

CITIZEN SUMMARY

Public Meeting on the Clarkson Airshed Study and CASAC

Held by: Ogilvie, Ogilvie & Company (OOC) – Facilitator, and
Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE)

Thursday, May 28, 2009 @ 7:00 p.m. at Lorne Park Secondary School, Clarkson

See **Contact Information** and **Editorial Note** at end of this document.

Approximately 300 residents attended this public forum, organized by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) through **Greg Sones**, Director of the Central Region. The meeting was facilitated by **Robb Ogilvie**, Managing Partner of OOC, and featured an initial presentation by **Dr. Isobel Heathcote**, who was the Technical Facilitator and Editor of the *Synthesis of Expert Responses: Clarkson Airshed Expert Consultation* based on the supporting document entitled *Verbatim Responses of the Experts: Clarkson Airshed Expert Consultation*.

Both documents were dated May 28, 2009, and were handed out in hard copy to all attendees at the meeting. There was no opportunity to read these lengthy and largely technical documents prior to the meeting.

Both the *Synthesis* and *Verbatim Responses* documents may be viewed on the new Clarkson Air website at: <http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/air/clarksonair/consultation.php>

Charles Sousa, MPP for Mississauga South, made introductory remarks. He thanked Pat Mullin (Ward 2 Councillor) and local citizen advocate Dr. Boyd Upper (both present) for their years of involvement on the air quality issue, and recognized all the ratepayer groups for their roles as well. He appreciated that provincial Environment and Health responses to the Clarkson Airshed Study are now being coordinated going forward, as the community has been asking. He wants current members of the Clarkson Airshed Study Advisory Committee (CASAC) to remain on the Committee alongside the new members.

Interjection from the audience: "Where's Kevin?" [in reference to Oakville MPP Kevin Flynn who is Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of the Environment]

Charles Sousa replied, "All I can say is, I'm here."

Robb Ogilvie then introduced himself and Dr. Isobel Heathcote, a member of the OOC team, and indicated the ongoing discussion at the meeting was being keyboarded and would be made available in a summary report of the meeting within a week. He stated that the task given to the consulting team by MOE was to strengthen and improve CASAC's operation. OOC interviewed all the present CASAC members and found that the recommendations of Phase II and Phase III of the Clarkson Airshed Study were considered to be conflicting and ambiguous.

The Clarkson Airshed Expert Consultation was initiated on the premise that there was insufficient science to prove that the local air is compromised. He then outlined the members of the Inter-Agency Health and Environment Working Group:

Louise Aubin	Peel Public Health
Peter Steer	Halton Public Health
Greg Sones	Director, MOE Central Region
Tracy Goodwin	Halton-Peel District Manager, MOE Central Region
Dan Orr	Manager, Technical Support, MOE Central Region

This Working Group invited “five distinguished academics to provide expert advice” on the Clarkson Airshed Study, and developed the questions to be asked of these experts. The purpose of tonight’s meeting was to present the *Synthesis* of the expert consultation, as created by Dr. Heathcote.

Dr. Isobel Heathcote began her presentation by displaying the map of the Clarkson Airshed Study (CAS) boundaries [available in the *Verbatim* report]. The CAS was conducted because it was suspected that the Airshed was taxed, based on complaints. The Ministry chose to track the contaminants that normally are emitted by industry, and ozone was not part of the study. The results of the Clarkson Airshed Study revealed that, yes, parameters were exceeded, and there was justification for the local concern. Modeling of transportation vs. industrial sources led to questions of whether the science was right, as so many of the emissions were contributed by transportation.

The Delphi Method was used for facilitating the expert opinions: the questions were sent separately and anonymously to the experts. Dr. Heathcote began to review the first round of questions that were sent, starting with Question #1 “How does the air quality in the Clarkson Airshed compare to: other urban areas...” She indicated that the level of air pollution in Clarkson is good compared to other urbanized parts of the world (e.g. in Asia ...).

