies for the processing of residual waste that would also include chemical and thermal technologies.</p> <p>The development of new landfill capacity will not be part of the EA Study. Either the City's (pending) landfill capacity, at the Green Lane Landfill or the use of private sector disposal capacity will be considered as the means of disposing of process residues. Landfill will also represent the "do-nothing" alternative against which other alternatives can be compared</p>	<p>Although most known chemical processing technologies are currently in the pilot or demonstration phase of development, current indicates that there is potential that this group of technologies could be applicable to processing Toronto's residual waste stream. Many thermal processing technologies have a track record of successfully processing residual municipal waste in jurisdictions across the world. Thermal technologies, such as pyrolysis and plasma gasification, are still in the pilot or demonstration phase of development in North America. These chemical and thermal technologies could be applicable to processing Toronto's residual waste stream and therefore they will be examined as part of the EA Study. The development of new landfill disposal capacity is not a component of the EA Study, as the City of Toronto has other alternatives for landfilling including the potential purchase of the Green Lane landfill or the use of private sector disposal capacity.</p>
<p>Q2a: Should only technologies that can meet or exceed current or planned regulations in Ontario be considered? Yes ___ No ___ Please explain...</p>		

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
<p>The majority of participants felt that only technologies that can meet or exceed current or planned regulations should be considered. Some individuals expressed difficulty in answering this question due to unfamiliarity with the Ontario regulatory environment. Many expressed concerns that Ontario lags behind other jurisdictions in terms of regulations and that at a minimum the technologies should meet the Ontario regulations. Others noted that there would be no point in pursuing a technology that could not meet Ontario regulatory requirements.</p>	<p>The process for evaluating alternatives outlined in the Draft ToR (Section 6) indicates that one of the first activities in the EA Study would be the identification and screening of technologies. <i>Background Report 3: Evaluation of Alternatives (Section 3)</i>, outlines the proposed method for screening these technologies. One of the screening criteria would be the ability of the technology to at least meet current or planned regulatory requirements in Ontario. Initial consultation during the EA Study will be undertaken to seek additional input on the proposed screening criteria.</p>	<p>It must be demonstrated that technologies must at least meet current regulatory requirements and that all applicable environmental approvals can be secured before the technologies are considered further in the EA Study. Planned regulatory requirements that have been proposed by the MOE and that are known publicly at the time that technology screening in the EA Study is being completed will be reviewed to determine if the technologies are capable of at least meeting both current and proposed regulations.</p>
<p>Q2b: Should only technologies that have at least one operating facility managing residual waste for a minimum of one year be considered? Yes ___ No ___ Please explain:</p>		
<p>Opinion on this question was split. Many participants felt that pilot or demonstration-scale technologies should be considered and that Toronto should seek innovative solutions to manage its residual waste even if they haven't been applied elsewhere. Others expressed strong concern that the City should not take any risks and should focus on technologies that are "tried and tested" elsewhere in the world.</p>	<p>Background Document 3 (Subsection 3.2.2) proposes that technologies must have a proven operating history processing municipal solid waste at a reasonable capacity. For the purpose of the City of Toronto's residual waste management study, this is defined as operating for at least 1 year on a generally continuous basis following the successful commissioning of the facility.</p>	<p>This proposed screening criterion attempts to balance the issues identified during consultation. The City of Toronto is interested in reviewing innovative solutions as part of this EA Study. However, reasonable effort should be taken to protect the City against unnecessary risks. Requiring technologies to meet a minimum standard for being 'proven' will reduce potential risks to the City as it must be demonstrated that there are existing operating facilities processing residual waste that use the technology. This will also ensure that data is available for application in the evaluation of the technology.</p>

