



## Addendum to the Works Committee Agenda

Council Chambers  
Regional Headquarters Building  
605 Rossland Road East, Whitby

**Wednesday, November 4, 2020**

**9:30 AM**

### 7. Waste

#### 7.1 Correspondence

- D) Email Correspondence from Linda Gasser, Whitby resident, dated November 3, 2020, providing background information to Durham Works staff on the presentation and background information she provided to Clarington Council on November 2, 2020 regarding concerns that have not been addressed to date, including a promised Durham report on impacts of the MWP and AD on the incinerator.

Pages 2 - 11

Recommendation: Receive for Information

- E) **Email Correspondence from Linda Gasser, Whitby resident, dated November 3, 2020, the Region of Durham's Submission to the Ministry of the Environment, re: Durham/York Energy from Waste Project Submission of the Regional Municipality of Durham Waste Diversion Program Monitoring Plan (Environmental Assessment Conditions 10) MOE File No.: EA-08-02; and a Summary of Durham's Diversion rates for last decade.**

12 - 19

Recommendation: Receive for Information

October 30, 2020

Mayor Foster and Clarington Council  
40 Temperance St.  
Bowmanville, Ontario

**Re: Nov. 2 Council Agenda Item 10.1 S. Siopis memo re Mixed Waste Pre-Sort and Anaerobic Digestion**

I write further to the memo from Durham Works Commissioner Susan Siopis re Mixed Waste Pre-sort (MWP) and Anaerobic Digestion (AD – Agenda Item 10.1). I apologize in advance for the length of my letter but the issues are complex and long in the making.

My comments focus primarily on MWP however, I also raise concerns around Durham's incinerator, because the MWP impacts the DYEC as well as to remind you that how Durham has addressed incinerator issues in the past could be an indicator of what to expect in the future.

Durham staff committed in writing to provide information about the impacts of the MWP on the DYEC -see page 5 of Durham Report **2019 May 15 COW 8** – attached – relevant extract promising report for September (bolding is mine):

Durham York Energy Centre (DYEC) Impacts – A report      September  
on the potential impacts on the DYEC will be provided to  
Regional Council based on the information currently  
available. Staff will continue to update Council on DYEC  
impacts as the project develops

Impacts to the DYEC arising from primarily from the MWP, could include but are not limited to: creation of potential capacity at the DYEC which under the put or pay agreement either Durham or York will use, changes to waste high heat values, changes to waste composition and the related changes to air emissions and process residues. At one meeting Durham staff mentioned possible changes to Covanta-DY Project Agreement.

Clarington Council should formally request this long overdue promised report from Durham Region. Not only should councillors and the public have been informed long ago, and certainly before staff sought approval for the MWP and AD May 27, 2020, Clarington should be fully informed when negotiating with the Region, who hold all the information cards and show these only infrequently.

Ms. Siopis in her Oct. 20, 2020 memo writes on page 2:

***“It is expected that the Mixed Waste Pre-sort and AD Facility will divert approximately 30,000 Tonnes of organics annually from the waste stream.”***

**Zero** supporting data was provided showing how that estimate arrived at. Clarington should request that and the calculation used to arrive at that estimate.

Please recall that York Region has the right to excess capacity AND to trigger a physical expansion.

See Durham -York Co-Owners agreement ( **NOTE page 13 missing from online version on DYEC website**) -see complete copy attached:

[https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/facility-approvals/resources/Documents/Durham\\_York\\_Co-Owners\\_Agreement.pdf](https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/facility-approvals/resources/Documents/Durham_York_Co-Owners_Agreement.pdf)

Relevant Sections 3 -Ownership of Facility and Facility Lands, 4 -Expansion of and Upgrades to the Facility and 5 - Entitlement to Capacity in particular.

#### Processing Source Separated Organics vs Organics from Mixed Waste

I provided a 2013 Environment Canada document “**Technical Document on Municipal Solid Waste Organics Processing**” to Durham Council and staff a number of years ago. It should be posted to Durham’s MWP-AD web pages, but isn’t.

