



**Investigations for Landfill Sites
in Areas I, II, and VI
in the City of Brampton**

**Social Impact
Assessment**

Tables

THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL

March 1987

**Armour and Associates
Institute of Environmental Research (1985) Inc.**

BRAMPTON LANDFILL SEARCH

MARCH 1987 SUBMISSION

In 1986, Council gave direction to compare and evaluate Areas I, II and VI in the City of Brampton in accordance with identified criteria. The results and recommendations of the detailed analysis conducted between June 1986 and February 1987 are described in the following documents:

1. Brampton Landfill Search: Overview and Recommendations
2. Overall Evaluation Report
3. Overall Evaluation Report Appendix A - Detailed Sub-Area Comparison
4. Hydrogeological Report
5. Well Inventory in Area II
6. Well Inventory in Area VI
7. Health and Safety Report
8. Land Use Planning Impact Assessment
9. Traffic Impact Assessment
10. Social Impact Assessment
11. Economic Impact Assessment
12. Ecological Impact Assessment
13. Visual Impact Assessment
14. Archaeological and Historic Sites Report

In addition, two reports were released in 1985 and 1986 which form part of the overall package of background reports:

15. Well Inventory in North West Brampton (Area I) (1985)
16. Investigations for Landfill Sites in the City of Brampton (1986)

All of these reports, with the Stage 3 Master Plan, are intended to form the basis of an application for Environmental Assessment approval. However, the position may be amended as a result of input from the public or interested parties/agencies. Any final submission must be approved by Peel Regional Council.

LIST OF TABLES

1. *A Comparative Perspective on SIA*
2. *Potential Impacts Associated with Landfills*
3. *Local Concerns About Landfilling*
4. *Factors, Indicators and Sub-Indicators Identified as Relevant to the Social Impact Assessment of Landfill Siting Options*
5. *Survey Response Rate by Area*
6. *Survey Response Rate by Sub-Area On-Site Households*
7. *Survey Response Rate Rate by Sub-Area 0 - 1,000m*
8. *Data/Information Sources*
9. *Social Profile - Degree of Resident Concern Regarding Landfill*
10. *Social Profile - Satisfaction with Place*
11. *Social Profile - Area's Perceived Positive Characteristics*
12. *Social Profile - Area's Perceived Negative Characteristics*
13. *Social Profile - Resident Concerns Regarding Proposed Landfill*
14. *Social Profile - Anticipated Impacts on Households*
15. *Social Profile - Loss of Satisfaction with Place - Degree of Concern*
16. *Social Profile - Resident Concerns Re Effect of Landfill on Their Satisfaction with the Community as a Place to Live*
17. *Factors, Indicators and Sub-Indicators used as Evaluation Criteria*
18. *Relative Importance of Factors, Indicators and Sub-Indicators*
19. *Community Services/Facilities Investigated in SIA*
20. *Displacement of Services/Facilities - Number Displaced*
21. *Displacement of Services/Facilities - Characteristics and Alternatives*
22. *Impact Rating and Ranking: Displacement of Services/Facilities*

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

23. Disruption of Services/Facilities - Owner/Operator Concerns
24. Disruption of Services/Facilities - Potential Disruption 0 - 500m
25. Disruption of Services/Facilities - Potential Disruption 500m-1000m
26. Disruption of Services/Facilities - Potential Disruption Beyond 1000m
27. Disruption of Services/Facilities - Characteristics 0 - 500m
28. Impact Rating and Ranking - Disruption of Services and facilities
29. Displacement of On-Site Residents - Number Displaced
30. Displacement of On-Site Residents - Farm Operations
- 31a. Displacement of On-Site Residents - Key Characteristics
- 31b. Displacement of Residents - Key Characteristics (Adjusted Survey Results)
32. Displacement of On-Site Residents - Length of Residence
33. Displacement of On-Site Residents - Ancestral Ties
34. Displacement of On-Site Residents - Friendship Ties.
35. Displacement of On-Site Residents - Anticipated Difficulties in Moving
36. Displacement of On-Site Residents - Problems Regarding Farm Relocation
37. Social Profile - Problems Regarding Farm Relocation
38. Impact Rating and Ranking: Displacement of Residents - Attachment to Place
39. Impact Rating and Ranking: Displacement of Residents - Number Displaced
40. Impact Rating and Ranking: Displacement of Residents - Characteristics (Adjusted Survey Results)