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
<p>Q3a: When developing a short list of systems, technology-specific considerations could be evaluated such as, the ability to divert materials from landfill, ability to recover resources, potential for emissions to air, land and water, the amount of land required to site facilities, etc. Do you agree with these technology-specific considerations? Yes ___ No ___ Please explain ...</p>		
<p>The majority of comments by participants supported the proposed technology specific considerations. Many participants noted key considerations on the list that were of importance to them, including costs, diversion/recovery of materials, recovery of energy, emissions, scalability and the use of life cycle analysis.</p>	<p>The Draft ToR (Section 6) outlines the proposed process for developing and short-listing of residual waste processing systems. The technologies remaining after screening would be assembled into different residual waste processing systems with each system being capable of managing the entire projected residual waste stream. Technology specific factors will be applied to determine potential advantages and disadvantages of the systems. A consideration of relative advantages and disadvantages will be used to ‘short-list’ residual waste processing systems for further consideration. The proposed technology specific factors are outlined in detail in <i>Background Document 3 (Section 3)</i>. The proposed factors address all of the key considerations noted as being important during consultation. Initial consultation during the EA Study will be undertaken to seek additional input on the proposed factors for evaluating and short-listing residual processing systems.</p>	<p>The proposed technology specific factors outlined in <i>Background Document 3</i> represent a range of considerations and are intended to address the potential effects of the technologies to the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act.</p>
<p>Q3b: Are there other technology-specific considerations that you think should be added?</p>		
<p>Few additional considerations were identified. They included the need to consider long-term and global impacts, the ability of the systems to be integrated with the City’s diversion programs as well as the durability, maintenance and efficiency of the technologies.</p>	<p>The proposed technology specific factors outlined in <i>Background Document 3 (Section 3)</i> represent a range of considerations and are intended to address the potential effects of the technologies to the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act.</p>	<p><i>Background Document 3</i> outlines that long-term, global impacts would be considered through the use of life cycle analysis to determine the potential for emissions to air and water. The land area that would be required to site all system components would also be considered.. All systems would be required to have the ability to be integrated with the City of Toronto’s diversion programs. The proposed technology specific factors address the</p>

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
		reliability of the systems, and the efficiency of the systems in the recovery of materials and energy. Further criteria related to design and operating risks are proposed for application in the evaluation of site-specific residual processing systems.
<p>Q4: In the proposed evaluation process, sites could be identified by examining City-owned sites within and outside Toronto; providing purchase opportunities with “willing sellers”; and providing for partnerships with public and or private sector parties. Do you agree with this method of identifying sites? Yes ___ No ___ If no, please explain:</p>		
<p>The majority of comments supported the proposed methodology, with some caveats. Support was expressed for the consideration of City-owned sites, and some identified preference for considering sites in Toronto and/or the GTA. Support was mixed in regards to 'willing sellers' with some participants noting the need to have communities that were 'willing hosts'. While the majority of participants supported partnerships in some form there were concerns expressed in regards to partnerships with private sector companies and the need for the City to retain some control over the systems.</p>	<p>The Draft ToR (Section 6) outlines the proposed method of identifying potential sites including, city-owned sites, 'willing seller' sites and sites proposed through partnerships or other contractual arrangements. <i>Background Document 3 (Section 4)</i> provides additional detail on the proposed method of identifying sites. All sites would have to meet the 'minimum' site attributes required to accommodate the technologies included in the short-listed residual processing systems. It is proposed that prior to proceeding with the identification of sites, that another round of consultation be undertaken regarding the proposed method of identifying and evaluating sites.</p>	<p>The Draft ToR outlines a process that includes the identification of potential sites through a variety of methods to ensure that a reasonable range of sites is considered in the EA Study. The proposed method of identifying sites recognizes that in order to manage the residual waste stream, at least some system components may have to be sited outside of the City of Toronto's boundaries. There is a finite amount of suitable industrial land within the City for facility development. In regards to the current stock of City-owned lands, there are only a few sites that are designated for waste management purposes, and there are competing needs within the City for the use of the other properties.</p>
<p>Q5a: Site-specific considerations to evaluate sites could include existing characteristics of the site, proximity to required infrastructure, potential impacts of the haul route(s), size of the property, etc. Do you agree with these site-specific considerations? Yes ___ No ___ Please explain ...</p>		