Comment from the audience: We don’t want to be compared to Mexico!

Dr. Heathcote agreed, and then cited that “winds from the N and NW keep the airshed pretty clean some of the time”. The conclusion from Question #1 – how does the quality of our air compare to other areas; was that the airshed requires improvement and this should be done through regional and federal partnerships on a larger scale with longer-term improvement strategies.

Question from the audience: How will putting an 850 MW gas-fired power plant into this area affect the air quality, given that it already “requires improvement”?

Dr. Heathcote said there were 2 answers:

- 1) the air quality here is “typical” for an urban area
- 2) the OOC team haven’t reviewed emissions data for the proposed power plant in any way and it was outside the scope of their consultation

Question from the same audience member: Using the actual numbers given by one of the power plant proponents (then cited some details), the amount of emissions in the airshed will DOUBLE. Scientific evaluation of the health impacts of these emissions refers to “sensitive receptors” when in fact this is referring to PEOPLE. The Ministry of Energy wants to put a power plant within 400 yards of homes, schools and a shopping centre [speaking of the proposed Oakville site]. It is crazy to put a power plant here. As an academic and expert in this area, what does Dr. Heathcote think will be the impact?

Robb Ogilvie said Dr. Heathcote was not prepared to answer this question as part of her preparation for this presentation, but that if she wished she could answer as an individual.

Dr. Heathcote agreed and said she would answer as a senior academic at a major research university. Her response would be that she wants to see the data. Her "response in general terms would be that it depends". It might be "OK, if there were off-sets from other industries" and could be "OK or better for the neighbourhood".

Comment from the audience: It is not a coincidence that this expert consultation started last Fall (2008) at the same time that the Minister of Energy started the RFQ process for a power plant in this area. This MOE consultation is an attempt to neutralize the impact.

Dr. Heathcote went on to discuss Question #2 – the quality of the monitoring; saying it was "pretty good". The MOE wanted to be sure it was monitoring properly before spending millions of dollars on further monitoring. Modeling should include that traffic has increased. There was no consensus among the experts on how to improve the monitoring.

Regarding Question #3 – the present AQI system; this ties in with regional statistics on air moving here from the U.S. The Air Quality Health Index is a new way of tying local monitoring data to human health.

Regarding Question #4 – the population health risk; the conclusion is that it is "not good all of the time" but "this is the price of living in a city" and we are experiencing "typical impacts".

Regarding Question # 5 – air contaminants of greatest concern; it is hard but worth monitoring for some of the contaminants which bear more study (e.g. ultrafine particles smaller than PM_{2.5})

Regarding Question #6 – if additional monitoring was warranted, e.g. for relative contributions from different sources; the conclusion was this needs to be monitored, BUT, we already know a lot, so there is not enough reason to continue to monitor for human health when it can be modeled from other existing studies. The cumulative impact of multiple sources needs more monitoring for a longer period.

Regarding Question #7 – other comments; there is a need to identify sources of particulate matter.

Question from the audience: It is a simple issue to continue monitoring – why would it cost millions of dollars?

Dr. Heathcote replied that the transboundary contributions to the airshed require assessment of origin to explain why our air may get worse even if a power plant DOESN'T go in. There is also the issue of when you measure air quality, are you actually measuring what people are breathing?

Question from the audience: Why is the expert at the front of the room saying that the air quality is "OK", when an expert at the March 3rd Town Hall meeting at the Ontario Racquet Club said the [Clarkson Airshed Study] found that Clarkson has a stressed airshed [that is 14% worse than the provincial average]?

Summary of the March 3, 2009 OPA Town Hall meeting at the ORC is at:

http://www.miranet.ca/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=59:town-hall-on-a-gas-fired-power-plant-in-mississauga-south&catid=1:latest-news

Dr. Heathcote explained that their consulting team didn't have the context of the power plant when they did their work.