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

41. Comparison and Ranking of Sub-Areas: Displacement of Residents
42. Disruption of Residents - Number Disrupted by Siting Option 0 - 1000m
43. Disruption of Residents - Number Disrupted by Siting Option 0 - 500m
44. Disruption of Residents - Number Disrupted by Siting Option 500 - 1000m
- 45a. Disruption of Residents - Key Characteristics by Siting Option 0 - 1000m
- 45b. Disruption of Residents - Key Characteristics by Siting Option 0 - 1000m (Percentages)
- 46a. Disruption of Residents - Key Characteristics by Siting Option 0 - 500m
- 46b. Disruption of Residents - Key Characteristics by Siting Option 0 - 500m (Percentages)
- 47a. Disruption of Residents - Key Characteristics by Siting Option 500m - 1000m
- 47b. Disruption of Residents - Key Characteristics by Siting Option 500m - 1000m (Percentages)
48. Disruption of Residents - Activities Perceived to be Potentially Disrupted 0 - 500m
49. Disruption of Residents - Activities Perceived to be Potentially Disrupted 500m - 1000m
50. Disruption of Residents - Activities Potentially Disrupted 0 - 1000m
51. Impact Rating and Ranking: Disruption - Number Potentially Affected 500 - 1000m
52. Impact Rating and Ranking: Disruption - Number Potentially Affected 0 - 500m
53. Impact Rating and Ranking: Disruption - Characteristics of Residents 500 - 1000m

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd)

54. Impact Rating and Ranking: Disruption - Characteristics of Residents 0 - 500m
55. Comparison and Ranking of Sub-Areas: Disruption of Residents
56. Social Profile - Length of Residence
57. Social Profile - Farming Operations
58. Social Profile - Farming Operations/Future Prospects
59. Impact Rating and Ranking - Loss of Community Character
60. Social Profile - Friendship Ties
61. Social Profile - Kinship Ties
62. Social Profile - Visiting with Neighbours
63. Social Profile - Social Support
64. Social Profile - Involvement in Community
65. Social Profile - Extent of Reliance on Local Services
66. Impact Rating and Ranking - Loss of Community Cohesion
67. Comparison of Sub-Areas-Overall Ranking and Rating Re Impact on Services/Facilities
68. Comparison of Sub-Areas-Overall Ranking and Rating Re Impact on Residents
69. Comparison of Areas-Overall Ranking and Rating Re Impact on Community
70. Overall Evaluation of Areas
71. Resident Assessment of Opportunities to Learn About and Discuss the Proposal
72. Resident Involvement in the Siting Process
73. Resident Perception of Their Influence on Final Decision
74. Issues - Effect of Siting Announcement on Household
75. Issues - Effect of Siting Announcement on Resident Plans
76. Compensation - Importance of Measures (Percentage of Respondents Indicating Measure to be "Very Important" on 1-5 Scale)
77. Compensation - Priorities (Relative Ranking of "Three Most Important" Measures)

NOTE

THE FOLLOWING TABLES PROVIDE THE RESULTS OF HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED IN THE PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA.

THE PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA ENCOMPASSED THE LANDFILL SITING OPTION ITSELF AND BOTH THE 500m AND 1000m BOUNDARIES EXTENDING FROM THE SITE BOUNDARY.

TABLE 1
A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON SIA

	<u>The Technical Model</u>	<u>The Political Model</u>
1. Philosophy of Science	Logical positivism; social science patterned on natural science; search for discoverable regularities on which to base prediction and planning.	Critical Theory: Social scientists seek to understand the processes and structures of change in order to develop a more humane society.
2. Role and Purpose of Planning	Responsible; to maximize net social welfare by efficiently facilitating development and minimizing its adverse impacts.	Responsive; to achieve a more equitable process of development by empowering the community to take control of it.
3. Concept of Decision-Making	Rationale; choice improved through the provision of comprehensive, accurate, factual information; emphasis on the scientific method.	Open; choice improved through citizen participation; emphasis on articulation of needs and values.
4. Nature of SIA	Technical component of the planning and decision-making process; product focus on the social impact statement; reliance on experts, processed and factual inputs.	Community development component of the political process; process focus on the quality of participation; reliance on the public, personal experiential inputs.
5. Mode of Research	Reductionist and objective; detached value and free analysis to identify and predict impacts; oriented to qualification of information; concern with improving research tools and capabilities.	Holistic and subjective; involved, value-laden intervention to clarify the issues; oriented towards qualification of information; concerned with improving communications between local people directly affected and external decision-makers.

