

Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Sites  
Remediation Project

***Environmental Assessment Track Report  
For the Minister of the Environment***

April 24, 2005

Prepared by  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Environment Canada  
Transport Canada

## **Table of Contents**

### ***Preface***

#### **1.0 Introduction**

#### **2.0 Environmental Assessment Process**

2.1 Roles and Responsibilities

2.2 Requirement for a Comprehensive Study

2.3 Draft Scoping Document

2.4 Environmental Assessment Track Report

#### **3.0 Public Consultation**

#### **4.0 Public Feedback Handling and Data Integrity**

#### **5.0 Public Comments and Responsible Authority Responses**

5.1 Summary of Consultation Exercise

5.2 Methodology Employed in Analyzing and Reporting on Issues and Public Concern in Relation to the Project

5.3 Comment Summary

5.3.1 Public Comments on Scope of Project

5.3.2 Public Comments on Factors to be Considered in the Environmental Assessment and the Scope of Those Factors

5.3.3 Public Comments on the Ability of a Comprehensive Study to Address Issues Related to the Project

#### **6.0 Potential of the Project to Cause Adverse Environmental Effects**

#### **7.0 Concluding Observations**

#### **8.0 Concluding Statement**

## **List of Tables**

Table 1.0	Proposed Remediation Project
Table 2.0	Summary of Public Comments Respecting Scope of Project
Table 3.0	Summary of Public Comments Respecting Factors to be Considered and the Scope of Those Factors
Table 4.0	Summary of Public Comments on the Ability of a Comprehensive Study to Address Issues Related to the Project

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A	Some Key Initiatives Previously Undertaken in Relation to the Remediation of the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Site
Appendix B	Draft Scoping Document
Appendix C	Public Notices
Appendix D	List of Invited Non-Government Organizations and Subsequent Briefing Participants and Dates
Appendix E	Public Comments Summary
Appendix F	List of Organizations that Submitted Comments

## **Preface**

*The appropriate level of federal environmental assessment for the proposed Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Sites Remediation Project must be established based on specific considerations set out in the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act. Public consultation is key. This report presents information which has been gathered by the federal Responsible Authorities in developing a recommendation on the appropriate level of federal environmental assessment and which is needed by the federal Minister of the Environment in making a final determination.*

## **1.0 Introduction**

Located in the heart of the Cape Breton Regional Municipality (CBRM), the landscape of the Muggah Creek Watershed and its estuary includes a recently closed steel making operation, the remains of a coke production facility, a rail yard, and several active and abandoned waste material dumps. Contaminant introductions from the Sydney coke production operations included coal tar, ammonia, sulphur, light hydrocarbons (benzene, xylene, toluene), and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs). Waste materials were allowed either to accumulate in unsecured storage areas at the plant site, or were deposited directly onto the soil or into watercourses crossing the Coke Ovens site and draining to the Tar Ponds. The soils and groundwater of the Coke Ovens site, as well as the waters and sediments of the Tar Ponds and Sydney Harbour, have been seriously degraded as a consequence.

In 1996, citizens of the Sydney community and the three levels of government formed the Joint Action Group for the Environmental Cleanup of the Muggah Creek Watershed (JAG) to investigate and recommend acceptable, safe, and technically sound cleanup solutions. Over a 7-year period, more than 100,000 volunteer hours were invested, and over 900 public meetings were held, in an effort to engage the community in planning the overall remediation program.

Through the JAG process several initiatives were undertaken including contaminant identification and delineation studies, groundwater and surface water studies, shoreline delineation studies, human health and ecological risk assessments, a technology demonstration program, and a remedial action evaluation process. A partial list of the initiatives is presented in appendix A. The JAG process culminated in an exercise of gathering public opinions on acceptable remedial options. In total, six remedial options for the Tar Ponds site and four for the Coke Ovens site were vetted with the community.

Based on the results of the JAG process, and deliberations by federal and provincial Cabinets, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that would guide remediation of the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens sites was negotiated. On May 12, 2004, then Minister Stephen Owen of Public

Works and Government Services Canada (PWGSC) on behalf of Canada, and Premier John Hamm on behalf of Nova Scotia signed the MOA.

The MOA indicates that, subject to a joint environmental assessment (EA) and to the stipulated funding arrangements, an acceptable remediation project shall include:

- The removal and destruction of PCBs from the Tar Ponds as well as the removal and destruction of the contents of the tar cell on the Coke Ovens site with a proven technology such as high temperature incineration in a single use dedicated facility;
- The in-place treatment of the remaining contaminated material using proven technology such as bioremediation, solidification or other appropriate technology;
- The subsequent engineered containment of both sites;
- Site restoration and landscaping compatible with the natural surroundings and future use; and,
- Provision for the ongoing future maintenance and monitoring of the sites for 25 years after completion of the project.

The federal government has since accepted a project proposal (the Project) from the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency (the Proponent) for EA and funding consideration. The Project, summarized in Table 1, is consistent with the MOA.

**Table 1.0 Proposed Remediation Project**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Tar Ponds Site</b>	<b>Coke Ovens Site</b>
1. Control Water	Control surface water and groundwater flowing through the Tar Ponds.	Control surface water and groundwater flowing through the Coke Ovens site. Contaminated groundwater will be removed via pumping and treated at a water treatment facility.
2. Remove and Destroy Selected Contaminants	Excavate, dredge, and dewater 120,000 tonnes (92,000 m <sup>3</sup> ) ( <i>ex situ</i> volume) of sediment containing PCB and other material and destroy the dewatered sediment in an approved temporary hazardous waste incinerator that will be constructed offsite in Industrial Cape Breton.	Excavate 1,300 tonnes (1,000 m <sup>3</sup> ) of PAH contaminated sediment from Coke Ovens Brook and 25,000 tonnes (12,500 m <sup>3</sup> ) of PAH contaminated material from the in-ground Tar Cell and destroy the excavated material in an approved temporary incinerator that will be constructed offsite in Industrial Cape Breton.

**Table 1.0 Proposed Remediation Project**

Activity	Tar Ponds Site	Coke Ovens Site
3. Treat Selected Contaminants In-place	Solidify and stabilize, in-place, the top 1 to 2 m of remaining sediment with a binder (such as Portland cement) using on-site auger or grout injection systems.	Treat, in-place, 253,700 tonnes (128,800 m <sup>3</sup> ) of the remaining contaminated surface soils using bioremediation. Landfarming of the top 0.5 m of contaminated soil will be used to promote biological breakdown of contaminants in surface soils.
4. Contain Residual Contaminants	Install a containment system designed to reduce human and ecological exposure to contaminants and to prevent the movement of contaminants off-site. The containment system will consist of low permeability barrier walls installed at various locations around the perimeter of the Tar Ponds and an engineered cap.	Install a containment system designed to reduce human and ecological exposure to contaminants and to prevent the movement of contaminants off-site. The containment system will consist of low permeability vertical walls installed at various locations around the perimeter of the Coke Ovens site and a soil cover designed to facilitate future site use(s).
5. Site Surface Restoration and Landscaping	Site restoration and landscaping will be compatible with the natural surroundings and (to be determined) future use.	Site restoration and landscaping will be compatible with the natural surroundings and (to be determined) future use.
6. Long-term Monitoring and Maintenance Plan	Monitor air quality, water quality, sediment, biota, and the performance of the containment system after completion of the project.	Monitor air quality, water quality, soil, and the performance of the containment system after completion of the project.

## 2.0 Environmental Assessment Process

### 2.1 Roles and Responsibilities

The Project is subject to a federal EA under the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act* (CEA Act). The Nova Scotia Department of Environment and Labour is currently reviewing the Project to establish EA requirements under the provincial *Environment Act*. In keeping with the MOA, the federal and provincial EA effort will be coordinated. The Proponent will be responsible for preparing an EA that satisfies federal and provincial requirements.

The need for the federal EA is based on the following decisions to be made on the Project by PWGSC, Environment Canada (EC) and Transport Canada (TC),

- provision of federal funds on the part of PWGSC;

- provision of a possible subsection 5(1) approval pursuant to the *Navigable Waters Protection Act*, and the provision of a land lease / land transfer, on the part of TC; and,
- provision of possible authorizations pursuant to the Federal Mobile PCB Treatment and Destruction Regulations under the *Canadian Environmental Protection Act (CEPA)*, and possible authorizations pursuant to those sections of CEPA related to disposal at sea, on the part of EC.

Accordingly, PWGSC, TC and EC are Responsible Authorities (RA) for the EA under the CEA Act. Health Canada, Natural Resources Canada and Fisheries and Oceans Canada will provide expertise in support of the EA. The Atlantic regional office of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency (Agency) acts as the Federal Environmental Assessment Coordinator.

