

**PORTLANDS ENERGY CENTRE
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM
CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATIONS PHASES**

**COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE
ORIENTATION MEETING**

DRAFT MEETING RECORD

November 22, 2006
Toronto Fire Academy
Toronto, Ontario



This Draft Meeting Record was prepared by Lura Consulting. Lura is providing third-party consultation services for the Portlands Energy Centre Community Liaison Committee (CLC). This summary captures the key discussion points from the November 22nd, 2006 CLC Orientation Meeting. It is not intended as a verbatim transcript, and is subject to review by meeting participants. If you have any questions or comments regarding the Draft Meeting Record, please contact either:

Ted Gruetzner

Senior Manager, Public Affairs

Portlands Energy Centre

Phone: 416-592-1591

ted.gruetzner@opg.com

Susan Hall

Senior Consultant

Lura Consulting

Phone: 416-536-9674

Fax: 416-536-3453

shall@lura.ca



**PORTLANDS ENERGY CENTRE
COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE ORIENTATION MEETING
DRAFT MEETING RECORD**

NOVEMBER 22ND, 2006, 7:00 P.M. – 9:30 P.M.
Toronto Fire Academy - TORONTO

1. ABOUT THE PEC COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE ORIENTATION MEETING

The November 22nd Orientation Meeting was convened by the Portlands Energy Centre (PEC) to introduce the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) to area residents, community group and business representatives. Specifically, the meeting was designed to seek feedback on the proposed CLC Terms of Reference, orient participants to the proposed role of the CLC during construction and operation of the PEC, and to begin developing the CLC's first work plan.

Approximately 70 people attended the CLC Orientation Meeting, including area residents, representatives from community groups, local businesses and environmental organizations, media representatives, Provincial government agencies and PEC representatives. Representatives from the City of Toronto - including City Councillors or their designates - also participated in the session.

This Meeting Record focuses primarily on the feedback and comments provided by participants at the meeting and through written comments at or following the session. Sections 2-4 of the report provide a summary of the key discussion points and themes emerging from the meeting. Appendix A contains the meeting agenda. The list of participants who signed in at the session is provided in Appendix B. Appendix C includes proposed CLC Terms of Reference tabled for discussion at the meeting. Finally, Appendix D provides a more detailed record of the meeting discussions, including the facilitated feedback and question and answer portions of the meeting.

2. WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

David Dilks, Lura Consulting, Facilitator

Mr. Dilks welcomed participants and explained that Lura Consulting has been retained to assist the PEC with forming and facilitating the CLC. He reviewed the agenda and meeting materials and indicated that copies of the Portlands Energy Centre *Community Involvement Program - Construction & Operational Phases CLC Proposed Terms of Reference* were available at the registration table. David explained that the purpose of the meeting was to orient participants to the proposed role of the CLC during construction and operation of the Portlands Energy Centre (PEC); to begin developing the CLC's first work plan and to hear participants' views on the role of the CLC as the PEC is being built and once it is up and running. He encouraged participants to submit written comments following the meeting using the "Feedback Form" which was distributed to those in attendance along with the meeting agenda.

3. CLC PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE PRESENTATION

Susan Hall, Lura Consulting, provided an overview of the Proposed CLC Terms of Reference (TOR). Susan began the presentation with a brief overview of the context for the CLC, indicating that forming the committee is a requirement for PEC in the Ministry of Environment's conditions of approval. She noted that a series of approximately 20 interviews with Portlands area stakeholders had helped to shape the draft TOR and that the feedback from the meeting would be used to revise the TOR for approval by those who wish to participate on the CLC. She added that approximately 10 people had already indicated interest in participating on the CLC during the interview process.

Summary of Feedback on the Proposed CLC Terms of Reference

The following provides a high level summary of the feedback received from meeting participants on the draft TOR. For a more detailed record of the discussions at the meeting, please see Appendix D.

General Feedback

- The CLC must be a genuine vehicle for dialogue and issue resolution (i.e. not "lip service", not a "PR exercise");
- In general, the language/wording of the TOR should be more in line with the guiding principles; the wording should also be "more honest";
- A process is needed to negotiate a TOR that will allow for meaningful dialogue and consultation with the community and facility neighbours;
- The CLC should enable airing of different views, including those opposed to the plant;
- The CLC should include a balance of interests (i.e. not "stacked" with one particular view); and
- The TOR should be flexible enough to enable future additions and amendments as conditions change over the life of the plant.