See: [https://www.ec.gc.ca/gdd-mw/3E8CF6C7-F214-4BA2-A1A3-163978EE9D6E/13-047-ID-458-PDF\\_accessible\\_ANG\\_R2-reduced%20size.pdf](https://www.ec.gc.ca/gdd-mw/3E8CF6C7-F214-4BA2-A1A3-163978EE9D6E/13-047-ID-458-PDF_accessible_ANG_R2-reduced%20size.pdf)

The entire document is useful but if pressed for time please review Section 1.3 Common Issues Challenges and Section 8 re Siting would be relevant Clarington’s situation.

There are big differences between processing Source Separated Organics (SSO), as Toronto’s ADs process, versus Organics from Mixed Waste, which Durham stated at various times it intends to process together with SSO (Green Bin) organics.

Both Peel Region and Durham Region did MWP pilot studies at Canada Fibres MWP facility.

As I reported to Durham councillors, Peel staff updated their council around challenges with the MWP component.

See attached my PPT from June 2019. Slides 10-28 which relay concerns raised by Peel staff re MWP. See bullets quoting Peel reports from slide 15 below:

- **Mixed Waste Processing may not be able to successfully divert organics if the province applies new product quality requirements that preclude the use of material derived from mixed waste.**

- The quality requirements applicable to the organic output of Mixed Waste Processing must be confirmed.
- The organic output of Mixed Waste Processing may not consistently meet product quality requirements, particularly for heavy metals, so long as items of household hazardous waste are present in the garbage.
- Programs or policies to eliminate household hazardous waste from the garbage should therefore be maintained and enhanced.

Garbage in = garbage out so these contamination issues are no surprise. Recall also that Markham adopted their Clear Garbage bag program in part to get the hazardous waste out of the bags going to the incinerator, as well as to get divertible material out of garbage. Clear bags were well received and helped Markham achieve diversion rates others can only dream of.

Questions Clarington should ask: What issues, including contamination, did Durham encounter when doing their pilot at Canada Fibres?

#### Quality of Digestate/Process residues

Ms. Siopis in her October 20<sup>th</sup> memo writes on page 2:

*The Source Separated Organics (SSO) Green Bin material within Durham Region will be processed in the AD and will produce digestate of comparable quality to the Elmira and Toronto examples.*

*The organic materials recovered from the Mixed Waste Pre-Sort facility will be managed and tested separately to demonstrate to the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) and other regulators that the digestates will meet the standards associated with their end uses.*

*In the instance where a compost does not meet an 'AA' or 'A' standard, the material can still be beneficially used as an organic soil conditioner in a variety of non-agricultural applications (e.g. land reclamation, mining rehabilitation, reforestation, etc.), subject to appropriate permits and regulations.*

*The digestate will not be processed at the DYEC as other beneficial use options are available.*

Ms. Siopis' assertions would entail a lot of expensive materials handling/testing/reporting and assumptions for which supporting data is not referenced.

GHD's June 21 2017 **Background Research, Technical and Options Analysis Report** - this report was NOT provided to Regional councillors at either the June 2017 COW or Council meetings so it's possible there may still be regional councillors who still have not read it, though I provided it to them.

See extracts from attached GHD report below that speak to the issues raised by the consultant at that time:

<https://www.durham.ca/en/living-here/resources/Documents/GarbageandRecycling/Anaerobic-Digestion-/Technical-Reports/AD-Technical-Options-Final.pdf>

See also report page 30-31:

*Composted digestate produced directly from OFMW through these technologies is not suitable for beneficial use according to Ontario regulations. Following composting, the composted digestate must be screened to remove contaminants, and may need to be processed with additional equipment to remove contamination such as small hard plastic and shards. These are required to meet the current Ontario Compost Quality Standards (Ontario, 2012). GHD is not immediately familiar with an application of this technology to Mixed Waste that has resulted in an organics stream suitable for land application in Ontario. Analytical results from compost-like-output (CLO) from Mixed Waste facilities as reported by Golder Associates (May 2009) are provided in Appendix B. Of note are the concentrations of copper, lead, molybdenum, nickel, and zinc, which exceed the criteria for Category AA and A compost under the Ontario Compost Quality Standards and the Nutrient Management Act regulations for land application of non-agricultural source material (NASM).*