Sources: Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council.

Social Impact Assessment: A Research Prospectus. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1985: 5.

TABLE 2: POTENTIAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH LANDFILLS

Listed below are potential negative impacts generally associated with landfills. It should be noted that this is a generic checklist of the kinds of impacts known to have resulted from landfilling operations. The kinds of impacts that could occur in a specific case depend on the characteristics of the environment where the landfill is located and on how the landfill is designed and operated. Many of these impacts can be avoided or minimized through careful siting, sound engineering and state-of-the-art operational practices.

POTENTIAL ON-SITE IMPACTS

- displacement of residents
- displacement of community/recreation facilities
- displacement of businesses
- loss of agricultural land
- loss of natural habitat or habitat continuity
- loss of core species (flora and fauna)
- loss or displacement of archaeological/historical sites
- fires in the landfill cells
- explosions due to methane gas build-ups

POTENTIAL SITE VICINITY IMPACTS

- decreased property value
- disruption of way of life
- loss of satisfaction with place
- methane gas build-up and possible explosions
- disruption of the operations of community/recreation facilities
- loss of business
- interference with local traffic and potential roadway safety hazards
- visual intrusion
- nuisance impacts (noise, dust, odours, smoke, litter, rodents)
- contamination of groundwater from leachate
- contamination of surface water
- potential health hazard resulting from birds and rodents which are vectors of disease
- interference with airport traffic due to birds

POTENTIAL COMMUNITY IMPACTS

- loss of community character
- potential stigma effect with area seen as less appealing to potential newcomers
- loss of community cohesion and stability if residents move from the area or lose interest in civic affairs
- change in land use patterns

POTENTIAL ACCESS ROUTE IMPACTS

- conflict between landfill trucks and local traffic
- conflict between landfill trucks and pedestrians
- reduced property access
- truck fires (internal combustion of garbage)
- truck spills of garbage
- increased requirement for access route maintenance
- nuisance impacts (noise, litter)
- drivers not adhering to designated access routes
- construction impacts as existing roads are upgraded (resident displacement, loss of land, nuisance impacts)
- damage due to truck vibration (cracked plaster, broken water mains)

TABLE 3: LOCAL CONCERNS ABOUT LANDFILLING

The following list is based on a review of public submissions made to the Regional Municipality of Peel and a series of meetings with the Community Liaison Groups in each area. The list is not in any order of priority. Confirmation and prioritization of this list of concerns was one of the objectives of the resident survey that was undertaken as part of the study approach (discussed in Part One, Section 2.2.5).

- interference with local traffic, possible safety hazard
- loss of agricultural land
- loss of ancestral ties for displaced residents
- disruption of way of life and life plans
- hardships for those having to start over as a result of displacement
- loss of satisfaction with place
- financial and emotional set back for those who have invested substantial time, effort and money in their property
- impact on the vitality of the community if residents displaced, become less inclined to get involved in civic affairs, or decide to move out
- possible contamination of groundwater and local wells
- possible reduction in well water supply
- possible contamination of surface water (and associated implications for Conservation Authority lands downstream)
- loss of or interference with business activities (due to water contamination or interference with accessibility to property)
- disruption of day-to-day activities due to nuisance impacts
- interference with the operation of services and facilities (in particular schools, churches, recreational facilities)
- property devaluation and loss of financial security
- air pollution and potential health problems (especially for those with respiratory problems or allergies)
- visual intrusion
- nuisance and health hazards posed by seagulls and rodents
- stigma effect of the landfill
- loss of century homes
- dumping of hazardous wastes into the landfill
- degradation of aesthetics due to litter, odour, etc
- loss of peace and tranquility of home/community
- interference of birds with airport traffic

TABLE 4: FACTORS, INDICATORS AND SUB-INDICATORS IDENTIFIED AS
RELEVANT TO THE SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF LANDFILL SITING OPTIONS

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Indicators and Sub-Indicators</u>
Displacement of Residents	Total Number of Residents on-Site Key Characteristics - age - tenure - full-time farm households Attachment to Place - length of residence - ancestral ties - family ties - friendship ties - life plans Hardship - difficulties in moving
Disruption of Residents	Total Number of Residents in Primary Impact Zone Key Characteristics - age - length of time on property during operation hours Number and kinds of Uses of Property; Water Use Potential for Interference - noise - environmental impacts - visual intrusion - traffic Resident perception of Compatibility of Landfill with Daily Activities Effect on Sub-Communities