Specific Comments on the Proposed TOR (by Clause)

Section 2:

- The mandate should include CLC discussion on "green design" opportunities for the facility;
- Mandate should include health impacts due to cumulative effects, need for "phase 2" operations (i.e. post simple cycle);
- The conditions under which the plant should cease operating (e.g., when allowable threshold is exceeded) should be added to the CLC mandate; and
- The 5th bullet requires more clarity on what the CLC would address regarding PEC's local air quality improvement and corporate citizenship initiatives (e.g., these could include solar and wind power).

Section 3.1:

- Asking members to sign an acceptance form is not consistent with the guiding principles.

Section 4.0:

- (iii) - It is not realistic to expect new participants to accept the past feedback of others; and
- (iv) - Participants should not be requested or required to sign a "CLC Membership Acceptance Form".

Section 4.1:

- CLC membership should be for the life of the facility (not just until the first year of operations is complete).

Section 6.1

- More meetings may be needed early on to discuss time-sensitive issues (e.g. design, landscaping plans, etc.).

Questions of Clarification

Participants' questions or comments are identified with 'Q' below. Responses, where provided are included in italics (identified with 'A').

Q1: Will changes be made to the TOR based on community feedback? Who will make the changes?

A: *Yes, Lura will propose changes to the TOR for further discussions with those who want to participate on the CLC.*

Q2: What process will be followed to finalize the TOR? When will members "approve" the revised TOR?

A: *Lura will revise the TOR based on the feedback received. It is envisioned that at the next meeting in January 2007, the revised TOR will be discussed by those who are interested in participating on the CLC. The CLC will ultimately approve its Terms of Reference.*

4. PROJECT CONSTRUCTION UPDATE - BARRY GLASSER AND TED GRUETZNER, PEC

Barry Glasser, PEC Project Manager, provided a brief project update and indicated that construction had commenced in September 2007. He said that more than 100 workers are involved in the construction of the facility. He noted that the schedule calls for the PEC to be in service by June 1st, 2008. Barry added that he is a resident of the area himself and that he hopes to work with the community to minimize the impacts of the plant on the neighbourhood and ensure the facility is a good neighbour.

Ted Gruetzner, Senior Public Affairs Manager with PEC, provided participants with an overview of PEC's thoughts on community involvement and the role for the CLC during facility construction and operations. Regarding the CLC, Ted said that there are elements of facility construction and operations that CLC members can influence while there are other elements that cannot be changed (such as the physical design of the plant) due to approvals or other reasons. PEC is happy to discuss both with CLC members.

Ted indicated that PEC is striving to be a good neighbour and a valued part of the local community. He highlighted some of the positive contributions the PEC is striving to make, including a program with local collegiate schools where students are matched with mentors in the trades for skills training and learning opportunities. He noted that PEC has signed an agreement with a local university and another partner to create an on-site solar park and research facility that could generate up to 1 MW of solar energy. He added that more details on this initiative will be provided shortly. Ted indicated that the CLC could also have an advisory role on allocating funding for community improvements from the \$400,000 available through the Toronto Atmospheric Fund.

Summary of Feedback on the Topics for Future/Further CLC Discussion:

The following provides a summary of the feedback received on topics or issues for further CLC discussion. For a more detailed record of the discussion, please see Appendix D.

Facility Design

- Landscaping plans - extent of hard vs. soft surfaces; drainage; plant material selection, etc.;
- Public access to the dock wall of the ship channel;
- Lighting - night lighting provisions;
- Fishing access for cooling water discharge if applicable;
- "Bird friendly" design - compliance with Bird Friendly Development Guidelines (now being finalized by City of Toronto); avoidance of mirrored glass and entrapment areas, etc.;
- Opportunities for "green", sustainable building design and practices, including use of materials (e.g., bio-fuels; bio-hydraulic oils in case of spills; low volatility paints; etc.); plans for ISO, LEED certification, etc.;
- Siting of the building and accommodations for vehicles (location of driveways, parking lots, etc.); flow of traffic and materials (egress and ingress to/from the facility);
- Site parking - can others use the lots on weekends and low-use times;
- Co-generation capability in the future; and
- Incineration capability at the site.

Impact Management During Construction

- Construction impacts on neighbouring businesses (including how best to communicate with neighbours).