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
<p>The majority of participants supported the proposed site-specific considerations. Many participants noted key considerations on the list that were of importance to them, including: size of sites, potential impacts related to haul and site access, need for compatible site characteristics and adjacent land uses. Many participants had concern about the use of greenfield sites.</p>	<p>In the Draft ToR (Section 6) It is proposed that site-specific factors be applied to determine potential advantages and disadvantages of the identified sites. The balance of relative advantages and disadvantages would be used to ‘short-list’ reasonable sites for further consideration. The proposed site-specific factors outlined in <i>Background Document 3 (Section 4)</i>, include the key considerations noted as being important during consultation. Additional consultation will be undertaken during the EA Study to seek additional input on the proposed factors for evaluating and short-listing sites.</p>	<p>The proposed site-specific factors outlined in <i>Background Document 3</i> represent a range of considerations and are intended to address the potential effects of developing waste processing facilities on various sites to the environment, as broadly defined in the EA Act.</p>
<p>Q5b: Are there any other site-specific considerations that you think should be added?</p>		
<p>A number of additional considerations were identified by participants. They included: the type of soil/agricultural land use; watersheds; distance/length of haul routes; and nature of surrounding communities. Many participants expressed a preference for sites located as close as possible to the City.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In <i>Background Document 3 (Section 4)</i> it is proposed that potential soil/agricultural land use issues be addressed both through the minimum siting attributes including the need to avoid prime agricultural land, and through the application of factors that would examine the current land use and surrounding land uses for proposed sites. It is also proposed that potential effects to watersheds be addressed through factors related to the existing characteristics of the sites and proximity to required infrastructure including sewer and water services. In addition, the proposed criteria for evaluating site-specific systems include criteria that address potential local and global effects on water resources. Finally, it is proposed that the potential effects of traffic along potential haul route be considered as well as the general 	<p>The proposed site-specific factors outlined in <i>Background Document 3</i> represent a range of considerations and are intended to address the potential effects of developing waste processing facilities on various sites to the environment, as broadly defined in the EA Act.</p>

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
	compatibility with surrounding land uses including communities near the sites.	
<p>Q6a: During the evaluation process, site-specific systems could be evaluated using criteria related to elements of the environment such as human health, the natural environment, the social/cultural environment, etc. Do these criteria address your concerns/issues? Yes ___ No ___ Please explain:</p>		
<p>The majority of participants supported the proposed criteria. Participants noted the need to weight the relative importance of the criteria. Many participants identified additional indicators or noted key criteria that were of importance to them, including: health, natural environment, community impacts/social cultural considerations, and costs. Some found the wording of each criterion to be too vague.</p>	<p>In the Draft ToR,(Section 6) it is proposed that site-specific systems would be compared using a net effect analysis through the application of proposed criteria and indicators that are outlined in detail in <i>Background Document 3 (Section 5)</i>. It is proposed that prior to proceeding with the development and evaluation of site-specific systems, consultation would be undertaken to review the proposed evaluation methodology and to establish and confirm the relative priorities to be considered during the evaluation process.</p>	<p>The proposed criteria and indicators for the comparative evaluation of site-specific systems, as outlined in <i>Background Document 3</i>, would address the potential for effects related to both the proposed technologies and the proposed sites to the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act. Additional consultation during the EA Study will be essential to solicit input on these more detailed criteria and to establish the relative priorities of the criteria, to reflect the concerns and interests of potentially affected parties.</p>
<p>Q6b: Are there any additional criteria or indicators that you would propose?</p>		
<p>A number of additional criteria were identified. Participants noted criteria related to aesthetics, employment, energy use and production, First Nations, health, land uses/community around prospective sites and the natural environment.</p>	<p>The proposed criteria and indicators for the comparative evaluation of site-specific residual waste processing systems, as outlined in <i>Background Document 3 (Section 5)</i>, address all of the criteria noted in consultation with the exception of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aesthetics, which is not proposed as a criterion but that would be addressed through the consideration of mitigation measures to reduce potential effects on surrounding communities. Aesthetics would also be addressed through procurement processes that would require that certain design requirements be met. 	<p>The proposed criteria and indicators for the comparative evaluation of site-specific residual waste processing systems, as outlined in <i>Background Document 3</i>, address the potential for effects related to both the proposed technologies and the proposed sites to the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act. Additional consultation during the EA Study will be essential to solicit input on these more detailed criteria and to establish the relative priorities of the criteria, to reflect the concerns and interests of potentially affected parties.</p>

