

**The following Action Items were not addressed:**

**Meeting #81: Action Item #4**

*Mark Rupke to report on details on the new fire suppression systems.*

**Meeting #81: Action Item #5**

*Mark Rupke to find out when Chicago begins commissioning their Pelletizer.*

**Meeting #81: Action Item #6**

*Mark Rupke to find out from Veolia what the current pellet output is.*

**Meeting #81: Action Item #7**

*Mark Rupke to find out when the London landfill will be able to receive biosolids.*

**Meeting #81: Action Item #8**

*Mark Rupke to find out who is managing the London landfill.*

**Meeting #81: Action Item #9**

*Mark Rupke to bring the Ashbridges Bay Odour Complaint Form to the next meeting.*

**Meeting #82: Action Item #1**

*Mark Rupke to find out if a representative from Veolia can attend an NLC/ICMC meeting to address the commissioning of the facility and marketing concerns.*

## Panel Charge Questions (Draft rev6)

A draft set of charge questions was provided to the panel. With consideration of input received at meeting 1 and following some discussion, the charge questions were revised by the panel. The charge questions are being used to guide the work of the panel. By the end of the process, the intent is that all questions will be answered. These questions are not necessarily to be considered in order. For example, it may not be possible to fully answer the first question until all other questions have been considered. Although a consensus response would be ideal, all panel guidance is valuable.

### 1. Evaluation of the Decision-making process and model<sup>1</sup>:

#### A. Analysis of the Decision-making process

- Was the decision making process appropriate? How can the process be improved to facilitate decision making?
- Comment on the adequacy of the description of the relationship to the Mediation Agreement (particularly the Guiding Principles) and the reflection of (the intent of) that relationship in the decision making process?

***Were the criteria used in the screening<sup>2</sup> of options appropriate and applied correctly?*** Please consider and comment on:

- The definitions and relevance of the criteria (regulatory compliance, proven management options, within the scope of BRMP T o R, Security of supply and treatment, technical feasibility)
- Their adequacy in describing the potential benefits, risks or concerns
- Additional criteria that should have been considered

#### B. Analysis of the decision-making model:

***Was the decision-making model an appropriate one to use?*** Please consider and comment on:

---

<sup>1</sup> The panel understands that its work includes both the process and content aspects of the decision-making model. The panel understands that commenting on the appropriateness of the assumptions used in applying the model is also part of its scope of work.

<sup>2</sup> This section was moved to the “process” section to reflect the way the process is described on page 80 of the BRMP (i.e. screening occurs prior to the application of the model).

**Biosolids and Residuals Master Plan Peer Review**

- Would the studies that were subsequently done, such as the Health Studies, have changed the results of the evaluation (especially in weighting and scoring)?<sup>3</sup>
- The advantages and disadvantages of the model?
- Transparency and ease of understanding.
- The ability of the model to prioritize and account for environmental and health effects (positive and negative) on the Toronto community, other communities and other affected stakeholders
- The adequacy of the list of biosolids management options and their description
- What other decision making models could the City consider? (include advantages/disadvantages of each relative to the model used)

***Were the criteria used in the decision making model appropriate and applied correctly?*** Please consider and comment on:

- The definitions and relevance of the criteria
- Their adequacy in describing the potential benefits, risks or concerns
- Additional criteria that should have been considered

***Were the weightings and scores in the model appropriate and were options categorized accurately?*** Please consider and comment on:

Weighting

- The suitability of the criteria weightings
- The completeness of the justification for the weightings
- Possible modifications the criteria weightings and/or the justification for the weightings (please explain)

Scoring

- The adequacy of the scoring system (i.e. range in values) used in the decision-making model
- Any need for additional explanation of the results of the scoring
- Any alternative methods of evaluating criteria such as subjective or semi-quantitative approaches

**2. Recommendations**

***What recommendations, if any, does the panel have?***

---

<sup>3</sup> To answer this question, the health studies were reviewed.