Facility Operations

- "Shutdown protocol" - requirements/conditions under which the plant would cease operations if permitted emission thresholds are exceeded; Who has the authority (e.g., Toronto Public Health) to order such a "shutdown"?
- Air quality monitoring - monitoring data should be made public as it is available (i.e. not on a delayed basis); frequency, scope and locations for data collection; frequency and method of reporting (e.g., every 6 months on website); can CLC influence monitoring plans; independent body to review monitoring data; consideration of cumulative effects (i.e. collective impact of PEC emissions combined with other sources in the area);
- PEC's contribution to the grid - conditions when plant is turned "on and off" depending on need for power, pricing of electricity, success of conservation efforts, etc.; will "phase 2" (post simple cycle operation) be needed if conservation efforts are more successful? Where will power generated by PEC be used and under what conditions (locally, contribution to provincial demand, etc.);
- Health studies - incorporating new information/studies in developing monitoring plans; commissioning further studies if appropriate; and
- Water quality monitoring - what baseline will be used? Are more studies needed to provide an adequate baseline for future comparisons? Impacts on fish/fishing due to water discharges.

Other Feedback

During the feedback session, participants raised a wide range of issues and questions regarding the PEC in particular and energy policy in general. Some of the major discussion themes are summarized below. Please see Appendix D for a more detailed record of the feedback.

Desirability of the PEC

A number of participants indicated that they have and will continue to oppose the siting of the PEC in the Portlands area. In particular, strong concerns were raised about the potential for further degradation of air quality and health impacts in an area that has experienced both of these in the past. Compatibility of the PEC with existing or future development in the area was also a concern for some.

Approvals

Participants raised issues regarding the Environmental Assessment (EA) process - in particular why an individual EA was not conducted for the PEC. Participants requested that they be informed if and when any amendments of PEC's approvals are posted under the Environmental Bill of Rights for comment.

Energy Policy

Some participants suggested that more emphasis should be put on energy conservation or development of alternative, "greener" forms of energy as opposed to constructing a gas fired plant on the waterfront, indicating that a new generating plant may not be needed if these approaches were pursued more aggressively.

5. NEXT STEPS

David Dilks thanked everyone for their participation and feedback at the meeting and noted that a report on the meeting will be circulated to all participants along with details on the next meeting.

Ted Gruetzner expressed appreciation on behalf of the PEC and project team for the ideas and feedback provided by participants at the meeting.

APPENDIX A: AGENDA

Portlands Energy Centre Community Involvement Program - Construction & Operations Phases

Community Liaison Committee Orientation Meeting

Wednesday, November 22, 2006, 7:00 - 9:30 p.m.

Toronto Fire Academy, 895 Eastern Avenue (between Leslie St. & Carlaw Ave.)

Meeting Purpose: To orient participants to the proposed role of the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) during construction and operation of the Portlands Energy Centre (PEC), and to begin developing the CLC's first Work Plan.

6:30 p.m. Sign-in and Refreshments

7:00 p.m. Welcome and Introductions - Dave Dilks, Facilitator, Lura Consulting

- Meeting Purpose and Agenda Review

7:10 p.m. Role of the Community Liaison Committee - Susan Hall, Lura Consulting

- Proposed CLC Terms of Reference

Discussion

7:45 p.m. Project and Construction Update - Barry Glasser & Ted Gruetzner, PEC

- PEC Construction Plans and Schedule
- Working with the CLC - Topics for Feedback

Discussion: Representatives of the Independent Electricity System Operator (IESO), Ontario Ministry of Energy and Conservation Bureau of the Ontario Power Authority will also be available to respond to questions

8:20 p.m. Break

8:30 p.m. Feedback Session

- Identifying Topics for Consideration by the CLC
- Developing the CLC's Work Plan

9:25 p.m. Next Meeting - January, 2007

9:30 p.m. Adjourn

Your PEC Contact:

Ted Gruetzner - Senior Manager, Public Affairs

Phone: 1-877-443-4464

Email: info@portlandsenergycentre.com

www.portlandsenergycentre.com

APPENDIX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

The following is a list of participants who signed in at the CLC Orientation Meeting:

NAME	ORGANIZATION	NAME	ORGANIZATION
Richard Anstett C. Baudry Michael T. Berger Patricia Boushel Donna Braniff	Greensaver/ TV Ontario	John Kladites Philip Knox Raymond Kriser Reith Large Joanne Lavoie	Citizen Beach-Riverdale Minor
Ken Brown Karen Buck P. Caraher John Carley David Charlesworth Penny Chester John Cheszes	Danforth East Association of Ratepayers Resident Greensaver/ TV Ontario Friends of the Spit	Phillip Levett Tom Marjanovich Brian McInnis Anita McMaster Richard Morris Adriana Mugnatto-Hamu Jim Neff	Toronto Public Health Toronto Energy Coalition GWNA OPA Toronto Energy Coalition South-East Riverdale Community Association
Edward Chin D. Crawford Allan Curie Veronica Cruz	RTC GWNA Toronto Public Health	Barbara Neyedly Barbara Nyke Monica Oscilowski Cheryl Penman	The Voice Newspaper George Smitherman Comm. Office
Deb Dergan	GWNA	Rick Prudil	Power Workers' Union, (Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 1000)
Laura Elen Chuck Farmer Paul Farman	Bain Co-op Member OPA Toronto Energy Coalition - East Toronto Climate Action Group	Ian Richards John Riddell Michael Rosenberg	TEC Toronto Comm. News Economics of Technology Working Group
Art Field Ava Field	Rideau Bulk Terminals Rideau Bulk Terminals	S. Saffee Pat Smith	Toronto Cancer Prevention Coalition
Dennis Findley	Portlands Action Committee	John Spears	Toronto Star
Michelle Fisher Paul Gales Sarah Gingrich Kathy Gorecki G. Hendel Samantha Hill Danone Hollard Sharon Howard Michael Joly De Lotbiniere Matthew Kellway Ali Khan	Eastern Marine Toronto Public Health Mayfair Toronto Energy Coalition Toronto Energy Coalition Team Smitherman	Tom Teahen R. Timmins Dave Toderick Tara Tovell Pablo Vivanco Stephen Wickens Janet Wilkinson D Wright Paul Young Joe Zingroue D. Zubrisky	Toronto Energy Coalition Paula Fletcher's Office S.R. Community Health Center
PEC PROJECT TEAM			
Ted Gruetzner		Barry Glasser	
LURA CONSULTING			
David Dilks Susan Hall		Jean-Pierre Bombardier	

APPENDIX C - DRAFT CLC TERMS OF REFERENCE

Portlands Energy Centre Community Involvement Program - Construction & Operational Phases

Community Liaison Committee

Proposed Terms of Reference

For discussion at the Community Liaison Committee Orientation Session on November 22nd, 2006.

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) is to provide an ongoing forum for community participants and Portlands Energy Centre (PEC) personnel to:

- Share and exchange information during the construction and operations phases of the facility; and
- Identify, discuss and resolve issues and concerns relating to facility construction and operation.

The creation of the CLC within three months of the launch of construction is a requirement of PEC's environmental approvals.

2.0 Mandate

Specifically, the mandate of the CLC is to provide feedback to PEC on key aspects of facility construction and operations, including:

- Impact management procedures and plans;
- Landscaping plans;
- Emergency preparedness plans;
- Performance monitoring;
- Eligibility criteria and other considerations for PEC's local air quality improvement and corporate citizenship funding initiatives;
- Community consultation and communications plans; and
- Other relevant topics that PEC wishes to refer to the CLC for feedback or which community participants wish the CLC to consider.

2.1 Topics for CLC Consideration

Specific topics and matters to be considered by the CLC will be summarized in the CLC Work Plan, which will be developed in consultation with the committee every six months.

3.0 Roles and Responsibilities

3.1 PEC's Commitment

Commitment to Community Involvement

PEC has been committed to consultation with the local community and stakeholders since the environmental approvals process began back in 2002. PEC will continue to take this approach, meeting with the CLC and broader community on an ongoing basis to encourage dialogue and provide information as the facility is built and once it is up and running.

Guiding Principles

PEC is committed to the following principles in forming and operating the CLC:

Openness: Providing a forum for open dialogue on matters relating to PEC construction and operation.

Inclusiveness: Offering the opportunity for interested community participants to take part in the CLC.

Balance: Ensuring that the CLC provides a forum for differing perspectives to be raised and discussed.

Responsiveness: Striving to ensure that the CLC process is responsive to the needs and interests of its participants.

Accountability: Ensuring that the PEC personnel working with the CLC are able to respond to matters raised and provide timely responses and/or decisions.

Forming the CLC

In view of the above principles, PEC has undertaken the following steps in forming the CLC:

- Personal contact with representatives of over 20 community organizations, businesses or agencies interested or involved in Portlands area issues;
- Notice of the CLC orientation session to over 200 community organizations, businesses or agencies interested or involved in Portlands area issues, as well as the local MP, MPP and City Councillor;
- An advertisement regarding the CLC orientation session in local papers (Beach-Riverdale Mirror & Beach Metro Community News);
- Notice of the CLC orientation session on www.portlandsenergycentre.com.