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First Nations input would be considered through the proposed consultation methodology. In addition, First Nations heritage would be considered through the number and significance of known archaeological and cultural areas at prospective sites. 	
<p>Q7a: Do you agree that residual waste management activities such as extended producer responsibility (EPR) that fall under the authority of the Province of Ontario and/or the Federal Government be identified and noted separately outside of the environmental assessment? Yes ___ No ___</p>		
<p>The majority of comments supported the examination of EPR outside of the EA process, but also recognized the importance of EPR measures.</p>	<p>It is proposed that Toronto’s Residual Waste Study would focus on the management of the residual waste that remains after Toronto’s various at-source diversion initiatives such as reduce, reuse, recycle and composting.</p> <p>Residual waste management activities such as extended producer responsibility (EPR) that fall under the authority of the Province of Ontario and/or the Federal Government would be identified and noted separately outside of the EA Study.</p>	<p>The technologies and approaches considered in the residual waste study will be those that fall within the City’s scope of responsibility to implement.</p> <p>This EA Study will recognize and respect the provincial and federal responsibilities to regulate the management of waste by municipalities.</p>
<p>Q7b: Do you agree that the City should continue to lobby and/or participate in initiatives such as extended producer responsibility? Yes ___ No ___ Please explain ...</p>		
<p>The majority of comments supported the City continuing with lobbying efforts to promote EPR.</p>	<p>The City of Toronto has been an active participant in EPR initiatives, providing input to processes such as Waste Diversion Ontario. The City will continue to lobby and/or participate in initiatives such as EPR to support efforts to increase at-source waste diversion outside of the EA process..</p>	<p>Efforts to further increase at-source waste diversion will decrease the quantity of residual waste that would require management over the long-term, reducing the overall potential for environmental effects associated with the management and processing of waste.</p>

Synthesis Statement	Response: How it will be addressed in the EA ToR and/or EA Study	Rationale
Q7c: Do you have suggestions on how the City can effectively lobby the Provincial and Federal governments on issues related to waste reduction?		
Some suggestions were provided on how the City could effectively lobby for EPR.	Suggestions on lobbying and EPR approaches brought forward through consultation will be forwarded to SWMS staff for review.	

Table 8.0 Summary of Government Agency Responses, Round Two

<i>Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, letter of March 1, 2007</i>		
Agency Response	How it would be Addressed in the EA	Rationale
<p>Please provide copies of the Round two consultation materials to the TRCA. Please provide four copies of the draft ToR for review and once the draft ToR is complete contact the TRCA to schedule a meeting to discuss issues and concerns. The TRCA would be interested in participating on the Technical Advisory Committee for this project should one be established. Also confirmed primary and secondary contacts for the project.</p>	<p>Copies of the Round two consultation materials were provided electronically via email to the TRCA. Four copies of the Draft EA ToR will be provided to the TRCA for review. The City is considering the appropriate forum and need for meetings with government agencies. The City has not established a Technical Advisory Committee for the study. Primary and secondary contacts for the TRCA have been noted.</p>	
<i>Toronto Medical Officer of Health, letter of March 7, 2007</i>		
Agency Response	How it would be Addressed in the EA	Rationale
<p>Response to Q1 from Round 2 Consultation:</p> <p><i>All technologies for processing Toronto’s RSW should initially be considered. The short-listing and evaluation process should then eliminate those technologies with the greatest potential impacts on environment and health.</i></p>	<p>It is proposed that the EA will consider technologies that include mechanical, biological, chemical and thermal processing. These categories encompass all currently known methods of processing waste.</p> <p>Waste processing systems (i.e., combinations of technologies) must be evaluated using criteria that reflect potential effects on the “environment” as defined in the EA Act. This will include the evaluation of potential effects on “environment and health”.</p>	<p>A wide range of technologies will be considered in the EA in order to ensure that reasonable approaches for meeting Toronto’s long-term residual waste processing requirements are addressed.</p> <p>The evaluation of waste processing systems must be based on the consideration of the potential effects on the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act in order to meet the requirements of the Act.</p>