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
Resident Loss of Satisfaction with Place	Perceived Quality of Community
	Perceived Quality of Services/Facilities
	Perceptions of Potential Impacts of Landfill
	Potential Disruption of Day-to-Day Activities
	Extent of Neighbouring Community Involvement
Public Health and Safety	Mitigation/Compensation Measures
	Reliance on Well Water and Surface Water
	Number and Proximity of Potentially Vulnerable Residents - health problems - less than or equal to 4 years - school age children - 65 years or more
	Potential Interference with School Bus Routes
	Resident Use of Road and Shoulders
Displacement of Local Services and Facilities	Implications
	Number
	Key Characteristics - clients - service area - role in community
	Availability of Alternatives

TABLE 4 (cont'd)

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
Disruption of Local Services	Number in Primary Impact Study Zone Key Characteristics - clients - service area - role in community - operating hours - proximity to landfill site or access routes - owners'/operators' concerns
Loss of Community Character	Unique/Distinctive Characteristics - environmental - cultural - historic Compatibility with Land Uses
Loss of Community Cohesion	Involvement of Residents in Community Homogeneous Lifestyle Number of Friends and Relatives in Area Length of Residence Extent of Use of Local Services/Facilities Number Displaced and Implications Loss of Satisfaction with Place and Implications Displacement of Local Services/Facilities

TABLE 5: SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY AREA
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

	<u>AREA I</u>	<u>AREA II</u>	<u>AREA VI</u>
Number of Households ¹	73	125	126
Number Interviewed	40	69	72
Response Rate	55%	55%	57%
Number of Non-Farm Households ¹	47	84	98
Number Interviewed	29	54	56
Response Rate	62%	64%	57%
Number of Farm Households ¹	26	41	28
Number Interviewed	11	15	16
Response Rate	42%	37%	57%

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 6: SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY SUB-AREA ON-SITE HOUSEHOLDS

	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Number of Households ¹	4	3	14	12	3	4	7	13
Number Interviewed	1	1	12	11	2	0	6	8
Response Rate	25%	33%	86%	92%	67%	0%	86%	62%
Number of Non-Farm Households ¹	3	1	11	9	3	2	6	9
Number Interviewed	1	1	9	8	2	0	5	6
Response Rate	33%	100%	82%	89%	67%	0%	83%	67%
Number of Farm Households ¹	1	2	3	3	0	2	1	4
Number Interviewed	0	0	3	3	N/A	0	1	2
Response Rate	0%	0%	100%	100%	N/A	0%	100%	50%

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 7: SURVEY RESPONSE RATE BY SUB-AREA 0 - 1,000m
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Number of Households ¹	57	60	78	63	72	66	84	78
Number Interviewed	36	29	44	38	38	42	46	48
Response Rate	63%	48%	56%	60%	53%	64%	55%	62%
Number of Non-Farm Households ¹	36	42	54	41	46	43	64	66
Number Interviewed	26	23	38	30	30	33	36	40
Response Rate	72%	55%	70%	73%	65%	77%	56%	61%
Number of Farm Households ¹	21	18	24	22	26	23	20	12
Number Interviewed	10	6	6	8	8	9	10	8
Response Rate	48%	33%	25%	36%	31%	39%	50%	67%

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 8: DATA/INFORMATION SOURCES

FACTOR	INDICATORS AND SUB-INDICATORS	SOURCE OF DATA/INFORMATION
Displacement of Residents	Total Number of Residents on-Site	Land Use Impact Study
	Key Characteristics - age - tenure - full-time farm households	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q.5, 48, 49, 50) and Farm (Q.10, 13)
	Attachment to Place - length of residence - ancestral ties - family ties - friendship ties - life plans	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 13, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28) and Farm (Q. 5, 6, 30)
	Hardship - difficulties in moving	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 24) and Economic Impact Study
Disruption of Residents	Total Number of Residents in Primary Impact Zone	Land Use Impact Study
	Key Characteristics - age - length of time on property during operation hours	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 48, 49, 50)
	Number and kinds of Uses of Property; Water Use	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 7, 11) and Farm (Q. 1, 14, 27, 24, 29)
	Potential for Interference - noise - environmental impacts - visual intrusion - traffic	Environmental impact studies; traffic impact study; visual impact assessment; land use impact study; economic impact study; review of Regional and MOE files on landfill facilities; literature review