From report page 36:

#### **6.3.1.2 Increase of Organics Diversion - Reported to Province**

*While additional organics capture is favourable for each Processing Option, the ability to divert the captured OFMW material is dependent on the organics processing technology. The OFMW captured in the pre-sort step needs to be processed and refined to meet standards for a reuse, avoiding the disposal of this material in landfills or the DYEC.*

From report page 41:

*It is also important to emphasize that the **certainty** by which quality of final products (e.g., fertilizers, compost, etc.) from organics can be created from SSO is currently greater than it is for Mixed Waste organics (OFMW).*

From report page 51:

*It is acknowledged that there will be some challenges with the permitting of the organic processing component for Mixed Waste. These issues are not insurmountable if the product of the organic fraction processing is effectively managed to meet existing standards.*

*For any organics processing facility, the Region will need to ensure that all environmental impacts of the facility including odour, noise, and air emissions are addressed to the satisfaction of the MOECC.*

*The permitting of a Mixed Waste processing facility for municipal solid waste will have some challenges, as this will be a newer type of waste processing within the Province. Similar facilities have operated in Ontario however there are none currently in operation.*

See: Analytical Results of Compost-Like-Output (CLO) Produced from Mixed Waste Facilities Table B-1 on pdf page 64 - see explanatory note that those results highlighted in blue Exceeds Ontario Standards (Category AA Compost)

Recall that Durham **does not offer collection source separated organics from Multi-Residential**, though much future growth in Durham will be in the Multi Residential sector. Durham's plans to offer SSO to single family homes, but not to Multi Res. It's more important than ever to offer SSO collection to new build condos and purpose-built rentals, and ensure that new builds across Durham have the appropriate infrastructure to facilitate separation of organics and collection.

Imagine the confusion Durham's inconsistent organics programs will cause as residents move from one housing type to another – .e.g. we separate at source if we live in a single-family home, but if we move to a condo or apartment, we should just throw our organics in the garbage?

The more I see from the Region's "messaging" around the MWP, the more I wonder if MWP might also a very expensive pre-treatment of waste going to the incinerator -i.e. get out the wet organics AND the other non-combustibles like grit, glass etc..for a better burn and higher electricity production/revenues.

Multiple delegations addressed waste composition and moisture issues during the incinerator EA. Durham staff asserted the waste was ok as was.

Clarington should ask what studies the Region intends to undertake to evaluate emissions and other matters related to changed waste composition at the DYEC?

From GHD 2017 report page 17

#### **4.2.3 Organics Recovery from Mixed Waste (SF & MR)**

Not all the organic material available in the Mixed Waste stream will be able to be harvested through the Mixed Waste Pre-Sort Facility.

In order to project the amount of organic material that can be isolated from the Mixed Waste stream the following assumptions were used:

- The current organics capture rate is 54 percent for the SSO single-family program.
- Approximately 80 percent of the incoming organics are recovered during pre-sorting.
- The contamination rate of the OFMW requiring pre-treatment is approximately 20 percent.
- Approximately 65 percent of the incoming organics are recovered through the pre-sorting and organics pre-treatment processes and treated by the organics processing technology.

From pdf page 20, report page 19:

#### *4.3 Modified SSO Program*

*The expansion of the Green Bin program has been identified by the Region as one area of the current system may be modified to improve its waste diversion. Implementation of a modified Green Bin program (one that accepts additional materials such as pet waste, sanitary products, diapers, etc.) would increase the quantity of SSO and decrease the quantity of OFMW by approximately the same amount.*

At a recent WMAC meeting Durham staff said the committee could make suggestions about what additional materials could be captured in the Green Bin. However, with MWP, you can see from the foregoing GHD extract, the more residents would Separate organics at the Source, the less organics would be found in the black garbage bag to “harvest”. MWP competes with Source Separation -which is best practice.

As you can see in extract from Sec. 4.2.3 above, GHD reported in 2017 that Durham's Green Bin capture rate languished at 54% . Clearly, we could do much better.