## **2.2 Requirement for a Comprehensive Study**

The Project falls under the following provisions of the Comprehensive study List Regulations of the CEA Act:

- Section 10 of the Regulations requires a Comprehensive study of projects involving “The proposed construction, decommissioning or abandonment of a facility for the extraction of 200,000 cubic meters per year or more of ground water or an expansion of such a facility that would result in an increase in production capacity of more than 35 per cent”.
- Section 32 of the Regulations requires a Comprehensive study of projects involving “The proposed construction, decommissioning or abandonment of a facility used exclusively for the treatment, incineration, disposal or recycling of hazardous waste, or an expansion of such a facility that would result in an increase in its production capacity of more than 35 per cent”.

Accordingly, the federal environmental assessment was initiated as a comprehensive study process.

## **2.3 Draft Scoping Document**

The scope of the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Remediation Project is described in the Project Description document prepared by the Sydney Tar Ponds Agency in its capacity as the project proponent. This document was released to the general public on February 8, 2005.

As the first step of the comprehensive study process mandated through federal involvement in the Project, a draft Scoping Document was prepared by the RA (appendix B) to facilitate public consultation on the following matters:

- The scope of the Project for the purposes of EA;
- The scope of the factors to be considered in the EA; and,

- The ability of the comprehensive study to address issues related to the Project.

The draft Scoping Document also provides a summary of community consultation carried out over the course of the JAG process, the purpose of the Project, and the likely schedule for Project implementation. The document commits the RA to a consideration of alternatives to the Project and the need for the Project in the EA. It describes the federal EA framework, a summary of EA methodology and a preliminary outline of technically and economically feasible mitigation measures that would be applicable to the Project. The document concludes with an overview of the consultation methods employed for the 30-day public comment period, as well as a brief discussion of consultation methods that could be used as the EA moves forward.

The Draft Scoping Document was employed in the public consultation process conducted by the RA from February 8 through March 9, 2005. A description of the consultation process and events is contained in section 3.0 Public Consultation.

## **2.4 Environmental Assessment Track Report**

Following public consultation on the draft Scoping Document, the RA are required by Section 21(2)(a) of the CEA Act to prepare a report in support of an EA track decision to be made by the Minister of the Environment. Accordingly, this report must address the following matters:

- a) The scope of the Project; the factors to be considered in its assessment and the scope of those factors;
- b) Public concerns in relation to the Project;
- c) The potential of the Project to cause adverse environmental effects; and,
- d) The ability of the comprehensive study to address issues relating to the Project.

As required by Section 21(2)(b) of the CEA Act, the RA are also required to recommend to the Minister of the Environment to continue with the environmental assessment by means of a Comprehensive study, or to refer the Project to a review panel or mediator. Accordingly, the recommendation will be prepared by the RA based upon the results of the consultation process as expressed through the observations and conclusions in this report.

After considering this report and accompanying recommendation, the federal Minister of the Environment will determine whether to refer the Project back to the RA to continue the comprehensive study process, or refer the Project to a review panel or mediator.

Mediation is a voluntary process of negotiation in which an independent and impartial mediator helps interested parties resolve their issues. Mediation is an appropriate option when there are limited interested parties willing to participate within a consensus-building forum.

### **3.0 Public Consultation**

In relation to the draft Scoping Document, public consultations and communications were undertaken as follows:

- PWGSC, the Agency and the Proponent conducted a media briefing on February 8, 2005. EC and TC agreed to material presented by PWGSC on the draft Scoping Document. Area MPs and MLAs were briefed the morning preceding the media briefing;
- A notice of Commencement was entered into the Canadian Environmental Assessment Registry (CEAR) – an electronic database managed by the Agency - on February 8, 2005. An executive summary of the project description was made available on the site in both official languages;
- The Public Registry for the EA was established in Sydney on February 8, 2005 for the storage of the hardcopy documents/reports/studies associated with the Project;
- Public notices were placed in the Cape Breton Post and the Courier de la Nouvelle Écosse on February 12, 2005 and again on February 19, 2005, describing the commencement of a 30-day public consultation period on the draft Scoping Document and informing the community of the location and dates of open houses. The notices also provided details concerning how to access the draft Scoping Document, and how to provide feedback (i.e. by E-mail; by regular mail; to the Public Registry office; by phone; at the Open Houses and by Fax.) The public was also invited to visit the Public Registry that holds all documents related to the EA and to visit the CEAR website. A copy of these notices comprise appendix C;
- The Cape Breton Regional Municipality Mayor and council, as well as city officials, were provided with two briefings, one on February 8, 2005 as the primary target audience and once again in live camera on February 15, 2005, which was subsequently rebroadcast for the benefit of the broader community;
- All five Cape Breton First Nation Chiefs and Councils and the Union of Nova Scotia Indians were invited to meet with PWGSC and other RA to discuss the Project and EA at their convenience. While none of these invitations were accepted, a briefing was provided on February 17, 2005 to representatives of Cape Breton First Nations at a meeting of the Unama'ki Institute of Resources executive in Halifax, Nova Scotia;
- PWGSC, on behalf of the RA, invited 25 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to attend briefings on the draft Scoping Document. Of these, five accepted (see appendix D for a list of invitees and subsequent briefing participants and dates); A third public notice was provided in Cape Breton Post and the Courier de la Nouvelle Écosse on February 28,

2005 for those who may not have been able to access related information or attend open houses, and included an offer to deliver related information upon request; and,

- Cape Breton residents who had previously corresponded (in the last two years) with the federal Minister of the Environment on the remediation initiative were identified, and a mail out to those individuals was sent inviting comment (hard copy or electronic, depending on available address). Hard copy mail was sent on February 25, 2005, and electronic mail was sent on February 28, 2005.
- In addition, four Open Houses were conducted from February 14, 2005 to February 17, 2005 at different locations selected to cover as diverse a geographic area of the CBRM as possible. PWGSC, EC, TC, consultants, the Agency and the Proponent facilitated the sessions. The RA provided information pertaining to the draft Scoping Document review exercise, and the Proponent and its consultants provided technical information concerning the Project itself. The locations were as follows:
  - a) Marconi Campus-Nova Scotia Community College: Held on February 14, 2005. This site is located near the preferred incinerator site. Approximately 70 people attended;
  - b) Polish Community Hall, Whitney Pier, CBRM: Held February 15, 2005. This site is located in an area that has been traditionally engaged and active in relation to the remediation initiative. Approximately 40 people attended;
  - c) Ashby Legion: Held February 16, 2005. The community of Ashby is situated immediately adjacent to the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens sites. Approximately 35 people attended;
  - d) Sydney North End-St. George's Church Hall: Held February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2005. This area also borders the Tar Ponds site, and comprises the heart of the north end of Sydney's downtown residential area. Approximately 35 people attended.

#### **4.0 Public Feedback Handling and Data Integrity**

Given the history of extensive community involvement in the development of remedial options, RA anticipated substantial public interest in the draft Scoping Document. In order to ensure that public submissions were handled and assessed appropriately, a rigorous data management and handling protocol was developed, whereby access to feedback was limited to PWGSC staff until coding, logging, reproduction, secure storage and subsequent entry into the Public Registry and distribution to EC and TC was undertaken.

Consulting and Audit Canada (CAC) reviewed feedback-handling procedures prior to and over the course of the public consultation period. An independent audit firm audited the accuracy and completeness of the transcription of public feedback to the source documents and records subsequent to completion of the public consultation period. Processing and categorization of public feedback was subsequently carried out by all three RA in consultation with the Agency.

An independent third party was also retained to carry out an identification of issues raised by the public during the consultation period. These were subsequently compared with those issues identified over the course of a similar exercise conducted by the RA for validation purposes.

Finally, a third party reviewer was retained to review public consultation mechanisms employed in respect of the draft Scoping Document, and to provide the RA with an opinion regarding the overall adequacy of the exercise.

All third party reports were entered into the Public Registry.

## **5.0 Public Comments and RA Responses**

### **5.1 Summary of the Consultation Exercise**

Comments received were very constructive in the context of contributing to the quality of the exercise, and will continue to inform the ongoing EA. The community has proven to be an important source of local and traditional knowledge regarding the scope of project, factors to be considered and the adequacy of the comprehensive study process to address issues in relation to the project. Through public participation, the RA have been provided relevant and valuable information enabling the development of a thorough EA Track Report.

A total of 435 submissions on the draft Scoping Document were received during the review period. This level of public input was significant for a consultation exercise of this nature, and is unprecedented in terms of this specific phase of the CEA Act. It is, however, consistent with the level of public feedback encountered throughout the entire JAG process. Submissions varied in form and content (see appendix E), and were delivered through the identified feedback routes (i.e. e-mail, phone, mail, drop box, Open Houses), as well as to the Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada and the federal Minister of the Environment. The 435 submissions received included the following 32 items, which were added to the Public Registry for completeness, but were not analyzed:

- 7 e-mail spam;
- 7 verification tests which were used by CAC as part of an their oversight to ensure the efficacy of the communication process (refer to section *4.0 Public Feedback Handling and Data Integrity*); and
- 18 general inquiries (e.g., requests for documents, open house locations and scheduling).