Question from the audience (East Oakville): There will always be experts to take both sides, e.g. in a legal case. Why is there no demonstration in this work of the additive effect of the proposed power plant in this airshed? Dr. Heathcote's use of the word "off-set" is curious – could she explain?

Dr. Heathcote stated, "This is awkward for us", being asked about the addition of a power plant, as they had a very specific mandate in doing this expert evaluation. They were not engaged to do a review of the power plant.

Greg Sones at this point stood up and introduced himself as the MOE Director for the Central Region and stated this process was the result of bringing Ogilvie, Ogilvie & Company in to work with CASAC and CASAC membership. CASAC had concerns over the modeling data and was it done properly. One of the Ogilvie recommendations was to conduct an independent expert consultation. Proponents will have to study cumulative impacts. A successful proponent will be selected by the OPA and they will need to get all necessary approvals from the MOE. The successful proponent will have to provide a report of the cumulative impact of the power plant emissions to the Airshed.

The MOE letter to CASAC concerning the decision to retain Robb Ogilvie of OOC is at:

http://www.miranet.ca/docs/MOE_Letter_to_CASAC_Sept_23_2008.pdf

Comment from the audience: Bill 51 [Section 23] means the plant can go anywhere, regardless of the environmental impact.

Bill 51: *Planning and Conservation Land Statute Law Amendment Act, 2006*

http://www.ontla.on.ca/web/bills/bills_detail.do?locale=en&BillID=455&isCurrent=false&detailPage=bills_detail_the_bill&Intranet=

Greg Sones stated that the proponent will be required to have an approval from the Ministry and they will be required to look at the impact of the plant on this community, and that [the analysis] will be done by the proponent and submitted to the MOE.

Question from the audience: What if the cumulative impact is shown?

Greg Sones: Mitigation would have to be done by the proponent of the plant.

Comment from the audience: We've not learned anything tonight here at all. This is not a "typical" environment, e.g. we have Petro-Canada and the [St. Lawrence] cement plant. This is a cynical government and a political process. Two [Liberal] seats are at risk in this area [Mississauga South and Oakville]. If the government wants to put the plant in, they can do it.

Comment from the audience (East Oakville): "Tonight's report shows us what we're up against." He cited the opinion of expert Gary Foley regarding Question #5 (1st round) about the air contaminants of greatest health concern: "I believe that PM_{2.5} is the pollutant of greatest concern. However, I believe that there may be synergies between PM_{2.5} and various organic compounds and that this is a very difficult area to focus on." Speaker then cited expert Michael Brauer on the same question: "PM_{2.5} concentrations are elevated...the heavy regional impact suggests that extra attention should be paid to local sources as the airshed is already under stress. The industrial impact (estimated at 25%) seems quite high compared to other urban areas." This is good information for us (the public), that one expert says the airshed is under stress.

Dr. Heathcote said that she doesn't disagree, and that it is "tough to synthesize differing expert opinion." As she had stated previously, she indicated that the reason some of the experts' comments were unclear was because they are academics.

Pat Mullin, Councillor, Mississauga Ward 2: The Mayor sends her regrets for not being able to attend tonight, because of the short timeframe of notice prior to the meeting. There would not have been enough room here tonight if everyone could have come [*the room was full and every seat taken, with more brought in, and with some people standing*].

In 2007, she was appointed to CASAC by John Budz [the MOE District Manager for Halton and Peel at the time]. The placement of monitors was part of their work. There were to be four (4) and the Peel Health Dept. helped CASAC determine where to put them and what to monitor for.

In 2008, CASAC issued three (3) Resolutions which were entirely appropriate in terms of its mandate. Boyd Upper will discuss these in more detail. After these 3 Resolutions, CASAC was suddenly deemed to be "dysfunctional" and the experts were brought in. CASAC *wasn't* dysfunctional.

Pat stated she'd like Charles to stand up in the Ontario Legislature and say there is no integrity within the MOE. How can they water down their own data? This Committee (CASAC) wants an Action Plan, not another Committee. She is insulted that the MOE is questioning the data now. Pat urged Charles to do this before the Legislature adjourns in June. There is another agenda here. For the new CASAC, there'd better not be a Ministry Chair but a citizen Chair.