Working with residents to achieve better Source Separation of Organics is really hard work. This requires dedicated, informed and credible staff to work with the community towards common and rational objectives. This needs a thoughtful, coordinated and consistent services Region wide, across all housing types.

#### Mixed Waste Pre-Sort - waste streams requiring separate disposal and management of non-Blue Box recyclables

Recall Durham's incinerator was sold to Council as "the made IN Durham solution" to disposal, but it never has been. It has been a made in Durham problem.

With what Durham staff envision, their primary disposal option -the incinerator -which needed secondary disposal for ash residues and "unacceptable/rejected" waste from day one, will now need other disposal for the non combustibles extracted via MWP, which Durham staff now don't want to process at the DYEC.

Bottom and fly ash now get sent to two different landfills (bottom ash in Modern Landfill in US, fly ash at Walker in Niagara). "Unacceptable and rejected" waste as well as By Pass waste, gets sent outside Durham.

Much of the waste excavated during Durham's landfill mining project was sent to landfill outside Durham Region.

With Durham's mega projects, lot of tonnage gets transported, pre-processed, processed, there may be post processing, monitoring, administration, reporting, repairing, all of which means a lot of work for staff, vendors and the consultants who get lucrative contracts.

When citizens separate their organics and recyclables at home it's low tech, efficient and results in high quality materials (low contamination), however, source separation does NOT create employment for staff, consultants and vendors.

Unless Durham staff can provide supporting data, the jury is still out regarding the quality of digestate and whether or not that may also require disposal and where it get disposed.

#### MWP and Processing of Recyclables Extracted?

Recall also that possibly as early as 2023, Durham may transition the Blue Box to Producers, aka Extended Producer Responsibility. That would mean that Durham Region would no longer be responsible for Collection and Processing of recyclables at Durham's Material Recovery Facility (MRF). One objective is that the cost of Blue Box recycling moves from municipalities to be the complete responsibility of producers of the products and packaging.

It is expected that producers will pass on the costs of managing the Blue Box to their consumers. Any budget room created by transitioning of the Blue Box should not be viewed by Works as freed up dollars to blow on other mega projects.

Recyclables extracted from the Mixed Waste are likely to be heavily contaminated and other than metals, may be low or no value. So, what resources will Durham expend on managing and marketing low quality recyclables?

No answers to date from staff to such questions.

Durham's and Clarington's messaging to the public leading up to transition should be encouraging residents to maximize Blue Box participation and utilization so that there would be as few recyclables as possible in the black garbage bag.

#### Informed Advocacy

While MWP & AD is a regional project, Clarington will be the most directly impacted - AGAIN.

It's challenging because Clarington doesn't have a councillor on Works Committee.



I know it is a tall order but you are 3 out of 29 -you need help at the Region. Please raise concerns at local council meetings and pass motions if that is what is needed to get action/information from Durham. When at Durham Committee and Council meetings, Councillors must take every opportunity to advocate for Clarington and work to achieve support from other regional councillors. It's hard because if it's not in THEIR municipality, some councillors may not care much.

From 2017 through to the May 27, 2020 Durham Council approval, Durham staff did NOT provide the underlying business case documents to council for the meetings at which staff sought Council approvals. Successive Durham councils have, inexplicably, tolerated this nonsense and approved projects/phases without fully understanding the costs or verifying staff assumptions.

Recall on May 27, 2020 when staff sought approval to proceed with MWP and AD, the Works Commissioner was unable to respond to a simple direct question around MWP. She indicated that she had provided the information to Clarington, yet could not manage to summon up that information at that moment in the meeting?? Nor did other staff present nor the consultant if he was still present? Turned out to be a red herring because what she provided to Clarington had been around AD, NOT MWP.

Yet, the majority of Durham councillors voted to approve the project anyway.

Six weeks after council approval, on July 8th, Durham staff and their consultant, GHD, gave the attached Power Point presentation on MWP. At that meeting, it was stated that GHD had "audited" a MWP facility, but no specifics offered where that facility was nor what the findings of the "audit" were.

Clarington Council should request that GHD "audit" information specifically because it should provide insights into how the various components of mixed waste processing operate. This should not be confidential information – in fact it should have been posted to the AD web pages.