The remaining 403 submissions included 29 from various organizations and 3 petitions. These organizations and petitions are identified in appendix F.

## **5.2 Methodology Employed in Analyzing and Reporting on Issues and Public Concern related to the Project**

### **(a) Issues Related to the Project**

In reporting on issues raised in relation to the Project, it is necessary to consider each issue, individually and on its own merits. Summary and analysis of public comments by the RA has focused on each issue's relevance to potential environmental effects and the level of EA required as well as its relative complexity or uniqueness.

In this regard, whether an individual, group or petition with multiple signatures raises an issue, it still constitutes one issue for the purpose of determining whether it can be successfully addressed by a comprehensive study, or whether a public review of the issue by an independent panel or mediator may be required. Dillon Consulting Limited was engaged by Public Works and Government Services Canada to review the use of input received during the consultation. The Dillon Report<sup>2</sup> of March 2005 stated in its assessment of the weighting employed by the RA that "all submissions were considered equal with no regard to any relative weighting".

Public comments were not restricted to addressing specific questions or issues respecting the project. Rather, feedback was sought in relation to general categories as described by the CEA Act (see tables below) and was organized accordingly. As a result, feedback material covered a broad range of subjects and issues, many of which overlapped other subject areas or which were phrased in such a way as to be applicable to more than one category at the same time. Because of this, separation of data into statistical populations and subsequent application of quantitative analyses in this regard was not possible. Assessment therefore largely employed a qualitative approach as opposed to a strict quantitative one.

### **(b) Public Concerns**

In order to gauge significance of public concerns over the course of the initiative, the RA have used professional judgement and consultations with other experts to report on this input.

With respect to public concern in relation to the Project, any attempt at weighting the analysis to reflect the number of individuals represented by each submission would be inappropriate. For example, petitions are inherently difficult to gauge owing to unknown demographics, geographical representation, whether signatories were fully cognizant of the nature and intent of the petition, and application of the petition statement to a specific issue or concern. Similarly, feedback with stated or inferred representation of constituents (e.g. letters from unions, local organizations and other authorities as identified in Appendix F) is difficult to analyze given that the actual signatures of said constituents are sometimes not in evidence.

---

<sup>2</sup> "Review of Public Comment Submissions; Remediation of the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Sites Draft Scoping Document".

### 5.3 Comment Summary

In its review of the draft Scoping Document, respondents were specifically invited to comment on:

1. the scope of the project,
2. the factors to be considered in the assessment and the scope of those factors, and,
3. the ability of a comprehensive study to address issues related to the project.

The following sections therefore reflect these three topics. Comments are organized by subject under the headings described above, with each subject broken down into a summary of issues identified, as well as a response from the RA to indicate how these issues will be accommodated in the scope of the EA. Unique requirements, which require special attention are identified through the nature of the RA response.

#### 5.3.1. Public Comments on Scope of Project

**Table 2.0 Summary of Public Comments Respecting Scope of Project**

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Issue Summary</i>	<i>RA Commentary</i>
Project Description – general	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate project description; lacks sufficient details</li> <li>• Technologies chosen are proven and effective</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project description was accepted by the RA as appropriate for this scoping stage of the EA.</li> </ul>
Bioremediation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bioremediation suitable</li> <li>• Bioremediation should not be included; release of volatiles will impact air quality</li> <li>• Identify and detail odours and vapours that will be generated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bioremediation will remain as part of the scope of Project for purposes of the EA. Potential environmental effects from release of volatiles will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Materials Handling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials handling methodologies will be crucial in avoiding additional impacts to the environment</li> <li>• Disposal of ash after incineration; potential creation of new landfill at site of former municipal incinerator or at Victoria Junction site</li> <li>• Consideration should be given as to how barge will maneuver around Tar Ponds during dredging – potential sinking risk</li> <li>• Dewatering and transport of contaminated sediments; potential release</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Materials handling protocols will be identified and evaluated in the EA</li> <li>• Potential environmental effects from sludge dewatering and transport will be assessed</li> </ul>

<b><i>Subject</i></b>	<b><i>Issue Summary</i></b>	<b><i>RA Commentary</i></b>
	<p>and deposition of contaminants</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide details on truckload numbers associated with volume of material to be transported, as well as on proposed transport routes</li> </ul>	
Collection and treatment of groundwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide details on collection and diversion of contaminated groundwater leaking from low-permeability barrier and from below the foot of barrier</li> <li>• Appropriateness of proposed treatment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific groundwater treatment requirements will be developed, as the project design is refined over the course of the EA. The hydrogeology of the site and the nature of groundwater contamination are well known for the study area and no difficulty in determining appropriate design features is anticipated.</li> </ul>
Diversion of surface water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More detail is required about how this will be accomplished</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The diversion of surface water away from the sites is being addressed under preventative works.</li> </ul>
Project Boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Boundaries not sufficient, should be expanded to include residential and commercial areas outside the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens sites</li> <li>• Boundaries of area to be affected by incinerator should be delineated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spatial boundaries for the assessment of environmental effects will take into account residential and commercial areas within the zone of influence of the proposed Project, including the incinerator.</li> </ul>
Removal and destruction of contaminated material from Tar Ponds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all areas of PCB contamination are identified for cleanup in the project description (as compared to past environmental site assessments)</li> <li>• Testing for PCB content required prior to solidification to ensure no</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analytical data and remediation criteria will be reviewed as part of the EA.</li> <li>• Contaminant delineation has not</li> </ul>

<b><i>Subject</i></b>	<b><i>Issue Summary</i></b>	<b><i>RA Commentary</i></b>
	<p>contaminated areas missed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criteria for PCB cleanup (i.e. 50 ppm) not appropriate; should use most stringent criteria</li> <li>• Consider potential for radioactivity of materials to be incinerated</li> <li>• Removal and Destruction as proposed acceptable</li> </ul>	<p>shown radioactivity to be an issue</p>
Encapsulation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encapsulation should be designed to provide flood control to area by creating reservoir</li> <li>• Encapsulation as proposed is suitable remedial approach</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encapsulation will be designed according to hydrogeological features of the site.</li> </ul>
Temporary incinerator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incineration is an acceptable technology</li> <li>• EA should present information on other incinerators as evidence of effectiveness</li> <li>• Clarify timing of incinerator use (i.e. 250 days per year, number of hours per day)</li> <li>• Provide full details on incinerator design and operation, including control systems and emissions</li> <li>• Siting did not follow CCME criteria (1500 m residential buffer zone)</li> <li>• Clarify why federal land is preferred for location and why a mobile incinerator; possible attempt to have less stringent regulations apply?</li> <li>• Clarify wind directions used in site evaluation</li> <li>• Address whether incinerator will be able to function efficiently 100% of time</li> <li>• Incinerator should be decommissioned upon completion of Tar Ponds work (i.e. temporary installment only)</li> <li>• No other wastes should be destroyed in incinerator; dedicated only to Tar Ponds cleanup.</li> <li>• Consider constructing new road to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All of these issues will be addressed in the EA, which includes a commitment to examine alternative solutions.</li> <li>• The Project as described includes the use of a temporary incinerator dedicated to the Tar Ponds remediation.</li> <li>• Construction of a new road will be considered as an alternative means of carrying out the Project, subject to technical and economic feasibility.</li> </ul>

<b><i>Subject</i></b>	<b><i>Issue Summary</i></b>	<b><i>RA Commentary</i></b>
	incinerator instead of using existing roadways	
Incineration should not be a project component	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health effects via air quality and food chain, residential area</li> <li>• High numbers of individuals with health problems in Sydney should have factored into choice of technology</li> <li>• Safety, upset conditions</li> <li>• Compliance record of other incinerators</li> <li>• Transportation through residential areas</li> <li>• Cumulative effects</li> <li>• Well water, water supply</li> <li>• Environmental effects</li> <li>• Not JAG recommendation</li> <li>• Soils/farms</li> <li>• Socio-economic impacts</li> <li>• Wildlife</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incineration will remain as part of scope of Project for the purposes of EA; it will be reviewed as part of the exploration of alternatives.</li> <li>• The rationale for selection of incineration as part of the Project will be presented in the EA.</li> <li>• Alternatives to and alternative means of carrying out the Project will be considered in the EA.</li> <li>• A technology safety assessment will be carried out as part of the EA.</li> <li>• The EA will be comprised in part by detailed health and ecological risk assessments.</li> </ul>
Incineration Acceptable Form of Destruction-Please Proceed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable proposal in this regard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All potential environmental effects to be assessed as part of the EA.</li> </ul>