TABLE 8 (cont'd)

FACTOR	INDICATORS	SOURCE OF DATA/INFORMATION
	Resident Perception of Compatibility of Landfill with Daily Activities	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 10, 38, 39, 40) and Farm (2, 24, 25) Water use survey; access road survey; review of public submissions; meetings with Community Liaison Groups; key informant interviews; meeting with Peel Federation of Agriculture
	Effect on Sub-Communities	Key informant interviews; interviews with Public Officials and Politicians
Resident Loss of Satisfaction with Place	Perceived Quality of Community	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 14, 15, 16, 17, 20); key informant interviews; meetings with Community Liaison Groups
	Perceived Quality of Services/Facilities	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 15, 16, 17, 18); key informant interviews; meetings with Community Liaison Groups
	Perceptions of Potential Impacts of Landfill	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 19, 21, 22, 23); meetings with Community Liaison Groups; interviews with Politicians
	Potential Disruption of Day-to-Day Activities	Results of Factor Assessment (Disruption of Day-to-Day Activities. . .); meetings with Community Liaison Groups and key informants
	Extent of Neighbouring	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q.27, 28)
	Community Involvement	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q.29)
	Mitigation/Compensation Measures	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 37, 41, 42, 43) and Farm (Q. 26)

TABLE 8 (cont'd)

FACTOR	INDICATORS	SOURCE OF DATA/INFORMATION
Public Health and Safety	Reliance on Well Water and Surface Water	Water Use Survey: Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 35, 36) and Farm (Q. 24, 25, 27, 28, 29)
	Number and Proximity of Potentially Vulnerable Residents	Interview Questionnaire: Resident (Q. 30, 31, 34)
	- health problems	Access Road Survey; Water Use Survey
	- less than or equal to 4 years	
	- school age children	
	- 65 years or more	
	Potential Interference with School Bus Routes	Discussions with School Board Officials; Traffic Impact Analysis
	Resident Use of Road and Shoulders	Interview Questionnaire: Farm (Q.27, 28, 29) Access Road Survey; meetings with Community Liaison Groups; meeting with Peel Federation of Agriculture
	Implications	Interviews/Discussions with Public Health Officials
		Literature Review
		Review of Regional and MOE files on landfill facilities

TABLE 8 (cont'd)

FACTOR	INDICATORS	SOURCE OF DATA/INFORMATION
Loss of Community Cohesion	Involvement of Residents in Community	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 29)
	Homogeneous Lifestyle	Key Informant Interviews; informal discussions with residents; meetings with Community Liaison Groups
	Number of Friends and Relatives in Area	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 25, 26)
	Length of Residence	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 1, 2, 3, 4)
	Extent of Use of Local Services/Facilities	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 31, 32, 33) and Farm (Q. 23)
	Number Displaced and Implications	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 21, 22, 23, 29); meeting with Peel Federation of Agriculture
	Loss of Satisfaction with Place and Implications	Interview Questionnaire: Residents (Q. 19); Results of Factor Assessment (Resident Loss of Satisfaction with Place)
	Displacement of Local Services/Facilities	Results of Factor Assessment (Displacement of Local Services/Facilities)

TABLE 9: SOCIAL PROFILE - DEGREE OF RESIDENT CONCERN REGARDING
LANDFILL
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Concerned?			
Yes	98% (39)	94% (65)	94% (68)
No	0%	4% (3)	4% (3)
Don't Know	3% (1)	1% (1)	1% (1)
Considered moving?			
Yes	48% (19)	51% (35)	60% (43)
No	45% (18)	41% (28)	39% (28)
No Response	8% (3)	9% (6)	1% (1)
If yes, taken steps towards moving?			
Yes	51% (10)	40% (14)	35% (15)
No	49% (9)	60% (21)	65% (28)
If landfill site here, would move?			
Yes	40% (16)	49% (34)	54% (39)
No	18% (7)	17% (12)	17% (12)
Don't Know	25% (10)	25% (17)	28% (20)
No Response	18% (7)	9% (6)	1% (1)

Note: Rounding of numbers sometimes results in the total exceeding 100%; numbers in brackets refer to number of respondents (see Table 5 for total number of households interviewed in each area).