You are in negotiations with Durham.

From HCA: <https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/facility-approvals/resources/Documents/HostCommunityAgreement.pdf>

## *12. Issue Resolution*

*12.2 In the event that informal discussions are not effective in resolving any disputes or differences of opinion arising between the parties which concern or touch upon the validity, construction, meaning, performance or effect of this Agreement, then said dispute shall first be mediated within a sixty (60) day time period prior to any dispute proceeding to arbitration. The parties shall determine a mutually agreeable location for the mediation to occur. The parties shall make all reasonable efforts to resolve their disputes by amicable negotiations and agree to provide, without prejudice, frank, candid, **and timely disclosure of relevant facts, information, and documents to facilitate these negotiations.** Any resolution of the dispute in mediation shall be kept confidential by all parties.*

Clarington Councillors should consider: has Durham held up their end of the HCA? If not, what are you going to do about it to address that?

### Larger Waste concerns which could impact Clarington

Durham staff are busy pursuing mega projects but don't really have a coordinated **strategy**. Their waste "system" is "integrated" in name only.

Reduce, Reuse and Recycle remains the prevailing hierarchy and should continue to be the cornerstone of any waste management strategy including Durham's. Durham staff and the Task Force that developed Durham's Strategic Plan appear to have lost sight of "Reduce and Reuse".

Reduction and Reuse strategies should be "front end" priorities. You can't recycle your way out of a waste problem – that's a back-end.

Durham no longer releases basic Waste Generation data and has no Waste Reduction targets that I am aware of.

Durham council had endorsed the following January 30, 2019, council approved staff rec in bullet 3 of 2019 COW 3 in Rec. A) :

*"that Regional Council endorse a vision for the Long Term Waste Management Strategy 2021-2040 that continues and enhances the reduce, reuse, recycle principles and incorporates the vision of waste as a resource as a foundation of the plan."*

In January 2020 Durham Staff developed Guiding Principles (GP) for the Long-Term Waste Management Plan review. The words "Reduce and Reuse" are NOT found in those four GPs.

Durham began LTWMP public consultation in August of 2020.

Staff claimed their GPs are consistent with Durham Council's 2019 endorsement of the LTWMP vision, the evidence shows they are NOT. Durham's Long-Term Waste Management Plan review web pages and the GPs were questioned repeatedly at last two WMAC meetings.

See GPs at: <https://www.durham.ca/en/living-here/long-term-waste-management-strategy.aspx>

Furthermore, in Durham's recently developed Strategic Plan (SP), "Reduction and Reuse" are not mentioned in the SP, though the SP does mention Diversion and Recovery -code for EFW.

### Energy Park Objectives and Infrastructure

Durham made Energy Park infrastructure improvements to satisfy their obligations in the Host Community Agreement for the incinerator.

In NO way should Durham be characterizing that servicing to the Energy Park lands as having been PRE-SERVICING to support additional future waste projects.

The Energy Park was originally to accommodate prestige employment uses, not dirty industrial uses like incinerators. Dirty uses tend to attract additional dirty uses.

I can't imagine OPG being pleased about the prospect of yet another waste related industrial use located close to where they are considering a new building.

Durham did Zero Public Consultation until Sham on Short Listed Sites Feb.27 2020

Recall up until the Short-Listed Sites public consultation event on February 27, 2020, there was ZERO public consultation on the MWP and AD project though I and others requested it multiple times.

At the Durham public consultation event on Short Listed sites, Durham asked for public input, set a comments deadline and then released THEIR recommended site two weeks prior to that comment deadline, thus turning that sole consultation event into a sad sham.

Furthermore, staff did NOT provide the Consultation Record (CR) to Council at the May 27, 2020 meeting at which they sought Site approval. Primary purpose of the CR is for the decision-makers to see what issues were raised and how staff responded.

Notification that the Consultation Record was posted was sent October 8<sup>th</sup>!!

Clarington Council could consider holding their own virtual town hall type meeting on the MWP and AD, including potential impacts to the incinerator. Objectives of consultation could be to inform the community about Durham's plans, to update the community about Clarington's actions to date and to solicit public input. The event can be targeted to Clarington stakeholders but could be live streamed thus available beyond Clarington's borders.

