

June 11, 2021.

Via Email to: Lisa.Trevisan@ontario.ca

Lisa Trevisan,
Director, Central Region
Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks
230 Westney Road South, 5th Floor
Ajax, Ontario L1S 7J5

Re: Durham-York Incinerator AMESA Long Term Sampling of Dioxins/Furans –
Reporting Deficiencies Require MECP's Immediate Attention

Dear Ms. Trevisan:

I submit this letter on behalf of Wendy Bracken, Kerry Meydam and myself. We are directing our concerns and questions around the AMESA Long Term Sampling System for Dioxins reporting to you and ask you to respond at the earliest opportunity.

Overview

MECP is the regulator ultimately responsible for oversight of the Durham York incinerator and for ensuring that the owners, Durham and York Regions, in turn ensure that Covanta Energy, their contracted operator, operates the incinerator in a manner that is consistent with the conditions of the Environmental Assessment (EA) Approval and the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) conditions. The Owners have obligations under both the EA and ECA around public records and reporting of air emissions monitoring.

The DYEC ECA describes AMESA in Condition 7.3 a) and b). You can also find the ECA condition text included in Durham staff report June 2, 2021 WR -10, in Section 2.10 or see ECA at: <https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/facility-approvals/resources/Documents/EnvironmentalComplianceApproval.pdf>

AMESA was intended to provide dioxins/furans emissions data over longer periods over a variety of operating conditions between the pre-advised limited hour semi-annual stack tests, only one of which MECP required to demonstrate compliance.

For the public to have a reasonable understanding of the incinerator's dioxins/furans emissions, AMESA ongoing monthly sampling data is required to supplement the limited data from the semi-annual Source Test (ST) information and the Ambient Air (AA) monitoring data collected every 24 days for 24 hours (about 4% of the year), which is reported out quarterly.

No AMESA data at all was reported for the years 2015-2019. For 2020, monthly summaries only were provided in the 2020 ECA Annual Report, however, NO supporting documentation was provided to allow readers to know how the calculations were arrived at.

Information regarding how, and by whom the AMESA data has been reviewed, validated/invalidated has not been provided to public. We have seen no evidence of an official MECP- approved plan for the AMESA monitoring and reporting required by the EA and ECA.

Multiple Requests around AMESA Plans and Data Reporting

We have raised concerns on multiple occasions over the years around Durham's failure to review and report AMESA data including to Durham Region Committees and Council. Please see our letter of March 17, 2021 on pages 62-74 of the March 24, 2021 Durham Council Agenda at:

<https://calendar.durham.ca/meetings/Detail/2021-03-24-0930-Regional-Council-Meeting/389fe365-d7e7-4a65-984e-acf400b72c0e>

Under the Air Emissions Monitoring Tab on the DYEC website, there are no webpages dedicated to AMESA sampling that would direct readers to either the AMESA Monitoring Plan, monthly results, related documentation or Ministry correspondence responding to the AMESA Works Plans. The average reader would also have difficulty finding the recently supplied 2020 monthly summaries that Durham included this past March in their 2020 ECA Annual Report

ALL other DYEC monitoring plans and reports have been developed with the assistance of independent qualified consultant(s) and submitted to MECP for review and response.

From correspondence included with other monitoring reports, it's clear the monitoring data is collected, summarized and reported by external qualified consultants who sign off on these monitoring reports and their conclusions and then they are submitted to the MECP. Ministry Correspondence is also posted.

In contrast, everything around AMESA has been like falling into a black hole and six years after start up and more than five years after entering into "commercial" operations, the public still has no verifiable AMESA data reported.

MECP 2019 Suggestion re AMESA data -Onus Put on Public to submit FOI Request

The Durham-York District office would be well aware of the multiple concerns we raised over several years directly to MECP, as well as to Clarington and Durham Region committees and councils, including after the first ST failure in 2015, again after the second dioxins (massive) ST exceedance in May 2016 and after the AA exceedance for dioxins in 2018, and ever since.