<p>Response to Q2 from Round 2 Consultation:</p> <p><i>Any technology that is considered for use by the City must, at a minimum, meet current and planned environmental quality standards or criteria. The screening criteria should be developed to ensure that technologies that have the least health impact, including new and innovative technologies, are considered for further evaluation.</i></p>	<p>As outlined in the Draft ToR, one of the first activities in the EA will be the identification and screening of technologies. One of the proposed screening criteria would be the ability of the technology to at least meet current or planned regulatory requirements in Ontario. Initial consultation during the EA will be undertaken to seek additional input on the proposed screening criteria.</p> <p>Background Document 3, “Formulation and Evaluation of Alternatives” proposes that technologies must have a proven operating history of at least 1 year (on a generally continuous basis) processing residual waste, following the successful commissioning of the facility.</p>	<p>It must be demonstrated that processing technologies at least meet regulatory requirements, and that all applicable environmental approvals can be secured before they are considered further in the EA.</p> <p>Requiring technologies to meet a minimum standard for being 'proven' will reduce potential risks to the City as it must be demonstrated that there are existing operating facilities processing residual waste that use the technology. This will also ensure that data is available for application in the evaluation of the technology.</p>
<p>Response to Q3 from Round 2 Consultation:</p> <p><i>The broad categories of considerations that were proposed for short-listing technologies incorporate important environmental health considerations, such as potential for emissions to air, land and water. In addition to those categories, I recommend adding consideration of inputs required by the facility (such as energy and water use), and outputs from the facility (such as by-products requiring further waste management).</i></p> <p><i>Care must be taken to ensure that the screening criteria used to develop a short list of technology systems do not eliminate the technologies that are most promising from an environmental and health perspective.</i></p>	<p>Inputs required by a waste processing system, or facility, as well as the outputs or emissions from a facility will be evaluated in the EA using a life cycle analysis (LCA) approach. (Table 3.1 in Background Document 3).</p> <p>As stated in the response to the “Q1” question, above, the evaluations that are completed in the EA will be based on criteria that reflect potential effects on the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act.</p>	<p>Inputs and Outputs related to the processing systems are critical elements of the proposed factors set out in <i>Background Document 3</i>.</p> <p>The short-listing of residual waste processing systems must be based on consideration of the potential impacts to the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act in order to meet the requirements of the Act.</p>