<b><i>Subject</i></b>	<b><i>Issue Summary</i></b>	<b><i>RA Commentary</i></b>
Neither incineration nor encapsulation should be project components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health impacts</li> <li>• Most inexpensive method was chosen</li> <li>• Alternative technologies should be considered</li> <li>• Cumulative effects</li> <li>• Trucking &amp; residential areas</li> <li>• Safety</li> <li>• Not JAG recommendation</li> <li>• Environmental impacts</li> <li>• Socio-economic impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incineration and encapsulation will remain part of scope of Project for the purposes of EA; alternative means of carrying out the Project will be considered in the EA.</li> <li>• A technology safety assessment will be carried out as part of the EA.</li> <li>• The rationale for selection of incineration and encapsulations as part of the Project will be presented in the EA.</li> <li>• Alternatives to and alternative means of carrying out the Project will be considered in the EA.</li> <li>• The EA will be comprised in part by detailed health and ecological risk assessments.</li> </ul>
Relocation/Buffer Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relocation/compensation of residents within an established buffer zone should be included in scope of project</li> <li>• Scope of Project adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reach conclusions on appropriate mitigation measures, potential exposure pathways for nearby receptors and related zones of influence will be considered in the EA.</li> </ul>
Site maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance requirements for site after project completion, and associated costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This activity is included in the scope of the Project.</li> </ul>

## **Synopsis of Public Comments Respecting the Scope of the Project**

RA agree that Table 2.0 accurately represents those issues provided over the course of the public consultation period as they pertain to scope of project. In this regard, the RA are satisfied that the current scope of project as proposed remains suitable for the purposes of EA, and detailed issues raised by the public can be accommodated in the EA as indicated.

### **5.3.2 Public Comments on Factors to be Considered in the Environmental Assessment and the Scope of those Factors**

The draft Scoping Document took a broad approach to identifying the factors that would be considered in the EA and the scope of those factors. Public comments were focused on the scope of the identified factors as set out in Table 3.0. RA commitments to address recommendations made by the public are also identified in the table. Regardless of the EA track selected, further opportunities will be available to the public to provide comment on the proposed scope of factors to be assessed before the necessary EA report is prepared.

With respect to alternatives to the project and alternative means of carrying out the project, the consideration of these specific factors in the EA will be consistent with the CEA Act and related guidance<sup>3</sup> provided by the Agency:

- “Alternatives to the project” are defined as functionally different ways to meet the project need and achieve the project purpose. Required analysis is limited to validating that the proposed project is reasonable and its selection as a preferred alternative is based on application of explicit environmental, economic and technical criteria.
- “Alternative means of carrying out the project” are defined as the various technically and economically feasible ways that the project can be carried out. This would include, for example, alternative incinerator locations, incineration methods, transportation modes and materials handling methods. The environmental effects of each alternative means will be identified, and criteria applied to verify the preferred way of carrying out the project, including technical and economic feasibility.

Accordingly, these definitions and Agency guidance were used by the RA in evaluating input and formulating responses as expressed under the heading of ‘RA Commentary’ in the table which follows.

---

<sup>3</sup> "Need for", "Purpose of", "Alternatives to" and Alternative Means under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, Operational Policy Statement issued by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, 1998.

Input for this section was categorized and grouped under the following five factors:

- Alternatives to the Project;
- Alternative Means of Carrying out the Project;
- Environmental Effects of the Project;
- Mitigation, Monitoring and Follow-up, and
- Other Issues Relevant to EA.

**Table 3.0 Summary of Public Comments Respecting Factors to be Considered and the Scope of those Factors**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Issue Summary</b>	<b>RA Commentary</b>
<b>Alternatives to the Project</b>		
Alternative remedial approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider disposing of contaminated material in old mines;</li> <li>• Remove and incinerate all contaminated material;</li> <li>• Encapsulate everything &amp; mix PCBs within site;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternatives to the project will be considered in the EA.</li> </ul>
Alternative destruction technologies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider soil washing or hydrogen reduction instead of incineration;</li> <li>• Other reliable and efficient options available at similar cost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative destruction technologies will be considered in the EA.</li> </ul>
<b>Alternative Means of Carrying Out the Project</b>		
Location of incinerator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unacceptable selection criteria</li> <li>• Offset distance of 500 m insufficient</li> <li>• Victoria Junction site not acceptable</li> <li>• Victoria Junction site is a good location</li> <li>• North Head site would be preferable since wind patterns would reduce zone of influence on land</li> <li>• Preferred location results in too long a transportation distance</li> <li>• Locate site in more remote area</li> <li>• Locate incinerator on Tar Ponds/Coke Ovens site</li> <li>• Locate incinerator adjacent to existing municipal incinerator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative sites will be considered taking into account the results of the Destruction Technology Siting Study. Adequacy of separation zones will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Alternative means of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recycling of energy; use incinerator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative means of</li> </ul>

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Issue Summary</b>	<b>RA Commentary</b>
incineration	<p>previously designed for Tar Ponds cleanup</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider using existing Lingan plant</li> <li>• Truck to out-of-province incinerator</li> </ul>	incineration will be considered in the EA.
Rail versus road transportation of materials to and from incinerator site	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rail transport preferred; less impact on traffic, safety</li> <li>• Consider new road to incinerator site instead of using existing roads</li> <li>• Evaluate transportation routes for all potential incinerator sites</li> <li>• Any transportation of materials is too dangerous</li> <li>• No transport through residential areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative means of transportation will be assessed taking into account the relative safety of road and rail.</li> </ul>
Materials Handling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative methods of sludge drying should be examined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative methods for handling materials will be assessed.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Environmental Effects of the Project</i></b>		
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise pollution from on-site activities, traffic</li> <li>• After hours requirements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of noise from all Project components will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Air quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Odour</li> <li>• Dust</li> <li>• Fugitive emissions from volatiles in exposed soils/sediments; impacts on and off site</li> <li>• Ecosystem and health impacts of incinerator emissions</li> <li>• Provide detail on the requirements for air dispersion modeling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impacts of odour and dust will be assessed.</li> <li>• The potential for these types of impacts will be assessed.</li> <li>• These issues will be addressed in EA through incinerator technology assessment, health and ecological risk assessments, air quality modeling, mitigation and monitoring.</li> </ul>
Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential health impacts of project,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed health and</li> </ul>

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Issue Summary</b>	<b>RA Commentary</b>
	<p>including incineration, on community; nearby residents, university, schools, daycares, businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of worker safety</li> <li>• Residents require health and safety planning in addition to workers</li> <li>• Ensure potential impacts are mitigable</li> </ul>	<p>safety issues will form an integral part of the EA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A primary focus of an EA is to identify required mitigation and to assess impact significance taking mitigation into account. Mitigation measures will be incorporated into the final project.</li> </ul>
Burial grounds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects on burial grounds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects on burial grounds will be considered as part of the EA.</li> </ul>
Socio-economic impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential economic loss to local business, tourism, recreational enterprises, immigration, university enrollment</li> <li>• Consider compensation for potential loss of business during cleanup phase</li> <li>• Impacts of road transportation option on local traffic patterns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impacts on social and economic factors will be assessed.</li> <li>• Current traffic patterns and potential effects as a result of road transport of materials will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Cumulative effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative air quality and health impacts in combination with existing incinerator and nearby power station and other industrial sources</li> <li>• Consider synergistic interactions between biotic and abiotic environment</li> <li>• Long term repeat exposure effects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative effects on ecological and human health will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts of contaminant deposition on soil quality</li> <li>• Potential effects on land use, such as farming, gardening</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EA will include ecological and health risk assessments.</li> </ul>
Water Quality/Aquatic Ecosystems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects of incineration on local water supply and residential</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This issue will be addressed in EA</li> </ul>

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Issue Summary</b>	<b>RA Commentary</b>
	<p>wells</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects of incinerator emissions on nearby watersheds</li> <li>• Impacts of off-site contaminated water</li> <li>• Consider potential leaching of contaminants to groundwater/surface water from site after project completion</li> </ul>	<p>through incinerator technology assessment, health and ecological risk assessments, air quality modeling, mitigation and monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects on aquatic environment are to be assessed.</li> <li>• Water control methodologies and related monitoring protocols will reflect this issue.</li> <li>• Potential leaching will be assessed as described</li> </ul>
Plants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects on plant life in the project area</li> <li>• Bioaccumulation of contaminants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrestrial environments and potential effects will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Animals/Wildlife	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects on animals/wildlife in the project area</li> <li>• Bioaccumulation of contaminants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrestrial environments and potential effects will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Fish and Fish Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential effects on fish and fish habitat in the project area</li> <li>• Bioaccumulation of contaminants</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aquatic environments and potential effects will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Effects of Environment on Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geological activity off coast of Cape Breton could pose risk to stability of encapsulated area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be assessed.</li> </ul>
Accidents/Malfunctions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upset conditions</li> <li>• Potential for human error; lack of trust in operators to inform public about failures</li> <li>• Evacuation plans/emergency response system</li> <li>• Liability in event of accident/malfunction</li> <li>• Contingencies/alternative approaches if incinerator fails</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential environmental effects from all potential accidents and malfunctions will be assessed.</li> <li>• Contingency plans for these types of unexpected events will be developed.</li> </ul>