We brought up our concerns about Durham's refusal to report AMESA monthly sampling results when we met with MECP staff at the D-Y District office in April of 2019. At that time, MECP staff suggested that we file a Freedom of Information Request to request for AMESA related information from Durham, which Ms. Bracken did on May 3, 2019.

While some document records were provided later in 2019, Durham has denied much of the information related to Ms. Bracken's two FOI requests, including for AMESA sampling data (from start up to April 30, 2019). This is still under appeal, dragging on for over two years

It's long past time for MECP to require Durham to post ALL AMESA monthly sampling results since start up on the DYEC website, together with ALL related Ministry correspondence around the AMESA Work Plans and implementation thereof.

Why would a regulator require a monitoring program, as part of the EA and ECA, paid for by Durham taxpayers, yet allow the Owner to withhold results from the public? Or, finds it acceptable for Owners to provide monthly sampling summaries for one select year only , but without any supporting documentation that would allow readers to understand how the summaries were arrived at, which is about as much use as if those numbers were pulled out of a hat.

What has been allowed to occur with AMESA reporting is completely inconsistent with what MECP has required around other types of monitoring nor is it verifiable, traceable or transparent for the public.

AMESA Long Term Sampling Saga

Citizens cautioned Durham repeatedly that dioxins and furans are a major concern with incinerators everywhere and these concerns were raised multiple times during the EA process. AMESA and other long term sampling systems are used in hundreds of facilities in Europe. AMESA has been around for about two decades.

Though draft Air Emissions Monitoring Plans were to be brought to the Energy from Waste Advisory Committee (EFW AC) (required by EA Condition 8), to review and comment, the 2016, 2017 and 2018 AMESA Work Plans that Durham provided in response to a Freedom of Information Request submitted by Ms. Bracken in May 2019, were not brought to the EFW AC for discussion or review. Both Kerry Meydam and Linda Gasser are members of the EFW AC. Wendy Bracken is an alternate for Ms. Meydam.

2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 AMESA Work Plans

Covanta's Interim AMESA Evaluation Report COVANTA REPORT Date: November 2015, is found at: <https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/environmental->

[monitoring/resources/Documents/AirEmissions/November 2015 Dioxin and Furan A MESA Evaluation Report.pdf](https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/environmental-monitoring/resources/Documents/AirEmissions/November_2015_Dioxin_and_Furan_AMESA_Evaluation_Report.pdf)

MOECC in their December 15, 2015 response included the following comment starting on page 9-10 of their letter found at:

https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/environmental-monitoring/resources/Documents/AirEmissions/MOECC_Evaluation_SourceTestReport.pdf

Initial phase of the assessment of the AMESA long term dioxins monitoring system was undertaken during this source testing program. Information is considered inconclusive. More information is required to be gathered when the next source testing program takes place. Covanta and the MOECC TSS are required to harmonize the strategy that will be used to assess 9 (Doc.Mgmt # 5Y120146) the reliability of this monitoring system. This strategy should be in place by the time the 2016 source testing campaign takes place.

We had asked Durham staff multiple times for updates around AMESA sampling, including at the EFW AC meetings, with minutes documenting those requests. We were not provided with the subsequent AMESA Work Plans (2016-2018) until, in response to Ms. Bracken's FOI requests (2), Durham provided some AMESA related correspondence and these AMESA Work Plans, in 2019.

Also provided was an email dated May 2, 2017, which was MECP's Sandra Thomas' response to the April 2017 AMESA Work Plan (attached). No copies of MECP responses to the April 2016 and November 2018 Work Plans were provided, therefore we don't know what direction, if any, MECP provided to the Regions and Covanta around Work Plan implementation and/or reporting.