Charles Sousa replied that he celebrated Lakeview Generating Station being shut down. He is proud of the green initiatives of his government, independent of the local issues. This doesn't minimize the issue in Clarkson – he breathes the same air. He is doing everything he can in the House to fight the issue.

The zoning is already in place. He is happy that the Resolution [opposing a plant in the Clarkson Airshed Study area] was passed by Mississauga Council, which strengthens our community's voice.

Ref: Council Resolution 0078-2009, dated April 8, 2009:
http://www.mississauga.ca/file/COM/resolution_amendedpowerplant.pdf

There is not good air here and efforts have been made by the government to reduce emissions, e.g. with the Toxic Reduction Strategy, and now the MOE has come forward with the plan for a reconstituted CASAC.

He (Charles) is the only one standing up in the House talking about this. The community Petition, which Oakville is joining, gives him the opportunity to speak about this on an almost daily basis. We don't want a plant, we want reductions. He is working side by side with the Ministries and the Ministers. He doesn't want the data watered down either.

He doesn't think the MOE is doing all this to support the Ministry of Energy and the OPA to bring in a power plant. He agrees action is what we need. The MOE's cumulative and broader look at the Airshed is an important sign that they are taking this seriously.

He has tried to have Opposition members speak up in the House and they haven't. Yes, he will make the remarks Pat has suggested in the Legislature.

Dr. Boyd Upper, Citizen Chair, Clear the Air Coalition; and Southdown Station Community Advisory Committee: He thanked everyone for coming tonight, which shows the importance of air quality to this community. The citizens have been fighting on this issue for 20 years. He reviewed the Petro-Canada expansion, and formation of Clear the Air Coalition with Rob Burton, now the Mayor of Oakville. CTAC was formed by 10 residents' group from the Clarkson area and Oakville to deal with Sithe – the Agreement they signed will cost Sithe \$45 million to implement. The MOE was NOT involved in this negotiation and he was surprised at the time, thinking that this should be the role of the MOE.

Air quality standards in Ontario are not adequate, as stated in public comments by the Medical Officers of Health for Halton, Peel and Toronto that "Ontario's air quality standards are not protective of human health".

<http://sirepub.halton.ca/cache/2/th5mns551r1acfrbdzanzwqh/7673405312009051514950.PDF>

http://www5.mississauga.ca/agendas/planning/2008/06_23_08/Item07SouthdownDistrictPoliciesReport.pdf (Appendix 4: pp54-7)

<http://www.toronto.ca/health/hphe/pdf/futureEnergyMix.pdf>

Proceedings: Air Quality as a Public Health Issue: Medical Officers of Health Air Pollution Workshop http://www.cleanairpartnership.org/pdf/health_air_pollution_workshop_0206.pdf

For example, Nanticoke is the largest coal-fired power plant in North America, and even IT meets the current standards. Sithe got its Certificate of Approval in 2002, and doesn't have to submit anything as part of this public process. Other proponents will be dirtier than the Sithe proposal. The OPA's RFP process is not a request to reduce emissions, but gives a mandate to increase power generation.

Further to the March 3rd Town Hall meeting at the Ontario Racquet Club, OPA's touted standards in the RFP for the "lowest emissions ever" didn't stay in the RFP for long: on March 15th the lower emission standards were increased by 50%, which allows cheaper equipment to be used. This is a race to the bottom. The dirtiest plant will be the cheapest and will win.