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Issue Summary</b>	<b>RA Commentary</b>
	<p>approaches if incinerator fails</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worker and residential health and safety – air quality and transportation issues</li> <li>• Property damage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects and compliance monitoring details will be identified over the course of the EA.</li> </ul>
<b>Mitigation/Monitoring/Follow-up</b>		
Environmental monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure baseline collected for monitoring of conditions before and after remediation, and that baseline will facilitate verification of impacts</li> <li>• Baseline must include areas of influence for air emissions and transportation route to incinerator site</li> <li>• Enhanced monitoring and enforcement required to ensure public trust</li> <li>• Negative feedback loop should be included in program design</li> <li>• Clarify timelines for monitoring; temporal boundaries should extend beyond the 10 year life span of project</li> <li>• Off-site monitoring of soil quality, plant and animal body burdens</li> <li>• Consider 24/7 monitoring</li> <li>• Accessibility of monitoring results to the public</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As part of the EA, existing baseline information will be evaluated. Where gap analysis indicates, additional baseline information will be collected and analyzed.</li> <li>• Detailed monitoring requirements will be identified over the course of the EA. Temporal boundaries concerning long term monitoring will also be identified over the course of the EA.</li> <li>• Monitoring for potential impacts for air, water, soil, human health, valued ecosystem components and safety will be mandatory. Other monitoring targets identified over the course of the EA will be included.</li> </ul>
Air quality monitoring also from dredging)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for and specifics of off-site air quality monitoring</li> <li>• Air quality monitoring required in vicinity of dredging</li> <li>• Air monitoring program design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air quality monitoring requirements will be developed over the course of the EA.</li> </ul>

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Issue Summary</b>	<b>RA Commentary</b>
	must account for potential changes in prevailing wind patterns	
Health monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medical testing of residents and employees of nearby businesses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for medical testing will be considered over the course of the EA.</li> </ul>
Water monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring of impacts of project on water supply</li> <li>• Groundwater monitoring should include infiltration under cap</li> <li>• Ensure monitoring can distinguish origins of surface water contaminants (i.e. from developed areas versus from project site)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed monitoring requirements will be developed over the course of the EA, and will include groundwater infiltration.</li> </ul>
Length of monitoring period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25 year period insufficient; monitoring should be undertaken in perpetuity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for monitoring beyond 25 years will be evaluated.</li> </ul>
Incinerator monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stack testing frequency</li> <li>• Criteria for continuous emissions monitoring</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will be determined during assessment of detailed incinerator design.</li> </ul>
<b>Other Issues Relevant to the EA</b>		
Timeliness of review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use fastest method possible for EA</li> <li>• Enough studies; proceed without any further delay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any given EA will be carried out in a timely fashion.</li> <li>• EA is a legislated requirement for the Project.</li> </ul>
EA Methodology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly define “significant” environmental effect</li> <li>• Adopt provincial definition of “environmental effect” to include both direct and indirect project effects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EA methodology and definitions will be provided in the EA.</li> </ul>
Public involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for continued public involvement in the EA should be detailed; use all available consultation tools during course of EA</li> <li>• Residents should be consulted on incinerator location.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for public consultation will be provided throughout the EA on a proactive basis.</li> <li>• Consultation with First Nations will be an</li> </ul>

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Issue Summary</i>	<i>RA Commentary</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First Nations should be actively consulted during the cleanup</li> <li>• EA should draw information from past consultations (i.e. JAG)</li> </ul>	<p>ongoing priority throughout the EA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As already stated, the EA will draw on past efforts such as JAG.</li> </ul>
Participant funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will participant funding be available during the EA?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participant funding is available for comprehensive studies and Review panels alike.</li> </ul>

### **Synopsis of Public Comments Respecting Factors to be Considered and the Scope of those Factors**

The RA have agreed to refine the scope of factors as indicated in Table 3.0 and will recommend inclusion of these factors in the final scope for the environmental assessment. Regardless of the EA track selected, further opportunities will be available to the public to provide comment on the proposed scope of factors to be assessed before the necessary EA report is prepared.

### **5.3.3 Public Comments on Ability of a Comprehensive Study to Address Issues Related to the Project**

***Table 4.0 Summary of Public Comments on the Ability of a Comprehensive Study to Address Issues Related to the Project***

<i>Subject of Commentary</i>	<i>Summary</i>
Comprehensive Study Adequate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive study adequate/can deal with issues</li> <li>• Already considerable consultation and study</li> <li>• Proceed via comprehensive study to avoid delays</li> <li>• Don't let interest groups control process</li> <li>• No need to re-evaluate technologies</li> <li>• Panel would result in needless delay and waste of money</li> <li>• Include independent ombudsperson in comprehensive study process</li> <li>• Include intervener funding and public meetings</li> </ul>
Comprehensive Study Not Adequate – Panel Requested	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Panel required to assess alternatives to incineration and encapsulation</li> <li>• Unanswered questions on incineration; need evidence of safety and health effects, precautionary principle</li> <li>• Panel can be conducted without causing delay to project (i.e. during the construction of preventative works projects)</li> </ul>

<b><i>Subject of Commentary</i></b>	<b><i>Summary</i></b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Independent, transparent, and impartial review required for public confidence; with opportunity for public input in hearing format</li> <li>• Complexity and size of project, cumulative effects, project boundaries and environmental concerns warrant more detailed review</li> <li>• JAG recommendation not followed</li> </ul>

**Synopsis of Public Comments on Ability of a Comprehensive Study to Address Issues Related to the Project**

Public opinion on the ability of the comprehensive study to address the issues raised was mixed and reflected a variety of perspectives that were focused on the proposed Project, the consideration of alternatives to the Project, consideration of alternative means of carrying out the Project, the timeframes involved, the thoroughness and results of studies conducted to date, and confidence in the process. Related comments are summarized in Table 4.0.

Regardless of the EA track selected, in response to the input received, the federal government should:

- Utilize the significant body of work already available in relation to the remediation program, including the efforts of JAG;
- Conduct the EA in an expeditious manner;
- Consider alternatives to the Project and alternative means of carrying out the project; and
- Make appropriate provisions for public participation.

**6.0 Potential of the Project to Cause Adverse Environmental Effects**

The RA have used professional judgment, results of public engagement programs conducted to date, and previous experience with contaminated site remediation projects in evaluating the potential of the Project to cause adverse environmental effects. The RA and public recognize (Tables 2.0 and 3.0) that the Project could result in adverse effects on air, water and soil quality, and related ecosystem components in the absence of proper mitigation measures. Mitigation options will be identified over the course of the EA, and their technical and economic feasibility, along with public acceptability, will be evaluated accordingly.

## **7.0 Concluding Observations**

In reviewing the submitted public comments, the following observations are offered by the RA in terms of EA track report requirements set out in the CEA Act as specifically outlined in section 2.4 Environmental Track Decision Report.

### **(a) Scope of the Project; Factors to be considered in Assessment and the Scope of those Factors**

- Many public comments were received both in favour of and opposed to specific Project components. While the scope of Project could remain as described in the draft Scoping Document, it is important that alternatives to the Project, alternatives means of carrying out the Project, and the public acceptability of the preferred Project, be given particular consideration in the EA.
- The factors to be considered in the EA can remain as proposed in the draft Scoping Document. However, the scope of those factors must be refined to accommodate the detailed recommendations offered by the public during the consultation period. It will also be important that the public have an opportunity to review further details on the scope of factors to be assessed before the next stage of the EA begins.

### **(b) Public Concerns in Relation to the Project**

- Considerable public comment has been received from a variety of individuals and groups through a variety of mechanisms (including three petitions) that reflected a range of credible concerns related to potential environmental, health and other impacts of the Project on the community and its surroundings. Strong opinions were received on both the Project and how it should be assessed. Related viewpoints are highly polarized and obtaining consensus among interested parties appears unlikely.
- Consultation with and engagement of First Nations will be an ongoing and important component of the EA process. The consultation will also extend beyond the EA process and throughout the life of the Project.
- The Project must be sensitive to the diversity of public opinion and the need for continued community engagement throughout its life.

**(c) Potential of the Project to Cause Adverse Environmental Effects**

- The Project could result in adverse environmental effects in the absence of proper mitigation measures. Mitigation options will be identified over the course of the EA, and their technical and economic feasibility, along with public acceptability, will be evaluated accordingly.

**(d) Ability of the Comprehensive Study to Address Issues Relating to the Project**

- A Comprehensive study could address the scientific and technical issues raised in relation to the Project, based on the parameters defined by the EA requirements of such a study.
- Inherent in the formulation of a recommendation with the continuance of the comprehensive study, or the referral of the environmental assessment to a review panel, is the necessity for transparency and openness in the process of assessment, both real and perceived.