I respectfully urge all Clarington councillors to pay the closest attention to the Region's plans, to monitor the project closely and to advocate for your community at every opportunity.

Thank you for your attention.

Linda Gasser

Whitby

Email: gasserlinda@gmail.com

Cc: May 15 2019 Report COW 08

LG June 2019 PowerPoint to Durham Region

Durham York Co-Owners Agreement

July 8.2020 DR PPT to Works Committee re MWP



October 21, 2011

The Regional  
Municipality  
of Durham

Works Department

605 ROSSLAND RD. E.  
P.O. BOX 623  
WHITBY ON L1N 6A3  
CANADA  
905-668-7711  
1-800-372-1102  
Fax: 905-668-2051  
Email: works@durham.ca

www.durham.ca

C. R. Curtis, P.Eng., MBA  
Commissioner of Works

Ms. Agatha Garcia-Wright, Director  
Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch  
Ministry of the Environment  
2 St. Clair Avenue West, 12A Floor  
Toronto, ON M4V 1L5

and

Ms. Dolly Goyette, Director  
Central Region  
Ministry of the Environment  
Place Nouveau  
5775 Yonge Street, Floor 8  
North York, ON M2M 4J1

Dear Ms. Garcia-Wright and Ms. Goyette:

**RE: Durham/York Energy from Waste Project  
Submission of the Regional Municipality of Durham Waste  
Diversion Program Monitoring Plan  
(Environmental Assessment Conditions 10)  
MOE File No.: EA-08-02**

---

The Regional Municipality of Durham (Region) continues to work cooperatively with all lower tier municipalities to ensure that waste diversion programs, policies and targets are being met. Currently, the Region provides blue box collection of recyclables for all eight municipalities. Additionally, the Region provides collection of garbage, food waste, leaf and yard waste, Christmas trees, White Goods and Bulky goods for all municipalities except the City of Oshawa and Town of Whitby which are locally responsible for collection of these materials. The Region is responsible for:

- Collection, processing and marketing of blue box recyclables;
- Disposal of residential residual waste;
- Composting of SSO, as well as leaf and yard waste;
- Operation of a Material Recovery Facility. Public Drop-in Facility for residents to obtain diversion information and kits (such as collection calendars, Blue Boxes, Green Bins, Composters, etc.);
- Operation of Brock Township landfill site;

"Service Excellence  
for our Communities"



- Operation of three waste management facilities;
- Operating as an approved service provider for Ontario Tire Stewardship, Ontario Electronics Stewardship and Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste;
- Providing eight annual compost give-away events to residents within each of the local municipalities;
- Providing eight community events for the recovery of Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment and Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste to residents within each of the local municipalities;
- Operation of four household hazardous waste depots; and,
- Education and promotion of waste reduction programs.

The Region's waste diversion monitoring plan remains consistent with the Waste Diversion Ontario annual municipal datacall which compiles information on residential materials diverted and disposed by Ontario municipalities. This data can be utilized to calculate a residential diversion rate for each municipality using Generally Accepted Principles (GAP). The GAP calculation includes:

- An allowance for provincial deposit systems based on the deposit containers returned from the residential sector;
- An allowance for residential on-property management through backyard composting, grasscycling and evapotranspiration resulting from use of aerated carts for organics programs;
- Municipally operated (directly or through contracted services) reuse activities;
- Municipally operated (directly or through contracted services) recycling activities including Blue Box materials, Other Recyclables, Waste Electronics and Electrical Equipment (WEEE) and Municipal Hazardous or Special Waste (MHSW);
- Municipally operated (directly or through contracted services) centralized composting activities for household organics, leaves and yard waste; and
- Disposal of garbage and recycling and composting processing residues through energy-from-waste and landfill.

The attached "Waste Management Services Annual Report 2010" summarizes the results of the at source diversion programs in Table 1 "Tonnes of Residential Waste Managed" on page 30. This table illustrates that the curbside and residential waste diversion rates for the

area municipalities ranges from 60 per cent to 51 per cent for a Regional average of 55 per cent.