Ref: The OPA released the final version of their Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Southwest GTA in mid-March 2009. This and other documents are available through the OPA's Generation Procurement webpage for the SWGTA at:
<http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/GP/Page.asp?PageID=861&SiteNodeID=215>

When CASAC was formed, no Terms of Reference were pre-written by the MOE; they were written by the CASAC members themselves. CASAC received its mandate from Phase IV of the Clarkson Airshed Study. There was to be an air quality management process, with continuous monitoring paid for by the separate Clarkson Airshed Industrial Advisory Group [CASIA] which had 11 members (and two reps on CASAC). Under Phase IV, CASAC was to go to the Southdown industries and ask them to go beyond compliance and reduce their emissions. CASAC could only use moral suasion – there was no legislative authority, but Mayor McCallion had agreed to visit industry to support CASAC's efforts to reduce pollution.

CASAC was at the point of starting this process, when the 850MW power plant was announced for the Southwest GTA in 2008. For volunteers to then go to local industry asking for reductions in order to improve the air quality, while another Ministry (Energy) was seeking to add emissions to the airshed was absurd.

Dr. Upper then described the three (3) CASAC Resolutions which were passed in July 2008, which Councillor Mullin previously referenced:

- 1) No gas-fired power plant:
http://www.miranet.ca/docs/CASAC_Resolution1_July_23_2008.pdf
- 2) Measure acrolein and acrylonitrile:
http://www.miranet.ca/docs/CASAC_Resolution2_July_23_2008.pdf
- 3) Request for Ministry of the Environment's support of CASAC:
http://www.miranet.ca/docs/CASAC_Resolution3_July_23_2008.pdf

At the time of the third Resolution, monitoring was going to industry, as it was paid for by industry; the MOE response at the time: they would "archive" it, according to Dr. Upper. These resolutions were consistent with CASAC's mandate, yet Robb Ogilvie said they were "dysfunctional". The Ministry of the Environment has been dysfunctional for two (2) decades. In June 2003 the MOE received the first data from the Clarkson Airshed Study, and now it is May 2009: what has been done to improve our Airshed since then? NOTHING.

In 2007, three (3) monitors were placed on a 1 km stretch of Royal Windsor Drive and during the period June 27-Sept. 28 only 4 days worth of data were captured. After delays, this report was only released this Spring.

Ref: April 24, 2009: **Clarkson Airshed Study: Addendum to Part II – The Ambient Air Monitoring Program: South Mississauga (Clarkson) and Oakville sampling results for acrolein, acrylonitrile and dichloromethane in ambient air, Summer 2007.**
<http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/publications/7074e.pdf>

Then in 2008, monitoring was promised by the MOE, but it wasn't done "due to bad weather."

In 2009, MOE says it will now monitor and will identify the sources of emissions and then will decide what to do in 2010. Meanwhile the OPA contract will be awarded in August 2009.

We're tired and fed up after so long. The Ministry of the Environment is deaf and working in a silo. This is a political decision. The Mississauga Mayor and Council have spoken, our federal MP Paul Szabo has said no to a power plant here, there is a Petition with 1,000's of signatures saying no to a power plant being presented by MPP Charles Sousa in the Legislature, the

representatives of 17 residents' groups who met with Environment Minister John Gerretsen on April 21, 2009 all said no. Yet all we're hearing is that there will be a gas-fired power plant.

"IT'S TIME FOR A CHANGE". [*thunderous applause*].

Maureen Shaw, President, Clarkson Fairfields South Ratepayers Association (CFSRA): Despite being on the Southdown Station Committee she is not "behind" Sithe and there should be no gas-fired plant in this area. Everyone is worn out. CASAC is not dysfunctional, and the newly constituted CASAC should retain present members (naming Boyd Upper, Julie Desjardins and Pat Mullin). How many members from industry were envisioned for the new CASAC? St. Lawrence Cement was on CASAC, yet they sold land to Invenergy in support of that proponent's bid to build a power plant in the Clarkson Airshed!

Referring to the MOE's Clarkson Air website article on CASAC, it sounds like the MOE will write the new Terms of Reference – who will be on the Committee? Her recommendation: one rep from each residents' association in the area (as met with Environment Minister Gerretsen on April 21, and no more than an equal number of industrial members.