Durham residents were concerned about potential for adverse health impacts after the DYEC's two stack test failures in 2015 and 2016. After the massive May 2016 dioxins exceedance, Durham's former Works Commissioner wrote on June 15, 2016 in Report WR-8, after the big May 2016 exceedance:

*"The objective for the installation and testing of the AMESA system is to generate additional Dioxins and Furans data to monitor the performance of the plant and its APC system. In addition, the Owners expect that after further investigation the AMESA system **will be used to monitor Dioxins and Furans between the scheduled stack tests. This will provide for an additional mechanism to better protect the public**". (emphasis added)*

From the limited information that was provided in 2019 to Ms. Bracken's FOI requests, there was correspondence indicating that John Chandler, who had some expertise around AMESA, was retained by Durham in fall of 2015 and appeared to be involved around August 2017. Because Durham chose to funnel some AMESA related correspondence through their external legal counsel, we have not been provided with evidence that an external qualified consultant was involved in advising the Owners/Covanta around AMESA matters after 2017.

There was an Ambient Air exceedance for dioxins and furans in May 2018. From MECP's September 2019 response to Ms. Bracken (attached), AMESA data was not reviewed as part of this investigation. We wondered why not as looking at sampling results over several sampling periods leading up to the recorded exceedance could have provided additional information. We also wonder whether an Abatement Plan should have been required.

On at least two occasions in Fall 2019, in response to direct questions from us, Durham's current waste director stated that he was not looking at AMESA sampling data, opining at various times the results were not meaningful or meaningless.

One instance is found on the September 24, 2019 EFW Waste Management Advisory Committee meeting webcast found at: <https://www.eventstream.ca/events/durham-region> from: 2:05:40 to 2:11:55.

The current Waste Director stated again on October 23, 2019 at a Public Information Meeting for the proposed incinerator throughput expansion to 160,000 tonnes per year, with others present, including we three, who heard him say that he wasn't reviewing AMESA data, perhaps without fully appreciating how such comments undermine public confidence in the Owners' ensuring there is sufficient oversight over their staff and the operator.

At that same meeting, York Region (minority owner) staff responded to questions indicating that they *had* looked some AMESA data.

Reading the 2018 Work Plan, it's evident that Covanta was reviewing the AMESA data. Though it's not possible to know since the versions of the Work Plans provided are not signed to indicate the author(s), it appears Covanta might be the primary author of the 2016, 2017 and 2018 Work Plans.

Durham's June 2, 2021 Staff Report-WR-10 – Durham's position re AMESA Reporting

Please see Durham staff report on AMESA reporting, June 2, 2021 WR-10 found at: https://icreate7.esolutionsgroup.ca/11111068_DurhamRegion/en/regional-government/resources/Documents/Council/Reports/2021-Committee-Reports/Works/2021-WR-10.pdf

From Section 2.11:

*The performance of the AMESA was initially evaluated during the annual Source Testing programs commencing in 2015. However, the correlation of the AMESA results to the Source Test results was not achieved until 2020 following the **implementation of several workplans that were developed with input from the MECP, Owners, manufacture, consultants and Covanta.** (emphasis added).*

While we have noted that Air Zone monitors the AMESA sampling runs that occur concurrent with Source Testing, we have found no evidence nor has Durham indicated that Air Zone would be involved in monitoring monthly AMESA sampling procedures and or lab results etc.

The September 24, 2019 WMAC meeting was when we first learned that the AMESA lab analyses were not going to Durham, rather these were going directly to Covanta, which was alarming. Who puts the fox in charge of the hen house?

Covanta, whose operations the AMESA is intended to monitor, should not be the sole recipient of lab analyses of AMESA cartridge data.

While AMESA sampling data is not required for compliance, as per previous EA and ECA conditions cited above, the public must have complete confidence that sampling procedures and lab analyses are conducted appropriately as well as overseen and reported by qualified independent professionals.

From what is written in Report WR-10, Section 4, it appears that some time after the Fall 2019, the Region (and Covanta) reviewed the lab results on a monthly basis.

On March 30, 2021, in their 2020 ECA Annual Report, Durham finally provided the monthly summaries only, for the year 2020 only, but no underlying data.

See graph on page 31 of 2020 ECA Annual Report at:

https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/operations-documents/resources/2020/20210330_RPT_2020_DYEC_ECA_Annual_ACC.pdf

While Durham staff now write in Report WR-10 that they will report AMESA data quarterly, they made no commitment to provide the underlying data and related information that would be required to verify results as being an accurate representation of dioxins emissions.