**8.0 Concluding Statement**

The Responsible Authorities agree that this report provides the information needed to form a recommendation on the most appropriate level of environmental assessment for the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Sites Remediation Project. Further, the Responsible Authorities are in agreement that the report provides a complete, accurate representation and associated analysis of the public feedback in support of a Ministerial decision.

***Appendix A***  
***List of Previous Initiatives Carried Out***

## APPENDIX A

### Some Key Initiatives Previously Undertaken in Relation to the Remediation of the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Site

Initiatives	Description
<b>Public Involvement Initiatives</b>	
Public Consultation	Public consultation over a 7-year period that has provided the residents of the Cape Breton Regional Municipality (CBRM) opportunity to input on the development of remediation options.
Joint Action Group (JAG)	In 1996, local residents, business people, and representatives of the 3 levels of government, formed the Joint Action Group for the Environmental Cleanup of the Muggah Creek Watershed (JAG), in order to seek acceptable, safe and technically sound remediation options.
Community Evaluation Criteria and Future Site Use	A public consultation program, undertaken by JAG in 2002, that resulted in the identification of Core Principles and Evaluation Criteria for cleanup technologies.
<b>Technical Investigations</b>	
Site Investigations	A study initiated by Environment Canada in 1997 to determine the extent of contamination associated with selected materials and structures remaining on the Coke Ovens site.
<i>Sydney Coke Ovens and Tar Ponds: A Preliminary Botanical Inventory and Vegetation Analysis (Haber, 1998)</i> <i>Sydney Coke Ovens and Tar Ponds: Supplementary Botanical Inventory (Haber, 2000)</i>	A study identifying existing vegetation, rare species, toxic substances and the potential for phytoremediation of the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens sites.
Muggah Creek Watershed Phase I Environmental Site Assessment	A Phase I ESA conducted in 1999 to provide a summary of previous activities on the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens sites and to improve knowledge of environmental conditions within the former industrial lands of the Muggah Creek Watershed.
Muggah Creek Watershed Phase II Environmental Site Assessment Coke Ovens Site	A Phase II ESA conducted in 2001 to collect and interpret data pertinent to the Coke Ovens site, the Municipal Ash/Industrial Disposal (MAID) site, the Coke Ovens Brook Connector, and the Area North of the Coke Ovens (NOCO).
Muggah Creek Watershed Phase III Environmental Site and Risk Assessments Coke Ovens Site	The final Environment Site and Risk Assessments Report, which included the results of field investigations, carried out on the Coke Ovens site in 2001.
Muggah Creek Watershed Phase III Environmental Site Assessment Ponds and Shoreline Areas	A Phase III ESA study conducted to build upon existing data and better delineate contaminant boundaries and quantities of the North and South Ponds and adjacent shoreline areas.
Human Health and Ecological Risk Assessment North and South Ponds	Based on data obtained from the Phase III ESA, the risk assessment was intended to evaluate the potential risks associated with the chemicals currently present in the Tar Ponds.
Technology Demonstration Program	A program contracted by the Nova Scotia Department of Transportation and Public Works in 2000, to evaluate the potential application of a selection of treatment technologies to the remediation of the Tar Ponds sediment. This included bench scale testing of technologies.
Environmental Effects and Remediation of Contaminated Sediments in Sydney Harbour	A research initiative led by staff of Fisheries and Oceans Canada.
Remedial Action Evaluation Report (RAER)	A report presented in 2003 that contained a short list of safe and effective remedial options for the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens sites evaluated according to the community's screening criteria.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Some Key Initiatives Previously Undertaken in Relation to the Remediation of the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Site**

Ambient Air Monitoring Program	Initiated in 1998 to monitor air quality in Sydney airshed, both prior to (background) and during remedial activities on the sites. Monitoring is designed to determine whether there are long term and/or short-term effects on air quality from remedial activities, and to assess impacts to the airshed from the site during periods of inactivity.
--------------------------------	---

***Appendix B***  
***Draft Scoping Document***

***<http://www.ceaa-acee.gc.ca/050/documents/5896/5896E.pdf>***

***Appendix C***

***Public Notice Text – Document Release and Consultation Notification***

## **Public notice for placement in local newspapers**

-----

### **Government of Canada FIP**

#### **Public Consultation Remediation of the Sydney Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens Sites Scoping Document**

The Governments of Canada and Nova Scotia signed an agreement on May 12, 2004 to clean up the sites of the Tar Ponds and Coke Ovens in the Cape Breton Regional Municipality.

The Government of Canada invites the public to comment on a scoping document which outlines the environmental assessment factors to be considered in the project. Interested parties can address their written comments to Public Works and Government Services Canada, the lead responsible authority for this project.

Over the next 30 days, the public is invited to comment on the proposed scope of the project, the factors proposed to be considered, the proposed scope of those factors and whether a comprehensive study alone is sufficient to address the issues relating to the project.

#### **Open houses**

A series of open houses will be held in your community to provide further information and answer questions. The locations and times are as follows:

- Monday, February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2005, 3 to 9 p.m., The Marconi Campus– Multipurpose Room, 1240 Grand Lake Road, Sydney
- Tuesday, February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2005, 3 to 9 p.m., St. Michael's Society Hall Polish Village, 954 Victoria Road, Whitney Pier
- Wednesday, February 16<sup>th</sup>, 2005, 3 to 9 p.m., Ashby Legion Hall, 35 State Street, Sydney
- Thursday, February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2005, 3 to 9 p.m., St. George's Hall, Nepean Street (behind Church across from Holy Angels High School), Sydney

Where to obtain information:

Copies of the scoping document are available at the following locations:

- |                                     |                                 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| • The McConnell Library             | 50 Falmouth Street, Sydney      |
| • The UCCB Library                  | 1250 Grand Lake Road, Sydney    |
| • Sydney Tar Ponds Community Office | 292 Charlotte Street, Suite 101 |

The document is also available at: [www.pwgsc.gc.ca](http://www.pwgsc.gc.ca)

## **How to provide feedback:**

The public is invited to provide comment on the scoping document by:

- Phone: (902) 564-2534
- Fax: (902), 564-2597
- Email: tarponds@pwgsc.gc.ca, or
- Mail: Public Works and Government Services Canada, PO Box 1280, Station A, Sydney, NS B1P 6J9
- Written comments can also be dropped off at the Sydney Tar Ponds Community Office, 292 Charlotte St. (rear entrance), Suite 101, Sydney, Nova Scotia.

Comments must be received no later than March 9, 2005.

NOTE: All documents and/or reactions received by Public Works and Government Services Canada regarding this scoping document are considered public and will become part of the public registry for the project.

**Canada wordmark**

***Appendix D***  
***List of Non- Governmental Organizations Invited to Attend***  
***Environmental Assessment Scoping Briefings***

## ***NGO Organization Invitation List***

Junior Chamber International  
P.O. Box 921  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 6J4  
Attention: Mr. Keith Mac Donald

Cape Breton – Richmond Federation of Agriculture  
105 Regent Street  
North Sydney, N.S.  
B2A 2G6  
Attention: Mr. Eddie Rendell, President

CB Black Employment Partnership Committee  
731 Victoria Road  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1N 1J3  
Attention: Ms. Karen Green MacIver

Cape Breton Business Partnership  
275 Charlotte Street  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 1C6  
Attention: Mr. Marc LeClare, Chairman

University College of Cape Breton  
P.O. Box 5300  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 6J2  
Attention: Faculty Association and Student Union Association

Grand Lake Road Volunteer Fire Dept.  
793 Grand Lake Road  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 5T3  
Attention Mr. Allan Hanratty

Sydney and Area Chamber of Commerce  
335 George Street  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 1J7  
Attention: Mr. Bruce Meloney, President

Lingan Golf and Country Club  
1229 Grand Lake Rd.  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1M 1A2

Sydney Airport Authority  
P.O. Box 670  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 6H7  
Attention: Mr. Larry MacPherson, CEO

CBCEDA  
338 Charlotte Street  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 1C8  
Attention: Ms. Eileen Oldford

Sierra Club of Canada  
412-1 Nicholas Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1N 7B7  
Attention: Ms. Elizabeth May

Northend and Area Neighbourhood Watch  
23 George Street  
Sydney N.S.  
B1P 1H3  
Attention Mr. Terry Mulcahy

Atlantic Coastal Action Program Cape Breton  
P.O. Box 28, Station "A"  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 6G9  
Attention: Ms. Judy McMullen

United Steelworkers of America  
Local 1064  
369 Prince Street  
Sydney N.S.  
B1P 5L2  
Attention: Mr. Mike Buchanan

Centre for Leadership Development  
14 Maple Avenue  
Sydney River, N.S.  
B1S 1J6  
Attention: Ms. Jane MacLellan

Nova Scotia Community College  
P.O. Box 1042  
1240 Grand Lake Road  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 6J7  
Attention: Faculty Association and Student Union Association

Cape Breton Island Building and Construction Trades Council  
238 Vulcan Avenue  
Sydney, N.S.  
B1P 5X1  
Attention: Mr. Cliff Murphy

Joint Action Group  
510 Purves Street  
North Sydney, N.S.  
B2A 1E2  
Attention: Mr. Francis Sirois

***Appendix E***  
***Summary of Feedback by Category and File Number***

**APPENDIX E  
DETAILED COMMENT SUMMARY**

Summary was prepared by Responsible Authorities, and then augmented by cross-reference with third party comment summary completed by Dillon Consulting (March 2005).