Summary of the Mississauga South Residents' Associations meeting with the Minister is at:
http://www.miranet.ca/docs/Summary_April_21_2009_Meeting_John_Gerretsen.pdf

Greg Sones responded that this was a good recommendation having 17 ratepayer associations on CASAC. There are Oakville residents' groups as well, and he has heard from them prior to this meeting. He is prepared to take that back and say the recommendation from here tonight was to have the presidents of the ratepayers associations invited to sit on the committee. He thinks this is a good way of engaging the community. To respond to an earlier question, he (as an MOE Director) would chair CASAC, at least to start.

Charles Sousa clarified that existing members would be welcome to remain on CASAC.

Greg Sones stated that the existing information on the Clarkson Air website is that the Ministry is looking to expand CASAC by six (6) community members, with no new industry members. He affirmed that the Ministry has invited all the current CASAC members to stay on the committee. He also commented that the Ministry has introduced 59 new or updated air quality standards for Ontario. They have changed the standards to be more protective of human health. He said it is important for him to take back to the Ministry what he has heard tonight – that the community doesn't want a plant here.

The CASAC Application Form is on the Clarkson Air website at:
<http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/air/clarksonair/application.php>

Question from the audience: Referring to the expert replies received on the Questions asked, and the MOE version of the *Synthesis* (through their consultant OOC): WHAT DOES ALL THIS MEAN? What is the point of all this?

Greg Sones replied that this is NOT the Ministry's *Synthesis*. MOE will further evaluate the *Verbatim Responses of the Experts*, not the *Synthesis* and take it back to CASAC and discuss it with CASAC. He commented that he is open to engage the community on how much more study do they want and how much do they want to focus on action plans.

Question from the same audience member: What are the standards of human health assessments?

Dan Orr, Manager, Technical Support, MOE Central Region: Any health impact study, risk assessment would put that information into perspective with existing air standards that are part of Regulation 419.

Ref: This link provides access to the new standards per Regulation 419:
<http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/en/air/ministry/index.php>

Question from the same audience member: Has the Ministry ever allowed a Certificate of Approval when they have not met the standards? Actually, I know the answer to that because I have done Certificates of Approval and the answer is yes they do. Sorry, a rhetorical question, I will not embarrass you like that.

Comment from the same audience member: We should all think about the Tamils. They received federal and provincial attention to their issue very quickly by blocking roads. We need to get attention.

Statement by a representative of Oakville MP Terence Young: The member couldn't be here tonight but has signed the Petition.

Hugh Arrison, Representative of the Mississauga Oakridge Ratepayers' Association: We need to apply common sense to the expert report. There are individuals suffering now and being monitored by the MOE and the Ministry of Health for their physical reactions to increased air pollution (e.g. on smog days). Is this being taken into account?

Representative of Peel Health in the audience: This question can't be answered because of privacy issues. The mandate of the Peel Health Dept. is with population health, not individual health. Individuals need to see their own doctors.

Question from the audience: As an 18-year resident of the community, I haven't heard what Sithe's legal standing is, but they have completed most of their licensing? It appears that the MOE is doing these studies to justify the deal that has already been done. When in doubt, study it to death. We're getting tired. We're talking here about modeling, but not simulation, and I can't believe simulation is not being done – models exist. We as a community have been too nice – from now on, we don't ask, we need to TELL. We need an Action Plan from the new CASAC.

Greg Sones: You are correct re Sithe having approvals. But since 2002, Sithe has undertaken a number of amendments to their proposal, but not updated their Certificate of Approval. Now MOE is asking them for the cumulative effects, and from MOE's perspective, Sithe does need to amend their Certificate.

Note from Greg Sones: I think the person may be referencing work that Sithe may have done as part of their Environmental Screening Report in relation to the Electricity Projects Regulation under the Environmental Assessment Act:
<http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/envision/gp/4021e.pdf>

In August 2007, the process regarding a gas-fired power plant in the Southwest GTA started, with hearings before the Ontario Energy Board (OEB). The Ministry of Energy asked the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) to look at more renewables. OPA was supposed to report back in March 2009, but they are not yet ready to present their revised plan. Bill 150 (Green Energy Act) has meanwhile been passed. The IPSP is still before the OEB, and the OPA is working on a revised IPSP.