From WR-10, you will see that Durham has no intention of providing AMESA results for 2015-2019.

In Section 2.11 Durham wrote:

However, the correlation of the AMESA results to the Source Test results was not achieved until 2020 following the implementation of several workplans that were developed with input from the MECP, Owners, manufacture, consultants and Covanta. All the AMESA data prior to correlation was not reliable and could not be used for the evaluation of performance or trend analysis. As a result of poor correlation testing there is no confidence in the AMESA data prior to 2020, therefore, release of this information will not be useful and may lead to inaccurate conclusions.

First: Durham staff claim that “correlation” to the Source Tests wasn’t achieved until 2020. However, what is written in the November 2018 Work Plan on page 7 raises questions around Durham’s statement.

4.3 Long Term Data Evaluation

As the AMESA appeared to report consistent results during the 2017 validation test program, subsequent long term sample results were included as part of the current AMESA performance evaluation. Since the successful completion of the 2017 validation test program, fourteen (14) monthly samples have been collected for each unit.

Second: The decision to withhold the AMESA data is inconsistent with several EA and ECA conditions which are listed further below in this document. This requires MECP's immediate attention especially after the public has made so many attempts to get data that is required to be publicly reported. Withholding data undermines public confidence in both the Owners as well as the Regulator, both of whom are required to provide adequate oversight and to protect the public.

The 2020 summary data is not verifiable or traceable. Without knowing that all underlying data has been properly collected, analyzed, evaluated, calculated, reviewed and signed by a qualified independent consultant, the public cannot have confidence in the summary data or DYEC operations.

In Section 5.7 of WR-10 Durham writes that *"the rationale for the invalidation of AMESA data will be included in the ECA Annual Report"*. Where is the evidence that what is described in the 2020 ECA is an appropriate approach for Data Validation?

From pages 30-31 in 2020 ECA Annual Report: *"To ensure valid data points are used in the calculation of a rolling average, a data point will be assessed if it falls outside of the established Target Range threshold of greater than 100% of the LoQ, i.e. $32 + 32 = 64$ pgTEQ/Rm3 @ 11%O₂. The suspected anomalous data point will be subjected to a data validation procedure before accepting or rejecting the data point."*

We have not seen anything that would confirm that a) this sole criterion is appropriate nor do they provide a copy of the Data Validation Procedure referenced and b) whether MECP has accepted Durham's above described approach. Appropriate and transparent data validation criteria are fundamental to the integrity of the AMESA monitoring results.

There is no commitment in WR-10 to supply underlying monitoring data, as is done with other monitoring reports. Durham also does not commit to posting ALL Ministry AMESA related correspondence so that the public would know that MECP is reviewing the monthly sampling data and responding where required, as occurs for ALL other monitoring.

Public Must Have Confidence that Monitoring Data is Reviewed by the Regulator

Because we have not been provided with complete documentation around AMESA development and reporting, our comments are based on the limited information released to Ms. Bracken in response to her FOI requests.

To repeat, we are very concerned that lab results go directly to Covanta and not to Durham directly, as staff claimed was the case. While Covanta would be required to provide

operational inputs so that someone qualified could calculate the final concentrations e.g. using the proper TEQ factors, those inputs and the lab analyses should be in the Owners' custody and then provided to an independent and qualified consultant, who would sign off on the final results, confirming that in their professional opinion these would be an accurate representation of the dioxins collection over the sampling period(s).

From what we have read in various documents, there appears to have been multiple changes to the Source Testing methods since the 2016 dioxins exceedance. Without having access to all the written comments that would have been supplied to the owners and Covanta over time around AMESA, including MECP's response to these changes, it's difficult for the public to have confidence that Stack Tests are an accurate representation of dioxins emissions, more so when AMESA monthly sampling data has been withheld by Durham and where the 2020 are not traceable or verifiable.

The incinerator went from 2015 and 2016 stack test failures for dioxins, to stack results after that, which were incredibly low.