The diversion rate at the Region's waste management facilities is at 30 per cent. In 2011, the Region is focusing attention on increasing the diversion rate at the waste management facilities through porcelain and asphalt shingle recycling and the possibility of expanding into demolition material recycling in 2012.

The Region retained a consultant in 2008 to assist in identifying possible strategies for reaching 70 per cent diversion. The consultant's study released in March 2009 suggests that the Region's waste diversion rate can be increased in two ways, by:

- Increasing participation in existing waste diversion programs; and,
- Creating new waste diversion opportunities.

The progress of our diversion program is documented and communicated to the public using various media. The enclosed Waste Management Services Annual Report 2010 summarizes our accomplishments.

The Region continues to promote the 4 R's through its marketing efforts and is currently implementing/evaluating new diversion programs. The Region has submitted the subject plan to the Energy from Waste Advisory Committee for information. In addition, the Waste Management Services Annual Report 2010 has been posted on the Region's website.

We trust that this plan meets the MOE's expectation as outlined in the EA Notice of Approval. If you require additional information, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Mirka Januszkiewicz, P.Eng.  
Director, Waste Management  
The Regional Municipality of Durham  
905.668.4113 ext. 3464  
Mirka.Januszkiewicz@durham.ca

/ms

- c. D. Dumais, Director, Approvals Program, Ministry of the Environment
- D. Fumerton, District Manager, York Durham District Office, Ministry of the Environment
- L. McDowell, Director, Environmental Promotion and Protection, The Regional Municipality of York
- Energy from Waste Advisory Committee (EFWAC)
- D. Kelly, Regional Clerk, The Regional Municipality of York
- P. Madill, Regional Clerk, The Regional Municipality of Durham

Encl.

**Oct. 31. 2020 Durham Diversion numbers – impossible to reconcile with limited data provided**

Durham and York get credit towards diversion for incinerator ash. NO other Ontario municipality approved an incinerator. RRPA numbers should not be used to compare Durham’s diversion rates to other municipalities. MBN data more accurately reflects diversion performance.

Municipal Benchmarking data reported to MBN Canada for a number of sectors including waste data <http://mbncanada.ca/> Durham reports a variety of waste metrics to MBN Canada. Some used to be reported to Council but have not been in recent years. Most recent MBN data posted is for 2018.

Waste report and links to similar reports going back to 2011 are accessible at link:  
<http://mbncanada.ca/practice/waster-management/>

Durham Diversion rates reported to Durham Council via Waste Management Annual Reports, posted online from 2010 to 2018 under Diversion Plan reports on DYEC website:  
<https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/education-and-resources/waste-plans.aspx#Reports>

See Table below. Differing diversion numbers claimed in the body of the report and the second diversion rate comes from summary table at end of all Annual Waste Management reports up to 2017.

Thereafter Durham stopped producing summary table breaking out data for lower tier municipalities and by housing type. Numerous delegations had pointed out to council that the gussied up #s were not accurate reflections of Durham’s actual diversion performance.

Starting 2016 Durham also reported the incineration industry’s favoured metric “diversion from landfill”

**2010 to 2019 Diversion Rates reported by Durham and by MBN Canada**

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>Durham reported diversion %</b>	<b>MBN reported diversion %</b>
2010	52	52
2011	53	53
2012	53	53
2013	52	52.3
2014	Reported 55 and 53%	53.2
2015	Reported 55 and 52%	52
*2016	Reported 55 and 53% and 79% Diversion from Landfill	52.8
2017	Reported 55% and 51% and Revised retroactively to 65% 78% Diversion from Landfill	51
2018	63 pending verification revised to 64%	49
2019	63 pending verification	Not yet posted



See Screenshots of Tables from 2018 and 2019 Durham Annual Waste Management Reports on following two pages

**2018 Annual Waste Management Report** -Page 8 shows revisions to previous years' diversion rates. (2018 Diversion rate gets revised in 2019 Report)

Looking at the tonnages table below the diversion numbers, diversion of divertible materials from total tonnage added up to less than 50% which is consistent with diversion rate reported by MBN Canada (49%)

**2019 Annual Waste Management Report Page 9** also revises diversion numbers – 2019 diversion rate pending verification. Again, looking at waste tonnage reported, diverted materials reported are less than 50%. 2019 MBN data not yet posted.