Ref: The OPA's **Integrated Power System Plan (IPSP)**, dated August 29, 2007, is available at: <http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/Page.asp?PageID=924&ContentID=6222>

Bill 150: *Green Energy and Green Economy Act, 2009*
<http://www.greenenergyact.ca/Page.asp?PageID=122&ContentID=1114>

Doug MacKenzie, President, Chartwell-Maple Grove Ratepayers Association (in East Oakville): I was formerly a Senior Vice-President at Petro-Canada, and I can tell you the easiest place to get ticketed is Ontario. Ontario has the lowest standards. The RFP for the power plant is weak, with pathetic emission standards. What can we do? The proponents will sue because their proposals will meet the standard. Regarding the province's new Green Plan (Bill 150), while commendable, a lot of the words are fluff.

JoAnne Butler (Vice President, Electricity Resources, OPA) keeps talking about clean renewables, but biomass energy is not clean. Four of the six monitors shown on the Clarkson Airshed Study boundary map are in Oakville and upwind of the industrial area. An uprising is already starting in Oakville. Off-sets must be local, not in Thunder Bay, for instance. To off-set the emissions from the Sithe plant, we would need over 2 million acres of forest located here.

Comment from the audience: The plan appears to be to wear us down and wear us out. We are on the verge of winning. Boyd Upper has gotten us to this point and we need to support him and the effort. Sithe has its approvals and will get the nod. Charles is working hard – let's get some action, and go to Queen's Park and say we won't take it anymore.

Comment from the audience: Thanks to Charles Sousa, Paul Szabo, Pat Mullin and Boyd Upper for their work and support, and thanks to the MOE for going over time on the meeting length [*this said at 9:25 p.m. – the meeting was supposed to end at 9:00 p.m.*]. We in Mississauga South support Oakville too – they are our neighbours. Many more would have been here tonight but there was such short notice. This is a major health issue. Any online search will bring up so much material on the detrimental effects of air pollution. We have children and seniors living here, who are particularly vulnerable. We (including the citizens in this room) have to be the voice of these people. JoAnne Butler's [VP, Electricity Resources, OPA] column in the *Mississauga News* said there would be no impact on our health.

Mississauga News, May 5, 2009: "Clean, Green power" by JoAnne Butler
<http://www.mississauga.com/article/26928> (*Opinion column*)

Mississauga News, May 12, 2009: "Missing the obvious" by Andrew Hamilton-Smith
<http://www.mississauga.com/article/27230> (*Letter to the Editor in rebuttal*)

Andrew Ganguly, Executive Member of CFSRA: After confirming that Dr. Heathcote was the technical editor of the *Synthesis* of expert opinion, he questioned the emphasis on certain parts

of the *Synthesis* which were reported during the initial presentation, and then cited an expert statement under Question #5 (1st round) concerning the contaminants of greatest concern, which indicates the air here is not "OK".

Dr. Heathcote responded that she had mentioned this opinion in her presentation, but read it again: "One expert noted that the industrial impact (estimated at 25% of PM_{2.5} for Clarkson) seems quite high compared to other urban areas."

Greg Sones then discussed abatement activity. The goal is to work with industry to reduce emissions as part of Phase IV of the Clarkson Airshed Study; to work with industry to move beyond compliance.

Question from the audience: How are you going to do that if a new power plant comes into the area with even more emissions?

Greg Sones replied that the successful proponent will have to demonstrate that the plant is not going to contribute cumulative impacts.

Exclamation from the audience: HOW IS THIS POSSIBLE?