Durham's consultant around AMESA matters from around 2015-2017, wrote the following on March 24, 2017 (attached) around Source Test Results and AMESA Correlation:

24 March 2017

TO: Leon Brasowski, Covanta

cc: Gioseph Anello, Durham

SUBJECT: AMESA Comparison Testing

Since our teleconference earlier this week I have been doing some investigation and thinking about how to approach the testing.

We all know that the results of the stack testing show that the levels in the stack are well below the limits set out in the ECA for the facility. The stack testing values obtained by ORTECH in the Fall 2016 testing are so low that the uncertainty in the value is high – I would suggest that it would be above the ± 50 pg TEQ/Rm³ uncertainty that has been documented for concentrations at the Canadian LOQ of 32 pg TEQ/Rm³. With that level of uncertainty, the AMESA cartridge results from the Fall 2016 testing agree with the stack results.

That simple comparison ignores the problem that the comparison between M23 results and the AMESA cartridge is a bit of an "apples and oranges" one – the M23 sample includes all the materials caught in the sampling train; the AMESA cartridge analysis approach ignores the material trapped in the probe and nozzle of the system. Including the probe catch with the AMESA cartridge, the AMESA results are at least an order of magnitude higher than the M23 test results – 5 – 59 times higher depending upon the sample.

Ms. Bracken received only limited information to her FOI requests. From what has been described in the April 2017 Work Plans, what exactly is being included when calculating concentrations – is it with or without probe rinses?

We have questions re TEQ factors used. From Sandra Thomas' May 2, 2017 email (attached) which responds to the April 11, 2017 Work Plan, several comments were provided at bottom of page 2 as below:

Covanta indicates the continuation of the use of NATO/CCME 1988 as the source of toxic equivalent (TEQ) factors. In April 2012, Ontario Regulation 419/05, was amended to reflect that the NATO/CCME 1988 TEQ factors were no longer reflecting the expected impact from PCDDs/PCDFs; and as such, the World Health Organization (WHO) TEQ factors were to be used at once to for such impact determination (this is also highlighted in the MOECC Summary of Standards and Guidelines to Support Ontario Regulation 419/05 - Air Pollution – Local Air Quality). The PCDDs/PCDFs in-stack TEQ concentrations are to be based on WHO TEQ factors, that includes the dioxin-like PCBs. (emphasis added)

However, Durham staff wrote in report WR 10, Section 3.6 as follows:

*The laboratory data provides values for each of the 17 dioxin and furan congeners. The respective toxic equivalency factor (TEF) for each dioxin and furan congener is applied to each value to obtain a total dioxin and furan total toxic equivalence (TEQ). The ECA for the DYEC specifies **the use of the NATO classification scheme and therefore the NATO TEF factors are applied to the TEQ calculation.** (emphasis added)*

We cannot determine if Sandra Thomas' advice as quoted above was amended in a subsequent letter. If it was amended, we would appreciate being provided with a copy of such a letter, along with all MECP comments to the November 14, 2018 Work Plan and subsequent Work Plans, if any. The public requires certainty that Durham and Covanta have implemented and are following all MECP direction.

A reading of the November 14, 2018 Work Plan indicates that Covanta was certainly looking at the AMESA sampling data results. Covanta was characterizing certain results as "outliers". Table 4 (below) on page 8 of the 2018 Work Plan (attached) indicates that for several sample periods, no data was included.

On page 9 of the 2018 Work Plan, it stated that Covanta reviewed past operational upsets during some periods, which upsets and conditions could have resulted in higher than "expected" dioxins emissions over those sampling periods.

Some results have been characterized as "outliers". It's not clear on what basis data were excluded and who made that decision. Approved data validation criteria should have been developed by an independent and qualified professional, with this reviewed and signed off on by MECP.