<p>Response to Q5 from Round 2 Consultation:</p> <p><i>Care must be taken to consider other environmental health factors when developing a short list of sites, including existing environmental conditions, social context and health status of nearby residents.</i></p>	<p>In the Draft EA ToR it is proposed that site-specific factors be applied in the EA to address the potential effects on the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act related to use of the sites for a waste processing system (or facility). The proposed factors to be used to “short list” prospective sites, outlined in Table 4.1 in Background Document 3, address existing characteristics of the sites; potential haul-route impacts (including consideration of land use along the routes); and general compatibility with surrounding land uses.</p> <p>Assessment of the health status of nearby residents is not proposed at this stage of the EA. It is proposed that the health status of nearby residents be considered during the evaluation of site-specific residual waste processing systems (or facilities).</p>	<p>The proposed factors to be used to “short list” prospective sites, outlined in Background Document 3, represent a range of considerations and are intended to address the potential effects of developing waste processing facilities on various sites, to the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act.</p> <p>These factors are reasonable in that they would be applied to what may be an extensive list of prospective sites so as to select those that have less potential effects on the environment including health.</p>
<p>Response to Q6 from Round 2 Consultation:</p> <p><i>I support the broad categories of elements and criteria proposed in Section Four of the consultation materials for evaluating site-specific systems, such as human health, natural environment and social/cultural implications, as they can be used to assess environmental health factors.</i></p> <p><i>For evaluating the technology component of site-specific systems, Appendix 1 contains health and environmental selection criteria, for your consideration. The suggested criteria in Appendix 1 would provide information needed to effectively undertake a Health Impact Assessment. They could be used to enhance the list of human health and natural environment “indicators” provided in Section Four of the consultation materials. Please note that Appendix 1 contains preliminary draft criteria suggested as a starting point for further discussion on criteria development.</i></p>	<p>The Draft EA ToR outlines the proposed method of developing and evaluating site-specific systems, developed through combining the short-listed residual processing systems (technologies) and the short-listed sites. Site-specific systems will be compared using a net effects analysis, through the application of proposed criteria and indicators that are outlined in detail in Table 5.1, Background Document 3.</p> <p>Consideration of the criteria provided by the MOH in Appendix 1 to the March 7, 2007 letter has revealed that the intent of these criteria has been accommodated by the proposed criteria outlined in Table 5.1 of Background Document 3. It is critical that the importance of human health be reflected in the evaluations to be undertaken in the EA. To this end, a thorough consideration of how the key elements of Health Impact Assessment can be effectively incorporated into the comparative evaluation of site-specific systems will be completed for preparation of the Proposed ToR for submission to the MOE.</p>	<p>The proposed criteria and indicators for the comparative evaluation of site-specific residual waste processing systems, as outlined in Background Document 3, address the potential effects of both the proposed technologies and the proposed sites on the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act.</p> <p>The selection of the preferred site-specific residual waste processing system must be based on the consideration of the potential impacts to the environment as broadly defined in the EA Act in order to meet the requirements of the Act. Consideration of human health, however, must be an integral component of the EA.</p>