<b>Calling for a comprehensive study</b>			
<b>Reason identified</b>	<b>Comment ID #</b>		
Panel would result in needless delay, waste money, no value	27,80,107,134,179,189,193,195,200,201,210,211,212,214,217,225,227,228-232,235,236,237,238-247,248,249-251,254,256,284,286,289,291-297,303,308,310,317,331,333,341,355,360,366,367,371,377,379, 392		
There has been considerable consultation and study already	48,80,82,86,88,91,93,95,97,98,99,101,102,103,107,110,112,116,117,128,163,175,179,181,183,192,193,197,198,201,213,217,220,222,224,238,245,254,256,281,283,303,305,306,310,311,313,315,316,317,318,319,320,323,324,325,332,339,340,341,342,343,348,349,350,352,358,360,361,362,364,366,367,369,370,371,375,376,379,391, 395,420		
Comprehensive study can adequately deal with issues; confidence in comprehensive study process	27,29,32,34,46,48,49,57,58,70(15),78,80,82,86,88,91,93,95,97,98,99,101,102,103,107,110,112,116,117,128,134,166,176,179,181,182,183,184,189,192,193,194,195,197,198,200,201,213,214,217,220,224-232,234,237,239,240,254,256,259,281,282,283,284,286,289,291-297,302,303,306,308,309,310,311,312,313,314,315,316-325,329-344,346,348-350,352,353,355-		

	359,360,361-372,374-382, 384, 385,386-388, 390, 391,392, 393, 394, 395, 401, 420		
Get on with it, clean up should proceed via comprehensive study (e.g. already reviewed technology)	27,32,46,48,70,80,82,86,88,91,93,95,97,98,99,101,102,103,107,110,112,116,117,128,134,144,163,171,174,175,179,181,183,190,191,192,193,194,195, 198,200,201,211,212,213,215,217,220,222,224,226,235,236,237,238,240,241,247,249,250,251,254,256,281,282,283,284,303,308,309,310,311,312,313,315,316,317,318,320,321,322,323,324,325,329,330,331,333,336,337,339,340,341,342,343,344,348,349,350,352,353,355,356,357,358,359,360,361,363,364,365,366,369,370,371,372,375,376,377,378,379,380,382,384,386-388, 391,393,395,396,420		
Don't let interest groups/individuals control process	70,93,107,163,168,193,200,201,360,393		
Include independent ombudsperson in comprehensive study process	184		
Proposed plan not wise, comprehensive study should be undertaken (possible misunderstanding of terminology)	20		

Calling for review panel	
Reason identified	Comment ID #
Against incineration	8,52,63,76,77,114,121,133,135,136,140,142,143,147,149,153,157,164,169(279),180,196,261-264,266,267,269,270,273,274-277,287,288,290,299,326,327,328,404,406,408,410,416,421,422,423,425,427,430
Against incineration and	22,120,127,151,153,160,161,173,177,199,202,203,204,207,216,257,260,265,269,270,272,300,399, 400,403,405,410,414,417,418,428

encapsulation		
Unanswered questions on incineration	21,42,59,85,151,158,187,203,223,268,269,270,326,327,407,411	
Independent, transparent, impartial, knowledgeable	21,42,52,59,105,121,135,136,139,140,143,149,154,164,169(279),173,177(a),180,199,207,209,268,269,270,272,279,290,304,326,400,403,405,407,423,427,431,435	
To ensure alternatives to incineration are considered/ find safest solution	26,42,45,63,65,66,67,68,119,123,127,142,149,160,161,164,199,203,207,260,272,273,290,326,327,399,400,403,405,406,407,408,410,416,417,418,421,422,423,425,427	
Complexity and size of project	59,45	
Need evidence of safety, concerned about proximity of community	45,64,66,142,158,261,262,263,279,407,408,425	
No reason identified	85,167,301	
Address health related issues	42,45,76,114,120,127,133,135,142,149,151,153,160,161,169(279),199,202,203,223,261-264,266,267,268,272,274,275,276,277,288,290,405,406,407,413,415,417,418,423,425,427,430	
Want hearing format	177(a),257	
Cumulative effects	127,135,149,169(279),173,272,279,404,406,423	
Human error/malfunctions	142,143,158,160,161,164,169(279),196,223,257,272,290,300,407,410,417,418,422	
Chosen remediation strategy is not what JAG recommended	127,136,150,160,161,203,216,260,272,273,287,290,300,326,327,328,400,403,406,408,410,417,418,423,427	
Mobile (versus permanent) incinerator regulations are different	160,161,199,203,273,400,403,410,417,418,423	

Peace of mind, public trust	132,142,143,154,268,327	
Everyone needs final say	147	
Environmental concerns	127,202,257,261-264,266-267,273(b),328,405,413,415,	
Boundaries of clean-up	203,257,327,328	
Demonstrate environmental leadership	414	

<b>Timeliness – neither panel or comp study</b>			
Reason identified	Comment ID #		
Fastest way possible	7,11		
Already thoroughly studied	7,11,30,94,108,109,126,131, 185,280,397		
Get on with it	7,11,12,18,30,36,54,92,94,108,10 9,126,131,185,208,252,253,255,2 80,307,345,347,351,354,373,397, 402		
Don't listen to interest groups	11,12,94,131, 185,280,402		

<b>Comments regarding Alternatives to the Project</b>		
	Comment ID#	
Examine alternative technologies (i.e. old mines); don't use cheapest alternative	3, 14, 16, 26, 42, 60, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 87, 96, 105, 119, 123, 127, 149, 152, 164, 178, 184, 199, 203, 205, 207, 260, 272, 273, 399, 400, 403, 405, 406, 407, 408, 410, 416, 417, 418, 421, 422, 423, 425	
Against incineration	6, 8, 33, 45, 47, 51, 52, 81, 100, 136, 142, 143, 145, 146, 147, 148, 188, 205, 218, 219, 233, 299, 389, 406, 409	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health, nearby residents</li> </ul>	9, 10, 13, 14, 24, 35, 39, 47, 51, 52, 56, 61, 62, 83, 111, 113, 114, 119, 121, 123, 127, 129, 135, 138, 140, 142, 149, 151, 153, 155, 156, 160, 161, 169(279), 178, 206, 261, 262, 263, 264, 266, 267, 271, 272, 274-277, 279, 285, 290, 298, 326, 327, 389, 391, 400, 403, 404, 405, 406, 408, 410, 412, 416, 417, 418, 419, 421, 422, 423, 425, 427, 430, 431, 432	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative technologies/safer options should be considered</li> </ul>	10, 19, 35, 41, 45, 56, 81, 83, 87, 89, 110, 113, 118, 119, 124, 136, 147, 152, 155, 156, 160, 161, 178, 203, 260, 269, 270, 272, 300, 400, 403, 405, 410, 414, 417, 418, 419, 423, 425, 427, 432, 434	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety, upset conditions, performance of CBRM incinerator</li> </ul>	13, 23, 39, 51, 56, 89, 100, 106, 111, 118, 130, 133, 142, 143, 151, 155, 160, 161, 164, 169(279), 271, 272, 279, 285, 288, 290, 400, 403, 410, 416, 417, 418, 419, 422, 423, 428, 431	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation through residential areas</li> </ul>	23, 51, 118, 205, 272, 326, 327, 328	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative effects</li> </ul>	39, 127, 135, 140, 149, 169(279), 404, 406, 408, 412, 419, 421, 423, 430	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Well water, water supply</li> </ul>	62, 135, 136, 142, 146, 160, 169(279), 206, 234, 285, 400, 403, 423	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental effects (e.g. wildlife)</li> </ul>	76, 77, 129, 136, 142, 206, 285, 389, 405, 406, 427	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chosen remediation strategy is not</li> </ul>	042, 81, 129, 150, 160, 161, 178, 221, 260, 272, 290, 300, 326, 327, 328, 400, 403, 405, 406, 408, 410, 417, 418, 419, 423, 426, 427	

what JAG/community recommended		
• Soils/farms	136,142,160,161,261,262,263,264,266,267,274-277,300,400,403,417,418,419,427	
• Socio-economic impacts	9, 121, 169(279),180,412,419	
Against incineration & encapsulation	111,177,207	
• Health	14,129,160,161,177,178,272,400,403,408,410,417,418,428	
• Alternative technologies should be considered	16,41,160,161,173,178,199,257,260,265,272,400,403,410,417,418,419	
• Cumulative effects	173	
• Trucking through residential areas	173,300	
• Safety	173,400,403,410,417,418	
• Chosen remediation strategy is not what JAG recommended	129,173,178,199,,216,260,272,273,287,300,400,403,410,417,418,419	
• Environmental impacts	16,129,177,257,399	
• Not a complete clean-up	260,419	
Incinerate everything	37, 60	
Encapsulate everything and mix PCBS within site	165,208,233	
Pro-incineration	11,15,18,25,37,60,99,107,109,131,181,198,215,235,236,239,242,244,248,250,251,253,255,280,282,284,312,341,351,354,355,382,402	