See Table 4 Nov. 14 2018 Work Plan Page 8

Table 4: Summary of Monthly AMESA Data Collected Post 2017 Validation Testing

Date Range (Start – Stop)	Unit 1		Unit 2	
	Sample Volume ⁽¹⁾	Dioxin Concentration ⁽²⁾	Sample Volume ⁽¹⁾	Dioxin Concentration ⁽²⁾
01 Jun 2017 – 30 Jun 2017	545.5	0.081	512.5	5.7
30 Jun 2017– 28 Jul 2017	504.0	0.063	483.3	8.0
28 Jul 2017 – 07 Sep 2017	383.3	0.080	371.7	521
07 Sep 2017 – 05 Oct 2017	514.9	0.049	500.9	35.5
05 Oct 2017– 02 Nov 2017	516.5	0.019	501.6	16.1
02 Nov 2017 – 01 Dec 2017	481.9	0.021	467.5	8.8
01 Dec 2017 – 29 Dec 2017	515.5	0.025	505.8	6.9
29 Dec 2017 – 26 Jan 2018	477.6	0.039	462.9	7.0
27 Jan 2018 – 01 Mar 2018 ⁽³⁾	531.5	0.037		
27 Jan 2018 – 21 Mar 2018 ⁽³⁾			454.5	14.1
02 Mar 2018 – 24 Apr 2018 ⁽³⁾	500.4	0.023		
21 Mar 2018 – 24 Apr 2018 ⁽³⁾			554.5	162.6
24 Apr 2018 – 22 May 2018	510.6	3.2	516.7	49.1
22 May 2018 – 22 Jun 2018 ⁽³⁾			517.6	8.7
22 May 2018 – 3 Jul 2018 ⁽³⁾	558.1	29.9		
3 Jul 2018 – 31 Jul 2018	473.4	22.9	476.2	9.3
31 Jul 2018 – 28 Aug 2018	474.0	12.8	478.2	4.7
Long Term Average	499.1	4.9	489.8 ⁽⁴⁾	14.5 ⁽⁴⁾

Notes:

- (1) Sample volume presented as cubic meters corrected to 25°C and 1 atmosphere.
- (2) All results presented as pg TEQ/Rm³ corrected to 25°C and 1 atmosphere, adjusted to 11% O₂, using NATO/CCMS (1989) toxicity equivalency factors with full detection limit.
- (3) Sampling times extended/shortened due to boiler outages.
- (4) Average excludes samples collected between 28 July and 7 September 2017 and 21 March and 24 April 2018 which appears to have been compromised and represent outliers.

EA and ECA Conditions relevant to AMESA Monitoring and Reporting

We fail to understand how Durham could have been allowed to withhold the AMESA data for as long as they have, given all the requirements to report Air Emissions monitoring data publicly.

Applicable EA and ECA Conditions include:

EA Condition 3 – Public Record

3. Public Record

- 3.1 Where a document, plan or report is required to be submitted to the ministry, the proponent shall provide two copies of the final document, plan or report to the Director: a copy for filing in the specific public record file maintained for the undertaking and a copy for staff use.
- 3.2 The proponent shall provide additional copies of the documents required for the public record file to the following for access by the public:
 - a) Regional Director;
 - b) District Manager;
 - c) Clerks of the Regional Municipality of Durham, the Regional Municipality of York, and the Municipality of Clarington; and,
 - d) Advisory Committee (as required in Condition 8 of this Notice of Approval).
- 3.3 The EAAB file number EA-08-02 shall be quoted on all documents submitted by the proponent pursuant to this Condition.

EA Condition 8.8 (g) -example of data to be provided:

g) Air Emissions Monitoring Plan required by Condition 12;

AMESA sampling is part of the DYEC Air Emissions Monitoring Plan, extract below page 13, Sec. 5.7 at: https://www.durhamyorkwaste.ca/en/environmental-monitoring/resources/Documents/AirEmissions/Air_Emissions_Monitoring_Plan_AEMP.pdf



AIR EMISSION MONITORING AND REPORTING PLAN

5.7 Long Term Dioxin and Furan Sampling System

The ECA, Section 7 Testing, Monitoring and Auditing include evaluation requirements for the Long-Term Sampling for Dioxins and Furans which are more typically applied to a continuous emission monitor.

