

I wish to highlight this critical information in advance of the imminent vote on a mega garbage incinerator business plan that shows the amount of documentation and public consultation that Durham York did prior to a business plan and ask do the Pontiac residents not deserve the same level of due diligence?

Please understand the **improper process** and the **premature nature** of paying \$120,000 for a mega garbage incinerator business plan that has:

1. **no feasibility study**...no identification of different types of current incinerators and process that chose Covanta to exclusion of all other technologies...despite a \$50,000 MRC budget allocation in 2020 to research and do feasibility study why wasn't it done as it was the will of the MRC Pontiac Council of Mayors? why did Durham study two scenarios 140,000 tons a year and 400,000 tons a year...why is the only option size here 400,000 tons?

2, **no public consultation at any point by MRC Pontiac Council or its 18 Municipal Councils** especially prior to the critical votes we are willing hosts and establish incinerator...no public consultation process on site choice Litchfield which now Litchfield Council does not support being a willing host or agree to build it in their municipality

3, **no memorandum of understandings** between potential partners who would potentially truck garbage here...no vote of their Councils Ottawa, Gatineau 2 MRCs. Pembroke or Renfrew

4. **no financing agreements** from Federal and Quebec government at 135 million each

5. **no identification or proof of the 180 million in private investors claimed in the PPP**

6. **no exemption from the Quebec ministry of the environment** to grant an exemption to our environmental protections and grant an exemption to Ontario to truck garbage into Quebec

7. **no feasibility report** from partnership **MRC Pontiac with Gatineau and other local MRCs that paid \$250,000** to do research and conduct 5 year study at the Polytech de Montreal into feasibility of garbage incineration in region which is to be released shortly Andre Fortin, local member of the Quebec Legislature advised

8. **no discussions or memorandum of understanding** on who would be responsible for the **ongoing operating costs of the incinerator** once it would be built and what the MRC Pontiac legal, environmental and financial exposure would be

9. **no mechanism to review the Durham environmental report** produced by Stentec Consulting that indicated under circumstances of internal or environmental stress a 400,000 ton facility would pose harm to humans like equipment shutdown, power grid failure, extreme weather conditions etc...would this finding not transfer to a 400,000 ton facility built here?

10. **no facts on what Quebec Environment agency would require in ongoing emissions testing** and whether the enhanced testing recommended at Durham would apply in Quebec...no proof Quebec environment would approve a 400,000 ton facility when Ontario would only approve a 140,000 ton facility?

11. **no proof that claims by the Warden that fly ash** could be used on the roads in lieu of sand, in concrete as a filler or be **allowed by the Quebec government** to be used as fertilizer on our agricultural lands

12. **no plan or location suggested for fly ash (up to 30 percent of tonnage of what is burned) that currently would be required to be taken to landfill with special designation to bury. Is it being considered to be buried at Litchfield location?**

13. **no public disclosure** that should the \$120,000 be insufficient for the scope of work required to do a business plan will the unnamed investors be contributing to augment the payment for the business plan? have these discussions occurred? if so, with whom, by whom and when? how was this amount arrived at?

14. how is it possible **before the tendering process has even began** according to MRC Pontiac response to access to information requests Covanta promotional videos, trip of the Mayors and Warden to Covanta Durham and endorsement has been publicly made that Covanta is the best and world leader. This shows **preferential treatment to one potential bidder** on the request for proposal should it even be created? It establishes that the quorum of Mayors who made the trip will also be the decision makers presumably on awarding a \$450 million dollar contract?

15. Le droit media has Warden Toller saying "not to reinvent the wheel" and just do like Durham and have Covanta incinerator as the Mayor of Gatineau says in same article he will not decide in advance of a **\$250,000 study MRC has partnered with** them and other local MRCs and agreed to wait for...what is the rush?

16. how is it possible that the Warden has publicly stated the \$200,000 business plan which was to include environmental assessment and feasibility plan and **named Deloitte before the contracting process has even began** according to MRC access to information reply? Warden now says it is a \$120,000 business plan? without the feasibility or environmental assesment she promised in the media? when was that discussed and voted on? and who is deciding this amount based on what? has outreach been made directly to a firm like Deloitte in advance of the proper contracting process? are they too being given **preferential treatment** over other consulting firms?

17. with no feasibility plan **how has the 450 million dollar cost been arrived at?** have discussions been made directly with Covanta? if so. by whom? when?

18. It has been published that trucks from Ontario would be required to use the **road that is a dam that has both a Hydro Ontario and Hydro Quebec generating stations** immediately adjacent to each other. It is a very narrow twisted 2 lanes? where are the **transportation impact studies** and comments from the two major hydro producers in the area on the feasibility of 35 trucks a day 53 foot trucks carrying 38 tons each on the narrow road with such critical power infrastructure? structural integrity confirmations?

Thank you for your consideration of these points and I include the Durham business plan and environmental assessment for your edification on the amount of work done prior to Durham doing first a pre business plan and a final business plan.

I respectfully request as decision makers you extend the same degree of due diligence prior to funding a business plan with no current factual content.

I further request you forward this email and attachments to your respective DG's and Members of Council for their review

Linda Davis