Working with the CLC

In working with the CLC, PEC will:

- i) Strive to provide accurate, comprehensible information to CLC members, such that they can obtain a clear understanding of matters pertaining to facility construction and operation, and can contribute informed feedback.
- ii) Ensure that appropriate PEC personnel (or other resource people) are present at discussions on specific issues or components of facility construction and operations.
- iii) Ensure that the input received from the CLC is fully considered as part of facility construction and operations plans.
- iv) Be open, receptive, and give careful consideration to feedback and ideas received from CLC members.

3.2 CLC Members

As a CLC member, each participant will:

- i) Consider any matters, issues or information referred to them by PEC relating to facility construction and operations, and provide feedback as requested.
- ii) Liaise with the organization they represent (if applicable) and bring forward feedback, issues or comments from their organization to the CLC.
- iii) Strive to operate in a consensus mode, where participants openly discuss views and opinions, and seek to develop common ground and narrow areas of disagreement to the best of their ability.
- iv) Ensure that the results of CLC discussions are accurately recorded in the meeting records, or in additional reports that members may determine are needed.

3.3 Reporting Relationship

The CLC is acting in an advisory capacity to PEC personnel, and is not responsible for the decisions made by the PEC or its partners.

By participating as members of the CLC, members are not expected to waive their rights to the democratic process, and may continue to avail themselves of participation opportunities through other channels, such as deputations to committees of City Council.

4.0 Membership

The following are the terms and conditions of CLC membership:

- i) Membership is voluntary and open to participants who accept these terms and conditions and these CLC Terms of Reference.
- ii) The membership of CLC shall attempt to maximize representation from stakeholders and sectors with an interest in the future of the Portlands area.
- iii) New members are must accept the past deliberations and feedback of the CLC prior to their involvement.
- iv) Members are requested to complete the "CLC Membership Acceptance" form to indicate acceptance of these terms and conditions and CLC Terms of Reference.

4.1 Membership Term

Membership on the CLC will commence with Meeting #1 in January XX, 2007 and be effective through construction of the PEC and the first year of facility operation.

5.0 Facilitation and Secretariat

Facilitation and secretariat services for the CLC will be provided by Lura Consulting, PEC's third party community involvement consultant. These services will include:

- i) Organization and facilitation of CLC meetings.
- ii) Distribution of meeting notices and CLC contact list management.
- iii) Development of meeting agendas and other support materials.
- iv) Record keeping and minutes for CLC meetings.

6.0 Meetings

6.1 Frequency

It is envisioned that the CLC will meet approximately every two months. Meeting dates and topics will be determined in consultation with CLC members as part of development of the CLC's Work Plan.

6.2 Mode of Operation

A consensus-based approach will be the operating mode for the CLC. If consensus is not achieved, differing perspectives and feedback will be recorded and reported in the CLC minutes.

6.3 Minutes

CLC meeting notes will be taken by a representative of Lura Consulting. Minutes will be circulated to CLC members following each meeting for review and comment. Minutes are subject to approval by the CLC at the following meeting.

7.0 Dispute Resolution

In the event of a dispute between CLC members or between CLC members and PEC personnel (or its consultants or contractors), the CLC's Facilitator will strive to resolve issues between the parties involved and/or recommend specific issue resolution approaches or mechanisms.

APPENDIX D - DETAILED DISCUSSION RECORD

The following are the detailed questions and comments raised by participants at the CLC Orientation Meeting. Participant questions or comments are identified with a 'Q' or 'C' below. Responses, where provided, are included in italics (identified with 'A').