ECA Requirement specifically states in Section 7.3.a:

"The Owner shall develop, install, maintain and update as necessary a long term sampling system, with a minimum monthly sampling frequency, to measure the concentration of Dioxins and Furans in the Undiluted Gases leaving the APC Equipment associated with each Boiler. The performance of this sampling system will be evaluated during the annual Source Testing programs in accordance with the principles outlined by 40 CFR 60, Appendix B, Specification 4."

This annual evaluation of the dioxin sample system according to the "principles of performance Specification 4" is interpreted to mean that as a minimum, flow to the long term sampling system will be subject to audit testing to ensure that the sampling system is receiving flue gas consistently with flue gas being emitted by the Main stack. The quantity and type of testing to evaluate this monitor will be established as a separate protocol that will be presented to the MOE six (6) months before Commencement Date of Operation. This approach will enable the final protocol to reflect developments in this topic over the period of time between now and Commencement Date of Operation

EA Condition 12.7:

12.7 The proponent shall post the reports of the air emissions monitoring systems on the proponent's web site for the undertaking.

ECA Condition 14.4 Monitoring and Testing Records

- (g) all records produced by the long term sampling program for Dioxins and Furans required by this Certificate;

ECA Condition 15 – Reporting:

1.

- (f) summaries and conclusions from the records required by Conditions 14.(3) through 14.(8) of this Certificate;
- (j) results of the evaluation of the performance of the long-term sampling system in determining the Dioxins and Furans emission trends and/or fluctuations for the year reported on as well as demonstrating the ongoing performance of the APC Equipment associated with the Boilers;

Conclusion and Requests to Regulator

MECP should not approve incinerators and then leave it to Owners like Durham Region or Operators like Covanta to make these enormously important decisions that directly affect public health, without also ensuring that monitoring plans have been developed, and data is reported, according to the conditions the Minister and Ministry set in the EA and ECA.

MECP cannot allow Owners like Durham Region to withhold monitoring data that is required by the EA and ECA.

MECP is responsible for ensuring that EA and ECA Conditions have been complied with. Where Owners/Operators have not, MECP should take remedial action.

Furthermore, as has been done with other monitoring plans, MECP must ensure that the Owners post all Ministry correspondence around AMESA on the DYEC website so that the public has evidence of AMESA monitoring “plan” approval and data review.

We ask that you give our concerns your closest attention and respond at the earliest opportunity.

Yours truly,

Linda Gasser, Whitby
Email: gasserlinda@gmail.com

Wendy Bracken, Newcastle
Email: wendy-ron@sympatico.ca

Kerry Meydam, Courtice
Email: ksam2@rogers.com

Cc: Jeff Yurek, Minister of the Environment, Conservation and Parks

Celeste Dugas, MECP Manager Durham-York District Office

Durham Region Council C/O Clerk

York Region Council C/O Clerk

Clarington Council C/O Clerks

Durham MPPs (L. Park, J. French, L. Coe, R. Phillips, P. Bethlenfalvy)

Attachments:

Durham Staff Report 2021 WR 10 June 2 re AMESA LTSS found at:
https://icreate7.esolutionsgroup.ca/11111068_DurhamRegion/en/regional-government/resources/Documents/Council/Reports/2021-Committee-Reports/Works/2021-WR-10.pdf

March 17, 2021 Letter to Durham Region Council -L. Gasser, W. Bracken, K. Meydam -see Pages 62-74 of March 24, 2021 Durham Council agenda at:

<https://calendar.durham.ca/meetings/Detail/2021-03-24-0930-Regional-Council-Meeting/389fe365-d7e7-4a65-984e-acf400b72c0e>

April 19, 2016 AMESA LTSS Work Plan

April 11, 2017 AMESA LTSS Work Plan

November 14, 2018 AMESA LTSS Work Plan

Sandra Thomas' May 2, 2017 email comments re April 11 2017 AMESA Work Plan

September 17, 2019 MECP letter to W. Bracken

March 24, 2017 John Chandler Memo to L. Brasowski, Covanta and G. Anello, Durham Region