**Durham 2018:** [https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/education-and-resources/resources/Documents/20191031\\_RPT\\_DYEC\\_Durham\\_Region\\_2018\\_Annual\\_Waste\\_Diversion\\_Report\\_RFS.pdf](https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/education-and-resources/resources/Documents/20191031_RPT_DYEC_Durham_Region_2018_Annual_Waste_Diversion_Report_RFS.pdf)

**Durham 2019:** <https://www.durham.ca/en/living-here/resources/Documents/GarbageandRecycling/Annual-Reports/2019-Waste-Management-Annual-Report.pdf>

# Diversion Achievements

Durham Region submits an annual datacall to the province through the Resource Productivity and Recovery Authority (RPRA) to receive funding from producers to assist with costs of operating the Blue Box Program. The datacall is the source of data used to confirm municipal diversion rates across the province. The following are Durham Region’s annual waste diversion rates since 2014:

## RPRA Annual Waste Diversion

**2014 – 55%**

**2015 – 54%** 1st for Urban Regional Municipalities

**2016 – 55%** 1st for Urban Regional Municipalities

**2017 – 65%\*** 1st for Urban Regional Municipalities, 3rd Overall in the Province

**2018 – 63%\*\*** Pending verification

All values are rounded.

RPRA diversion numbers from landfill after curbside collection does not include Durham Region’s approved energy-from-waste initiatives.

\*Updated from 55 per cent to reflect finalized 2017 RPRA diversion rate.

\*\*2018 diversion data presented is unverified by RPRA at time of printing.

## Tonnes Collected

Material Type	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Garbage	110,417	110,498	107,887	115,271	119,716
Organics	27,007	26,796	27,612	28,318	28,446
Blue Box	49,531	48,254	47,923	47,839	43,139
Leaf & Yard Waste	32,123	27,554	24,730	25,082	27,330
Other Diversion	6,296	7,231	10,837	6,887	6,707
<b>Total</b>	<b>225,374</b>	<b>220,333</b>	<b>218,989</b>	<b>223,397</b>	<b>225,338</b>

# Diversion Achievements

Durham Region submits an annual datacall to the province through the Resource Productivity and Recovery Authority (RPPRA), to receive funding from producers to assist with costs of operating the Blue Box program. The datacall is the source of data used to confirm municipal diversion rates across the province.

## RPPRA Annual Waste Diversion

- 2015 – 54%** 1<sup>st</sup> for Urban Regional Municipalities
- 2016 – 55%** 1<sup>st</sup> for Urban Regional Municipalities
- 2017 – 65%\*** 1<sup>st</sup> for Urban Regional Municipalities, 3<sup>rd</sup> Overall in the Province
- 2018 – 64%** 1<sup>st</sup> for Urban Regional Municipalities, 3<sup>rd</sup> (tied) Overall in the Province
- 2019 – 63%\*\*** pending verification






All values are rounded.

RPPRA diversion numbers from landfill after curbside collection does not include Durham Region's approved energy-from-waste initiatives.

\*Updated from 55 per cent to reflect finalized 2017 RPPRA diversion rate. First year RPPRA recognized recycled materials recovered through energy-from-waste.

\*\*2019 diversion data presented is unverified by RPPRA at time of printing.

## Tonnes Collected

Material Type	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
 <b>Garbage</b>	110,498	107,887	115,271	119,716	120,637
 <b>Organics</b>	26,796	27,612	28,318	28,446	28,522
 <b>Blue Box</b>	48,254	47,923	47,839	43,139	41,738
 <b>Leaf &amp; Yard Waste</b>	27,554	24,730	25,082	27,330	26,646
 <b>Other Diversion</b>	7,231	10,837	6,887	6,712	6,553
<b>Total</b>	<b>220,333</b>	<b>218,989</b>	<b>223,397</b>	<b>225,343</b>	<b>224,096</b>