Draft CLC Terms of Reference and CLC Role

- Q: I don't see any space for real community discussion on the agenda. The CLC must be a genuine vehicle for real and meaningful community input. Are you prepared to enter into negotiations that will lead to a revised Terms of Reference for the CLC?
- A: *Tonight is the beginning of dialogue to discuss possible changes to the TOR. If you have suggestions please raise them now or using the feedback form. There will be an opportunity to discuss the TOR further at the next meeting in January 2007.*
- C: The PEC indicated they want to work together to minimize the impact - what impact? Secondly, the building is a done deal and the first CLC meeting isn't until January with the next meeting in March (every two months as proposed in TOR). So the TOR won't be finalized until June/July and this isn't fair to the community.
- A: *Your point is appreciated. The TOR should be finalized well in advance of the summer.*
- C: You've struck a notion that the CLC is only for those in favour of construction and we will stop you.
- A: *People who are opposed to the plant are also welcomed on the CLC.*
- C: I'd like to see the following in the mandate: (1) consideration for when the plant can be shut down when it's gone over a threshold; (2) local cumulative emissions from City of Toronto health studies; and (3) something within the mandate that identifies the need for a second phase after 2008.
- Q: Why is the plant running at peak times? Minister Smitherman stated that when spot pricing is high, the plant will be turned on. The plant might be fired up at night for this. If this is true, this needs to be included in the TOR.
- A: *The spot price is based on supply and demand.*
- Q: If the rationale for the plant is to address peak demand, what happens when the rest of Ontario's demand increases and the demand in Toronto drops? The spot price would be great and then the plant would be turned on. You should include in the TOR to turn off the plant in this situation.
- A: *The power system is set up with two transmission lines entering Toronto. When the transmission lines are full, power cannot be used both ways and will remain in the downtown core. The plant has other needs related to reliability and voltage support and the energy requirement is beyond strict demand issues. The IESO has identified a risk in the Toronto region. In 2005 the lines in Toronto were near/at capacity. As demand in Toronto grows, the transmission lines will be at maximum capacity which could result in rotational load cutting. There is a strong need to procure new supply for Toronto region through this power plant.*

- C: The PEC identified a desire is to play an active role in the community by providing \$400,000 for air quality improvements through the community. The Canadian Breast Cancer Foundation allocated \$10 million in Ontario alone last year - 40% of which went to community health promotion. The \$400,000 from the PEC is not enough and needs to be re-examined.
- Q: Should we wait for two months before next meeting? Can you release a list of stakeholders in 3-4 weeks so stakeholders can create a meaningful dialogue and move forward?
- A: *We will look at the timing of the meetings. It may be that we need to have more meetings in the first several months. We will ask the stakeholders we spoke with if the names can be released.*
- C: I recommend that the PEC be required to listen to, and implement, the recommendations of the CLC; that the TOR should be open to future additions and amendments as conditions change over the life of the plant; and that future purposes of the PEC be stated beyond peak load supply.
- C: I recommend that the CLC has balanced and fair stakeholder representation.
- C: The TOR needs to be agreed upon by many community members; CLC meetings should be open to the public, not just members; and the CLC should address gas volatility of supply and cost.
- C: People should not have to sign anything to participate on the CLC. *(Note - several participants made similar comments on this matter.)*
- C: The presentation implies that people accept the PEC. This is not the case. That point should be stricken because people oppose the plant and will continue to do so.
- A: *It is clear that some people we spoke with oppose the plant. We recognize this.*

Communications

- Q: Why are you not making monitoring statistics available on-line to the community?
- A: *There is no reason why we (PEC) cannot do this. If CLC suggests this, it can be done.*
- C: In terms of the process, we (participants) have had to scramble to get up to speed on the issues. There has been no discussion to educate people on energy demand. The demand projection assumes demand is increasing. Secondly, this is the largest nitrogen oxide source in this city and we have not been asked to discuss this.
- Q: Is the PEC environmental assessment available?
- A: *Yes, it is posted on the website.*

TOPICS FOR FUTURE CLC DISCUSSION

Conservation and Demand Management

- Q: If conservation continues to be as successful as it was this summer in achieving a 2% reduction, and we manage to conserve 500 MW on an ongoing basis, can one of the sections in the TOR be that you don't turn the plant on at all?
- A: *The plant is needed to meet system requirements and is expected to operate during peak demand hours. The plant is required not just for supplying energy, but for maintaining the reliability of the power supply for the downtown core.*
- Q: The plant is proposed as a 'peaking' plant to run at times when electricity is needed in the downtown core. Is there a difference in how you are expected to run that plant?
- A: *No. Typically the plant will be run when required for peak hours for business days. Generally this is 9 a.m. - 4 p.m. in the summer and in the morning hours for the winter season. It is anticipated that the plant could be running 40% of the time.*
- C: Given that conservation and efficiency are part of the electricity plan, can 750 MW be saved? If we can save 750 MW of electricity, I suggest that we don't need the plant or need to spend the money on the plant.
- Q: Does the energy conservation that occurred in Toronto cancel out necessity for the power plant?
- A: *Not necessarily. The calculations used to determine the need for the PEC already took into consideration a 300 MW reduction. The second part of OPA's mandate is to promote a "culture of conservation." Next year, 3.5 million dollars will be invested in behaviour change initiatives and education in schools. There is a public stakeholder process for the overall power plan.*