TABLE 10: SOCIAL PROFILE - SATISFACTION WITH PLACE
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Level of Satisfaction</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Very Dissatisfied	0%	1%	1%
2	0%	0%	3%
3	0%	0%	4%
4	5%	3%	4%
Very Satisfied	95%	96%	88%

TABLE 11: SOCIAL PROFILE - AREA'S PERCEIVED POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Characteristics Most Liked</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Open Space	58%	55%	51%
Peace and Quiet	55%	52%	46%
Clean Air	50%	48%	49%
Attractive Area	50%	45%	49%
Way of Life	50%	46%	44%
Accessibility to Work, School, etc.	48%	49%	43%
Friendly People	45%	46%	44%
Good Place to Raise Children	43%	46%	43%
Cooperation Among Neighbours	40%	39%	47%
Large Properties	45%	39%	43%
Safety	40%	41%	35%
Pace of Life	35%	41%	40%
Accessibility to Friends	35%	39%	43%
Values of the Community	38%	39%	39%
Absence of Industrial Development	43%	38%	29%
Quality of Schools	25%	30%	44%
Traffic	35%	32%	28%
All of the Above	43%	44%	44%

TABLE 12: SOCIAL PROFILE - AREA'S PERCEIVED NEGATIVE CHARACTERISTICS
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Perceived Problems</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
None	46%	42%	39%
Lack of Political Influence	40%	30%	28%
Traffic	15%	16%	28%
Water Quality	10%	12%	9%
Noise	5%	3%	14%
Odours	5%	12%	4%
Dust	3%	4%	9%
Lack of Upkeep of Neighbouring Properties	3%	1%	4%
Lack of Accessibility	0%	1%	3%
Other (e.g. inadequate services, lack of government services)	5%	6%	14%

TABLE 13: SOCIAL PROFILE - RESIDENT CONCERNS REGARDING PROPOSED
LANDFILL
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Concerns</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Water Pollution	75%	61%	57%
Odours	33%	33%	57%
Devaluation of Property	38%	31%	29%
Litter/Dust	30%	41%	24%
General Traffic Concerns	40%	32%	15%
Gulls/Rodents/Insects	25%	22%	35%
Health/Safety/Environmental Problems	30%	20%	14%
Community Disruption	20%	22%	13%
Noise	15%	22%	22%
Reduced Quality of Farm Products	15%	22%	4%
Aesthetics	15%	13%	4%
Reduced Quality of Life	13%	12%	8%
Loss of Farmland	8%	10%	1%
Expropriation/Relocation Problems	5%	10%	8%
Health/Safety Concerns Regarding Children	10%	9%	7%
Illegal Dumping of Toxic Wastes	10%	7%	3%
Loss of Business/Old Age Security	8%	6%	4%

TABLE 14: SOCIAL PROFILE - ANTICIPATED IMPACTS ON HOUSEHOLDS
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Impact</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Odour			
Yes	93%	93%	92%
No	0%	2%	6%
Don't Know	8%	4%	3%
Birds and Rodents			
Yes	93%	94%	87%
No	5%	6%	9%
Don't Know	3%	0%	4%
Litter			
Yes	93%	94%	87%
No	8%	6%	10%
Don't Know	0%	0%	3%
Truck Traffic			
Yes	85%	93%	89%
No	15%	7%	9%
Don't Know	0%	0%	3%
Dust			
Yes	88%	88%	86%
No	10%	9%	11%
Don't Know	3%	3%	3%
Noise			
Yes	80%	88%	86%
No	13%	7%	11%
Don't Know	8%	4%	3%
Visual Intrusion			
Yes	67%	79%	73%
No	26%	19%	21%
Don't Know	8%	2%	6%

TABLE 15: SOCIAL PROFILE: LOSS OF SATISFACTION WITH PLACE - DEGREE
OF CONCERN
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Anticipate Effect on Satisfaction</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Yes	93%	90%	90%
No	8%	10%	6%
Don't Know	0%	0%	4%

Note: "Satisfaction with Place" is a phrase that refers to the extent to which residents are satisfied with their community as a place to live.