<p><i>Also regarding the Indicators proposed in Section Four of the consultation materials, I suggest using an accepted, environmentally sustainable definition for “renewable sources” in the indicator “Quantity of energy generated by the System from renewable sources”.</i></p> <p><i>Overall, the sites chosen for RSW management facilities should be those having the lowest overall health impact. When evaluating the site component of site-specific systems, in addition to the site selection criteria that were proposed in Section Four of the consultation materials, I recommend further emphasis on the environmental health and social characteristics of potential sites. For example, the impacts from transporting waste, materials and products should be considered, and added to the list of “indicators” provided in Section Four. Impacts from transportation can vary substantially, depending on the proximity of the site to sources of waste and destinations for by-products from the facility. The mode of transportation available, for example truck, train or ship, also affects the air quality implications of a potential site, and should be considered in a site evaluation.</i></p> <p><i>Other environmental health factors to consider when evaluating sites include existing environmental conditions, social context and health status of nearby residents. When evaluating sites, it is also important to consider the cumulative air pollutant concentrations that are likely to result from existing local sources, plus emissions from the proposed facility. I suggest adding existing environmental conditions, cumulative air pollutant concentrations, and health status of nearby residents to the list of human health “indicators” proposed in Section Four of the consultation materials.</i></p>	<p>A definition of ‘renewable sources’ of energy is provided in Background Document 3. Essentially ‘renewable’ sources of energy would be derived from the biogenic (i.e. from biological sources) portion of the residual waste stream (e.g. paper, wood and organics).</p> <p>Impacts related to the transportation of waste materials and products are addressed in the proposed criteria and indicators. Existing meteorological and ambient air quality conditions are included as indicators related to the potential local and global effects on air quality. Existing environmental conditions as well as social and health conditions are also addressed in the proposed criteria and indicators. (See Table 5.1 in Background Document 3).</p> <p>It is proposed that prior to proceeding with the development and evaluation of site-specific systems, consultation will be undertaken to review the proposed evaluation methodology and to establish and confirm the relative priorities to be considered during the evaluation process.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Response to Q7a) from Round 2 Consultation:</p> <p><i>Working with other levels of government to encourage waste prevention is a valuable addition to Toronto’s local waste-reduction efforts. Addressing waste at its source through prevention, such as by encouraging extended producer responsibility, is an important consideration. By reducing the overall quantity of solid waste, waste prevention also reduces the effort required to manage the City’s RSW. Enhancing Toronto’s successes in waste prevention, in part through discussions with other levels of government, is of primary importance to the City’s overall waste management strategy.</i></p> <p><i>The priority of the EA is to identify the best technology or approach for managing the City’s residual solid waste in such a way that protects health and the environment. If waste prevention policies are expected to have a substantial impact on RSW composition, and a significant influence on City’s RSW management choices, then the EA for managing Toronto’s RSW should reflect waste prevention considerations. The City should strive to adopt the best possible approach for managing Toronto’s waste overall, that provides the least environmental and health impacts and considers upstream waste prevention as an important part of the overall strategy.</i></p>	<p>It is proposed that Toronto’s long-term residual waste study will focus on the management of the residual waste that remains after Toronto’s various at-source diversion initiatives such as reduction, reuse, recycling and composting.</p> <p>Important management activities that would reduce the quantity of waste, such as extended producer responsibility (EPR), that fall under the authority of the Province of Ontario and/or the Federal Government are being considered by the City on an on-going basis and do not have to be included within the scope of the EA.</p> <p>The relationship, however, between effective waste reduction efforts and the identification of a sustainable alternative means of processing the residual waste that will remain after the application of reduction, reuse and recycling efforts by the City will be included in the comparative evaluation of site-specific processing systems (facilities). Table 5.1 in Background Document 3 includes a criterion that will be applied to assess the relative flexibility of alternative site-specific systems to respond to fluctuations (including potential reductions) in the quantity of residual wastes to be processed over the identified 25 year planning period..</p>	<p>The technologies and approaches considered in the residual waste study will be those that fall within the City’s scope of responsibility to implement.</p> <p>This EA Study will recognize and address the provincial and federal responsibilities to regulate the management of waste by municipalities.</p> <p>The effect of the City’s on-going waste reduction, reuse and recycling efforts on the quantity of waste requiring processing is important and as a result, criteria to assess the ability of alternative site-specific systems to respond to fluctuations in waste quantities are included in the evaluation to be undertaken in the EA.</p>
<p>Response to Q7b) from Round 2 Consultation:</p> <p><i>Encouraging extended producer responsibility, and working with other levels of government to develop healthy public policy, are important City responsibilities. Enhancing the City’s efforts on waste prevention would also reduce the City’s solid waste management capacity requirements.</i></p>	<p>The City of Toronto has been an active participant in EPR initiatives, providing input to processes such as Waste Diversion Ontario. The City will continue to lobby and/or participate in initiatives such as EPR to support efforts to increase at-source waste diversion.</p>	<p>Efforts to further increase at-source waste diversion will decrease the quantity of residual waste that would require management over the long-term, reducing the overall potential for environmental effects associated with the management and processing of waste.</p>

<p>Response to Q7c) from Round 2 Consultation:</p> <p><i>As noted in my previous comments, diverse approaches to encourage waste prevention are available to the City, such as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mounting an educational campaign for Toronto residents, schools, retailers and other businesses to reduce the amount of garbage created;</i> • <i>Identifying and exploring the feasibility of introducing mandatory, practical, waste-reduction best practices in Toronto. For example, requiring retailers to charge an additional small fee for products packaged in non-reusable and non-recyclable materials, would create an appropriate incentive. This approach is already successfully used by some retailers in Toronto; and</i> • <i>Enhancing waste-related policies, such as actively working with the federal government to improve packaging legislation. For instance, under the federal Consumer Packaging and Labelling Regulations, only a few specific products have limits on the size of packaging. These regulations could be expanded to apply to other products, reducing the quantity of residual waste to be managed.</i> 	<p>Suggestions on lobbying and EPR approaches that are brought forward through consultation, such as these suggestions from the Medical Officer of Health will be forwarded to SWMS staff for review.</p>	
--	---	--