Emissions/Monitoring

- Q: I recommend that we add a statement in the CLC TOR that the PEC should come forward on a bi-annual basis with monitoring results to inform the community about exceeding limits.
- A: *If that's what people want, that can be provided. Monitoring is a fulsome discussion and a good topic for the CLC to focus on. The community has expressed a strong interest in making monitoring a priority and this can be discussed in the CLC.*
- Q: Will there be an independent agency that will monitor the facility's environmental impact on air, water, soil quality, etc?
- A: *Most facilities are self-monitoring with measurements being submitted to the government. We do have a requirement to report to the Ministry of Health with data on nitrogen oxide, sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide emissions, etc. The stacks are continuously monitored and will meet requirements for immediate reporting of any offsets beyond set limits in operation. Any other ideas/suggestion on how monitoring should be conducted are welcomed.*

- C: Monitoring needs to be worked on now, not later.
- C: The IESO indicates that Toronto needs a reliable source of power, especially during peak demand. Alternatives to gas-fired power could be diesel, which is a dirtier option, so we need to consider this. Gas produces emissions that are as dirty as coal. Regarding monitoring issue and health impacts, it's great that individual stacks are being measured for emissions. However, you are still looking at one plant and not multiple sources of emissions. You need to consider the cumulative effects of emissions.
- Q: Are there any baseline studies being done on the ecology of air, water or soil? Can studies be done to verify and monitor the pollution impacts?
- A: *There are monitoring processes that have been developed for the PEC. It would be good to review these with the CLC.*
- C: Monitor energy demand in the areas where the plant is actually producing electricity.
- C: David Suzuki's website doesn't endorse natural gas plants because the ultra-fine particulate matter is cancer-causing.
- Q: Will monitoring be on site or will there be satellite stations 1 km down from prevailing winds to monitor what ambient pollution is in the air?
- C: I recommend that the PEC make the environmental monitoring process and results open, transparent and accessible.

Criteria for Plant Operation

- C: You should discuss the criteria for turning the plant on. IESO will turn on during peak market rates.
- Q: Should the plant be turned on if built? According to a study that was done, background levels of nitrogen oxides and fine particulate matter (PM) have impacts. Those levels are at 75% of what Health Canada states are acceptable. Once plant is switched on, it is at a 98% acceptable level up to 100%. The TOR should indicate what will happen when the plant is turned on at we're at 99%, 101%, 110% and into significant risk. Smog days happen when peak demand occurs due to air conditioners being turned on. This in turn would trigger the plant to be turned on to meet demand. Under what conditions do you turn the plant down regarding human health impacts?
- A: *Monitoring is a substantive topic that PEC recognizes and will be discussed with the CLC.*
- C: Has PEC applied for a simple-cycle certificate of approval?
- A: *There has been an amendment to operate single-cycle for a 4-month period.*

- C: Different sectors of the economy increase and decrease. We need to consider shutting the Internet down on hot days and look at where increases in demand happen, such as electronic systems.
- A: *Power comes from Ohio, Kentucky, Indiana and Michigan coal-fired plants. This plant prevents 550 MW from a coal plant being used in the United States and smog coming up to Toronto through our common airshed.*
- C: In Europe, they build small gas plants which they can close down when necessary. This plant (PEC) needs to be kept running to pay for itself and will increase ecological debt in meantime.
- C: An environmental study was done in 2002-2003 - I recommend that this study be publicly updated since there are new studies and revised to account for differences on how the plant operated.

Co-Generation Capabilities

- Q: What is the steam going to be used for in the second phase combined cycle?
- A: *There is a common misconception that the steam that is part of the cycle is the same steam process used for co-generation. PEC is capable to hook up hot water for district heating provided that a buyer was available.*

Environmental Assessment and Certificate of Approval (CoA)

- Q: Can we have an update on the CoA for the single-cycle power plant? Can there be plans for broader community consultations where Toronto Public Health representatives can answer questions like that?
- A: *The PEC is a combined cycle plant. In order to meet a specific need for 2008 we are going to run single cycle for 4 months and we applied to MOE to amend the CoA to do so. If there is a request for community consultation from the MOE, then we will consider. The MOE will also advise if the CoA will be posted on the Environmental Bill of Rights (EBR) for public comment.*
- Q: Would it be possible to let everyone know when they are on the EBR for comment?
- A: *Yes, PEC will inform everyone if MOE requests EBR posting.*
- Q: Are amendments for single-cycle operation on the EBR?
- A: *This is for the MOE to decide.*
- Q: Who decided not to implement an Environmental Assessment (EA)?
- A: *The government developed a special EA screening process for generating plants and the PEC was subjected to this. There was an attempt to bump this up to an individual EA but the MOE did not approve the bump up request.*

PEC Organization, Team and Governmental representation

Q: Who owns the Portlands Energy Centre?

