

Highlights of Elevation Request (ER) Port Hope Residents 4 Managing Waste Responsibly (MWR)

1. Serious Health Concerns

- MWR had two medical experts review ENTECH-REM's proposal, and its self-assessment that the facility would pose no health risks. **Both experts expressed serious concern that the proposed facility would in fact have serious negative effects on the health of people in our community** (see MWR ER, Appendix C and D). Both experts outlined in great detail the specific dangers posed by toxic emissions, with a particular emphasis on the dangers posed by dioxins, and nanoparticles.
- Professor Vyvyan Howard, a medically qualified toxic-pathologist, concluded that ENTECH-REM's self-assessment of the health risks of the project is flawed and unreliable, and that **the public's health concerns regarding the proposed facility are "understandable and justified"**. (see MWR ER, Appendix D)
- Dr. Stan Blecher, a retired medical Doctor and Professor Emeritus of Molecular Biology and Genetics at the University of Guelph, concluded that ENTECH-REM's self-assessment "...fails to address the very serious health concerns that are associated with the proposal...**the conclusions that emissions from an ENTECH plant would not constitute health risks are patently erroneous.**" (See MWR ER, Appendix C).

2. No Track Record

- ENTECH-REM has no track record. By their own admission, they have **never owned or operated any waste facility.**
- The technology they propose using has **no track record in North America or Western Europe** (see MWR ER, section 2.2). It has no track record anywhere in the world processing the type of waste stream proposed for Port Hope. **It has no track record anywhere in the world processing anywhere near the quantity of waste proposed for the Port Hope facility** (see MWR ER, section 2.2).

3. Unreliable Emissions Data

- The Municipality's peer-reviewer of the proposal has publically stated that ENTECH-REM has provided "...**insufficient information** to understand how their claimed emission rates were determined", and that the emissions information that has been provided contains **major errors** (see MWR ER, section 2.2.3.2).

4. Threat to Local Agriculture

- The proposed facility would result in **hazardous dioxins being emitted.** Dioxins can **bio-accumulate readily in the food chain**, and are capable of causing, among other things, birth defects and cancer (see MWR ER, section 6.2). ENTECH-REM does not address these concerns at all.

- The Northumberland Federation of Agriculture (NFA) supports MWR’s elevation request, and has expressed serious concerns about the proposed facility, including concerns about the emission of toxins, and the stigma which may come to be associated with farm products from Port Hope and Northumberland (see MWR ER, Appendix X).

5. Threats to Local Tourism

- ENTECH-REM claims that there is “limited tourism” around the location of the proposed facility (see MWR ER, section 5.2.1). In fact, **this is false.**
- Within 1km of the proposed facility is the Lakeshore Road, an official part of **Ontario’s Waterfront trail** (see MWR ER, section 5.2.4). There is also an official municipal **cycling route** within 1km of the proposed facility. If the proposed facility becomes a reality, cyclists on this official route would have to share portions of that route with 40 to 50 garbage trucks on a daily basis (see MWR ER, section 5.2.4). Within the 2km radius of the location of the proposed facility are also wetlands and woodlands that are used for **bird-watching** events every year (see MWR ER, 5.2.4).
- More broadly, ENTECH-REM continues to refuse to acknowledge even the potential that the proposed incinerator could have an **impact on tourism to Port Hope**, a critically important economic driver for the town. This, despite the fact that there have **already been cases of home sales falling through in Port Hope as a direct result of this proposal** (see MWR Appendix F).

6. Disrespecting Port Hope Residents

- ENTECH-REM has consistently given Port Hope Residents **changing and contradictory information** about the project. When residents have asked written to ENTECH-REM requesting answers to important outstanding questions, **ENTECH-REM has refused to respond** (see MWR ER, section 9.0).
- Rather than providing interested persons with an opportunity to make meaningful input into project review and development, as required per the MOE’s *Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Waste Management Project*, ENTECH-REM repeatedly **refused to share critical information** about the project until the last possible moment (see MWR ER, section 9.2.3).

7. Need for Elevation to Individual Environmental Assessment

- Given the chronic inaccuracies and misrepresentations contained in ENTECH-REM’s Environmental Screening Report, **it is clear that the proponent is either incapable or unwilling to assess its own project with any degree of accuracy**, and therefore does not have the credibility to continue in a self-assessment process.
- Further, Individual Environmental Assessments are intended for large-scale complex projects that have the potential for significant environmental effects. This accurately describes ENTECH-REM’s proposed project.