TABLE 16: SOCIAL PROFILE-RESIDENT CONCERNS RE EFFECT OF LANDFILL ON
THEIR SATISFACTION WITH THE COMMUNITY AS A PLACE TO LIVE
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Concerns</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Community Disruptions	43%	41%	39%
General Traffic Concerns	38%	42%	38%
Water Pollution	30%	29%	21%
Odours	20%	23%	33%
Aesthetics	28%	16%	11%
Devaluation of Property	20%	22%	10%
Standard of Lifestyle	15%	17%	24%
Noise	13%	12%	26%
Litter/Dust	18%	13%	13%
Gulls/Rodents/Insects	13%	10%	13%
Health/Safety/Environmental Problems	15%	9%	1%
Reduced Quality of Farm Products	3%	9%	0%
Loss of Farmland	3%	7%	0%
Health/Safety Concerns Regarding Children	5%	1%	8%
Loss of Business/Old Age Security	5%	4%	1%
Illegal Dumping to Toxic Wastes	3%	1%	1%
Damage to Roads	0%	1%	1%
Other	5%	1%	1%
Don't Trust Region/Political Decision	3%	1%	0%
Process Unfair	0%	0%	1%
Safety of School Buses	0%	0%	1%
No Effect on Satisfaction	8%	10%	6%
Don't Know	0%	0%	4%

TABLE 17: FACTORS, INDICATORS AND SUB-INDICATORS USED AS EVALUATION CRITERIA (cont'd)

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Sub-Indicators</u>
Disruption of Services/ Facilities	- o Number Beyond 1,000m - o Number 500 - 1,000m - o Number 0 - 500m - o Key Characteristics	- o Number of recreational facilities - o Number of schools, churches, cemeteries - o Clients - o Service area - o Role in community - o Hours of Operation
Loss of Community Character	- o Potential Impact on Unique/ Distinctive Characteristics - o Compatibility With Character	- o Environmental - o Historical - o Visual intrusion - o Sociological intrusion
Loss of Cohesion	- o Disruption of Significant Services/Facilities 0-1,000m - o Displacement of Significant Services/Facilities - o Loss of Satisfaction With Place - o Displacement of Residents	- o Number of recreational facilities potentially affected - o Number of recreational facilities potentially affected - o Number who say they would move - o Number potentially displaced - o Percent involved in community groups - o Percent with relatives in community

TABLE 18: RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS, INDICATORS AND SUB-INDICATORS

INCREASING IMPORTANCE

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Sub-Indicators</u>
Displacement of Services/ Facilities	- o Number Displaced - o Key Characteristics - o Availability of Alternatives	- o Clients - o Service area - o Role in community
Disruption of Services/ Facilities	- o Number Beyond 1,000m - o Number 500 - 1,000m - o Number 0 - 500m - o Key Characteristics	- o Number of schools, churches, cemeteries - o Number of recreational facilities - o Clients - o Service area - o Role in community - o Hours of operation
Displacement of Residents	- o Number Displaced - o Key Characteristics - o Attachment to Place	- o Number of residents - o Number of households - non-farm; farm - o Age - 0 to 14 years; 65 years or older - o Tenure - tenants; owners - o Number of full-time farm operations - o Length of residence - more than 20 years at address; more than 20 years in community - o Ancestral ties - property owned by ancestors in family more than 100 years

TABLE 18: RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS, INDICATORS AND SUB-INDICATORS (cont'd)

INCREASING IMPORTANCE
↓

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Indicators</u>	<u>Sub-Indicators</u>
Disruption of Residents	o Number 0 - 500m	o Number of residents o Number of households - non-farm; farm
	o Number 500-1000m	o Number of residents o Number of households - non-farm; farm
	o Key Characteristics 0-500m	o Tenure - tenant; owner o Time on property - 0 to 4 years; 65 years or more; farm households
	o Key Characteristics 500 - 1,000m	o Tenure - tenant; owner o Time on property - 0 to 4 years; 65 years or more; farm households
Loss of Community Character	o Potential Impact on Unique/Distinctive Characteristics	o Environmental o Historical
	o Compatibility With Character	o Visual intrusion o Sociological intrusion
Loss of Cohesion	o Disruption of Significant Services/Facilities 0 - 1,000m	o Number of recreational facilities potentially affected
	o Displacement of Significant Services/Facilities	o Number of recreational facilities potentially affected
	o Displacement of Residents	o Number potentially displaced o Percent involved in community groups o Percent with relatives in community
	o Loss of Satisfaction with Place	o Number who say they would move