A: *The PEC is a 50-50 ownership between Ontario Power Generation (OPG) and TransCanada Energy.*

Q2: These are private and public companies - are there vested interests by the private sector to make revenue?

A: *There is a rate of return.*

Q3: How long did the government ask for tenders on this project?

A: *The Portlands project has been on the books for design for a long period of time.*

Q: What environmental consultants are you working with? What about getting LEED certification for the PEC?

A: *SNC Lavalin are part of the project team and have environmental consultants working on these issues. Part of LEED certification is taking the environmental footprint of the plant into consideration and this plant's footprint is small. We are using environmentally friendly materials as much as possible in the design. There may be some considerations in the building envelope that can be discussed by the CLC.*

Q: How come we don't have the Minister of Energy and Minister of Environment sitting at the front for the CLC discussions?

A: *A representative from the Ministry of Energy is here and will move to the front.*

Q: What plans do the Provincial Government/OPA have to continue to educate residents on energy reduction? How much funding will be allocated for education during the PEC construction?

A: *The Ontario Power Authority (OPA) is not a vehicle of the government but rather funded through electricity ratepayers. The OPA is in a process of creating an integrated power supply plan (IPSP) that outline how the province will increase electricity reliability while achieving a 6,300 MW energy savings target by 2025. 6,300 MW is approximately 25% of Ontario's current generation capacity. We have a goal to reach 1,350 MW savings by 2010 goal; of which 300 MW savings are in Toronto alone. The remaining 1,050 MW of savings must occur elsewhere in the province through OPA funded programs. The fund is \$1.6 billion.*

C: I would like to see more direct involvement by the Ministry of Environment.

Plant Design Considerations

Q: Will the solar power installation you mentioned generate electricity?

A: *Yes, about 1 MW or enough power to supply about 1,000 homes.*

Q: Is there LEED certification for the power plant? Are you applying for LEED credits?

A: *Not currently. It's not typical for a generating plant to be LEED certified. There are no standards for LEED for industry yet. This is a good suggestion and internal plant efficiency is taken seriously.*

Q: Where do environmental building practices fit into the design? Is there still an opportunity to integrate sustainable building materials into the design?

A: *This is a topic of discussion for the CLC.*

Other

C: Saying that the debate about the PEC is over is not a good way to start off.

A: *Barry apologized for making that statement. He indicated that he is a builder and unless something drastic happens the construction is already underway and the debate is over. His point was should instead work to minimize the environmental impact and make this a focus of discussion.*

C: This community discussion should have happened before the plant is built, not after. If you separate public and blame the province, you are responsible in your corporate way for how the community is impacted. Recommendation - don't build a project without starting the consultation process first.

C: Community right to know should be a priority. Correct the 'bad', but also be forthcoming with information.

C: A press release on September 18th spoke of new housing development office towers; demand increase and building association supporting the plant. I suggest to step back from quoting and responding to what's going on in this world. You may have chosen to build the plant, but the fact that you quote these things doesn't support that your choice to build the plant is correct.

C: Regarding the wording "according to contract..." Contracts can be broken.

C: Incineration should be used in interim usage for waste energy. Look at the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation plans in 25 years.

C: I'm concerned about the attitude. Why should we try at all? China is polluting. We need to focus on the fact that this plant is dirty and will burn 8000 lbs of CO₂ each day at maximum capability. We need to focus on that and energy conservation.

C: I protested at the Darlington plant and was told that it wasn't going to turn a profit. I pay tax on my hydro bill every month that say otherwise. Here, we're at 75% capacity on air pollution and that can go up to 100% on peak days. I don't have an opportunity to hold anyone responsible when this is done. Who do you hold responsible? Decisions have been made and now I have to breathe the air. I love the area.

C: It was unfortunate that most people lost sight of the meeting agenda tonight. This was simply a review of stakeholder concerns. The TOR will be a work in process throughout the project.

C: I would like to explore possible ingress and egress of staff, material, equipment, etc; impact on neighbours; and opportunity of providing heavy equipment to the project.

C: Toronto's waterfront should be for people and not industry.