Greg Sones continued that per Regulation 419, new or updated air standards are coming into effect in 2010 and 2013 and emitters will be required to meet these if they aren't already. In terms of where the Ministry is right now, one of the things they are looking to do is sit down with CASAC to work on an action plan to address air quality in Clarkson and it is not just industrial – some come emissions come from the outside. The Ministry will also work with the Health Units to look at regional air issues (broader issues) and will bring other partners to the table.

Question from the audience: Are you actually going to force Petro-Canada and St. Lawrence Cement and the rest of industry to reduce their emissions or are you going to ask?

Greg Sones replied that industry must meet the new standards for lower emissions and "the Ministry will work with industry and the community to see if we can reduce these emissions further".

Pat Mullin: She has received an e-mail from a resident, stating that since this government is promoting a Living Green agenda, why would the Liberals not consider making Mississauga South / Oakville a pilot project in an active and engaged way to reduce energy consumption and utilize renewable sources of energy?

Maureen Shaw: Referring to the previous question about modeling and simulation, there has been modeling done, but it has been subject to interpretation.

Sithe's Plan B would not adhere to their MOE Certificate of Approval as previously accepted, and would break its [2001] agreement with the citizens in order to now include water cooling since air cooling is expensive. The three (3) other proponents have water cooling planned because it is cheaper and the MOE has such lax standards. Water cooling will create vapour clouds and black ice and captures PM_{2.5}. This is a rush to the bottom with concern to our health. Why is there not an MOE regulation that air cooling is the only acceptable way? While the community doesn't want a power plant at all, surely there must be standards!

Ref: The Nov. 2001 Sithe Agreement with certain residents groups is at:
<http://www.southdown-station.com/pdfFiles/SouthdownRatepayerAgreement.pdf>

The explanation of the reason for this Agreement is at:
http://www.miranet.ca/docs/Boyd_Upper_re_Sithe_Agreement.pdf

Question from the audience: (Further to an earlier question) Will the MOE make a commitment to do a complete simulation of what a power plant would do here?

Greg Sones replied that he couldn't give a commitment on that, and that he has to go back to the technical experts. He is not sure a simulation could be done by July but CASAC should have that discussion.

Note: the OPA will be awarding a contract by August 31, 2009:
http://www.powerauthority.on.ca/Page.asp?PageID=122&ContentID=6866&SiteNodeID=134&BL_ExpandID

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Contact information:

Greg Sones , Director, MOE Central Region	greg.sones@ontario.ca
Dan Orr , Manager, Technical Support, MOE	dan.orr@ontario.ca
Ogilvie, Ogilvie and Company (OOC)	http://www.mobalizers.com/
Robb Ogilvie , Managing Partner, OOC	mobal@ils.net
Dr. Isobel Heathcote	iheathco@uoquelp.ca
JoAnne Butler , VP, Electricity Resources, OPA	joanne.butler@powerauthority.on.ca
Pat Mullin , Councillor, Mississauga Ward 2	pat.mullin@mississauga.ca
Hazel McCallion , Mayor of Mississauga	hazel.mccallion@mississauga.ca
Charles Sousa , MPP for Mississauga South	csousa.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org
Paul Szabo , MP for Mississauga South	szabop1@parl.gc.ca
Rob Burton , Mayor of Oakville	mayor@oakville.ca
Kevin Flynn , MPP for Oakville	kflynn.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org
Terence Young , MP for Oakville	Young.T@parl.gc.ca

Editorial Note: This summary was reviewed by the named representatives of Mississauga South citizen groups who spoke at the meeting, together with other residents' group representatives in attendance. It was also previewed to Councillor Pat Mullin and MPP Charles Sousa. Greg Sones, MOE Director of the Central Region, was given the opportunity to review the statements attributed to him, and the questions that prompted them, to ensure accuracy. Ogilvie and Ogilvie are also preparing their own summary of the meeting, which will be linked from this document once available. The shaded boxes contain links for reference and have been added from a number of sources

Any additional comments may be sent to secretary@miranet.ca.

June 17, 2009