<b>Comments regarding Alternative Means</b>		
Location of incinerator		
• Too long to transport	28	
• Through residential area	28,106	
• Use existing Lingan plant	31	
• Burn it where it is	28,34,100,118	
• Site in more remote area	39,42,51	
• Criteria for selection	100,158,178,184,259	
• Truck to Quebec	145	
Alternative means of incineration	25,226	
Alternative means of soil remediation for Coke Ovens	96	
Rail vs. road transportation	31,42,45,54,57,60,62,80,106,107,159,205,259,272	
New road to incinerator	106	
Evaluate routes for all sites	272,273	

<b>Environmental Effects</b>		
Noise	4,45,54,159,260	
Air quality (odour, dust, air modeling distance and boundaries	4,8,9,23,24,35,39,41,42,45,52,54,59,60,61,111,114,132,145,158,169(279),172,178,182,184,199,207,223,233,259,260,261-264,266,267,272,284,275,276,277,285,300,327,326,328,398,400,403,407,410,417,418,419,425	
Health impacts	9,10,14,24,26,33,35,39,42,45,47,52,54,56,61,62,65,76,77,111,113,114,119,120,121,123,127,129,132,135,138,140,142,151,153,155,160,161,169(279),172,178,184,202,203,206,207,226,233,241,261-264,266,267,269,270,271,272,273,274-277,284,285,290,298,326,383,389,391,398,400,403,404,405,406,407,408,410,412,413,415,417,418,419,422,423,425,427,428,430,431,432,435	
Pollution	65,89,114,172,383,400,403,410,417,418,423	
Socio-economic impacts (e.g. nearby businesses; jobs) – positive & negative	9,54,76,77,106,121,169(279),171,180,282,285,384,390,412,419,420	
Cumulative effects	39,45,77,127,135,140,145,169(279),173,178,200,384,390,404,406,408,412,430	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cumulative health impacts</li> </ul>	45,77,114,149,298,419,423,427,430,431	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lingan Power Station and other industry in area</li> </ul>	39,50,169(279),285,416,421,423	
Soil (farms, bioaccumulation)	23,42,45,54,76,77,142,158,160,199,233,261-264,266,267,272,274-277,300,257,398,400,403,407,417,418,419,427	
Water (water supply, wells)	42,45,54,62,76,77,100,111,135,136,142,146,158,160,161,169(279),206,207,234,259,260,272,273(b),285,398,407,423	

Transportation (noise, cleanliness of roads)	23,30,31,42,45,51,54,57,60,80,106,107,118,158,159,173,205,233,257,259,260,272,326,327	
Effects on UCCB	52,60,106,169(279),199,261-264,266,267,268,274-277,285,384,390,428	
Worker safety	45,111	
Plants	142,172,269,270,384,390,419	
Animals	111,142,158,172,206,269,270,384,390,400,403,410,417,418,419,423	
Property damage	142	
Fish and fishing	111,158,260,272,285,423	
Burial grounds	115	
Effects on Daycares	261-264,266-267,274-277,301	
Environmental effects	54,76,77,114,136,202,257,261-264,266,267,273b,284,326,328,384,389,390,399,405,406,408,413,415,425,427	
Recreation	423	
Effects of environment on project	419	

EA Methodology	
• Public participation	178,384,390,
• Define significance	390
• Definition environment effect – consider direct and indirect effects	384,390

<b>Accidents/malfunctions</b>		
Accidents/malfunctions (upset conditions, human error)	8, 13, 23, 39, 42, 45, 48, 51, 56, 57, 59, 77, 64, 66, 89, 100, 106, 118, 130, 133, 142, 143, 151, 155, 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 169(279), 173, 178, 196, 199, 223, 233, 257, 259, 272, 285, 288, 290, 300, 301, 400, 403, 407, 408, 410, 417, 418, 422, 431, 432	
Incinerator monitoring & enforcement	42, 54, 59, 111, 114, 133, 158, 178, 182, 199, 233, 259, 384, 390, 423, 425	
Evacuation plans	158, 178, 199, 301	
Liability	172, 233, 259	
Alternatives if incinerator fails	111	

<b>Follow-up</b>		
Environmental monitoring & enforcement	54, 57, 105, 106, 178, 199, 259, 384, 390, 425	
Air quality monitoring also from dredging)	54, 60, 111, 178, 199, 233, 259(CBRM),	
Health quality monitoring	54	
Health monitoring	178	
Water monitoring	259	
Effectiveness (length of time)	106, 178,	
Maintenance & paying	158, 257	
Independent auditor/ombudsperson for project implementation	390	

<b>Scope of Project – 158,178,233</b>		
Scope is appropriate	27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 42, 46, 47, 48, 49, 57, 58, 107, 144, 166, 182, 189, 226, 234, 384, 385, 390	
What will be done with end product after incineration?	30, 54, 132, 160, 161, 165, 173, 400, 403, 410, 417, 418	

Collection & treatment of GW	105,158,	
Dredging, Dewatering materials & handling	106,158,233,407,435	
Boundaries not sufficient	165,178,203,257,400,403,417,418,419	
Identification of PCB areas to be remediated	165,178,260	
New landfill/ash disposal	114,160,161,165,178,260,269,270,400,403,410,417,418,419	
Flood control	165,233,259	
Info on other incinerators	33,111,158,259,272	
Arsenic in tar ponds	383	
Decommissioning (only tar ponds waste, only temporary)	233	

<b>Mitigation compensation</b>	149,178,187,199,233	
• Relocation	111,132,133,136,160,161,178,203,265,269-270,273(b),288,400,403,410,417,418,422,425,	
• Buffer zones	11,160,161,178,203,265,400,403,417,418	
• Lost revenue	54	

Total comments received	435	
Junk mail	7	44,53,75, 141, 162,186, 278
Not related to scoping exercise (e.g. project inquiry, CLC, media clippings, submitted prior to scoping exercise)	18	1,2,5,17,38,43,74,84,90, 104,122,125, 137,170,258, 424,429,433
CAC audit submissions	7	40,55,69,71,72,73,79
<b>Total comments relevant to exercise</b>	<b>403</b>	

***Appendix F***  
***List of Group Feedback Submissions***

## Appendix F: List of Group Feedback Submissions

In addition to input received from numerous individuals through numerous channels, comments were received from the following specific interest groups in regards to the CEAA process for the Project:

<b>File Number</b>	<b>Group</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Approximate # Represented (if known)</b>
088	Sydney and Area Chamber of Commerce	Letter	-
091	Sydney ports Corporation Inc.	Letter	-
107	Legion, Branch #12	Letter	450 Indicated in Letter
109	International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Local 73	Letter	-
116	Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local 56	Letter	-
134	United Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, Local 1588	Letter	-
140	Citizens Against Toxins in the Environment (CATE)	Letter	-
158	Lingan Road Community Association	Letter	-
167	Margaree Environmental Association	Letter	-
168	Cape Breton Island Building & Construction Trades Council	Letter	3600 Indicated in Letter
171	Cape Breton District Labor Council	Letter	-
174	International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers, Local 2	Letter	-
177	General Anti-Incineration Petition	Letter/Petition	500 Signatures
178	Sierra Club of Canada	Letter	-
179	United Steelworkers of America, COPE 343	Letter	2200 Indicated in Letter
180	Lingan Golf and Country Club	Letter	-
181	Labourers International Union of North America, Local 1115	Letter	752 Indicated in Letter
184	Cape Breton District Health Authority	Letter	-
193	United Steelworkers of America, Local 1064	Letter	-
201	United Association of Plumbers and Pipe fitters & Welders, Local 682	Letter	750 Indicated in Letter
202	Ecology Action Centre	Letter	-
259	CBRM Council	Letter/Motion in Council	-
303	JCI Cape Breton	Letter	-
389	General Anti-Incineration Petition	Letter/Petition	220 Signatures
399	Friends of Nature Conservation Society	Letter	-
405	Sierra Club of Canada	Letter	-
406	Stewards of St. Ann's Harbour Association	Letter	-
408	The Council of Canadians	Letter	-
409	Sierra Club of Canada	Letter/Petition	4000 Signatures