TABLE 19: COMMUNITY SERVICES/FACILITIES INVESTIGATED IN SIA

<u>Service/Facility</u>	<u>Screened Out</u>
Recreational Facilities	
● Peel Regional Police Association Recreation Centre	
● Castlemore Golf and Country Club	
● Caledon Recreation Centre	
● Upper Canada College Boys Camp	
Cemeteries	
● Alloa Pioneer Cemetery	
● St. Mary's Anglican Cemetery	
● Brampton Cemetery	●
● Memorial Gardens Cemetery	
Churches	
● Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	
● Home United Church	
● Jehovah's Witnesses Assembly Hall	
● Canadian Reformed Church	
● Norval United Church	●
● Norval Presbyterian Church	●
● Bramalea Christian Fellowship Church	
● Salem United Church	
● Huttonville United Church	●
Schools	
● Alloa Public School	
● Mayfield Secondary School	
Other	
● Chinguacousy Health Services Centre	●
● Mormon Tabernacle Church	●

Note: Services/Facilities were "screened out" of the analysis when preliminary investigations resulted in the determination that the proposed landfill would have a negligible, if any, impact on the service or facility.

TABLE 20: DISPLACEMENT OF SERVICES/FACILITIES - NUMBER DISPLACED

<u>Service/Facility</u>	<u>AREA I</u> <u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>AREA II</u> <u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>AREA VI</u> <u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
SCHOOLS								
Alloa Public School								
Mayfield Secondary School								
CHURCHES								
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints								
Home United Church								
Jehovah's Witnesses Assembly Hall								
Canadian Reformed Church								
Bramalea Christian Fellowship Church								
Salem United Church								
CEMETERIES								
Alloa pioneer Cemetery					•			
Memorial Garden's Cemetery								
St. Mary's Anglican Cemetery								•
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES								
Peel Regional Police Association					•			
Recreation Centre					•	•		
Castlemore Golf and Country Club								
Caledon Recreation Centre								
Upper Canada College Boys Camp								
NUMBER POTENTIALLY DISPLACED	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1

Note: "•" indicates that the service/facility may potentially be displaced and require relocation; it does not indicate significance of potential impact.

TABLE 21: DISPLACEMENT OF SERVICES/FACILITIES - CHARACTERISTICS AND ALTERNATIVES

<u>Services/Facilities Potentially Displaced</u>	<u>Number of Clients</u>	<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Role in Community</u>	<u>Availability of Alternatives</u>
Alloa Pioneer Cemetery	N/A	Local	LOW Historic Feature	N/A
St. Mary's Anglican Cemetery	-	Local	LOW Still in Use	HIGH
Peel Regional Police Association Recreation Centre	1,000+ members, local residents	Regional	LOW-MODERATE Banquet hall rented out; exhibition soccer games; plan further services for community	LOW Alloa Home Church and School offer banquet hall and outdoor recreational facilities but not comparable capacity

NOTE: Assessment of "Role in Community" based on importance of facility from perspective of local residents (i.e. the use they make of it and extent to which it can be regarded as a community social resource) and not necessarily from the perspective of facility owner/operator (i.e. their assessment of the role of the facility in serving local users versus other users in the Region and beyond). This distinction is important. A facility that is "regional" may draw only a small percentage of its clients from the local area; yet, from the perspective of local users the facility may be regarded as quite important to their quality of life. Thus, instead of rating the role of the facility in the community as "low" (based on percentage of local versus non-local users), it would warrant a higher rating.

"Availability of Alternatives" took into account both existence of alternatives in the Region and convenience for local residents (i.e. proximity of alternative, frequency of use on a day-to-day basis by residents).

Note: "-" indicates that no information was obtained from the service/facility owner/operator.

TABLE 22: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING: DISPLACEMENT OF SERVICES/FACILITIES

IMPORTANCE OF INDICATORS INCREASING ↓		AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
		<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
	Number Potentially Displaced	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1
	Number of Clients	-	-	-	-	N/A 1,000+	1,000+	-	-
	Service Area	-	-	-	-	Local Regional	Regional	-	Local
	Role in Community	-	-	-	-	Low Low- Moderate	low Moderate	-	Low
	Availability of Alternatives	-	-	-	-	N/A Low	Low	-	High
	Impact Rating	NI	NI	NI	NI	H	H	NI	L
	Impact Ranking	1	1	1	1	8	7	1	6

Note: 1. NI is "No impact".

2. Ranking 1 is the most preferred site.

TABLE 23: DISRUPTION OF SERVICES/FACILITIES - OWNER/OPERATOR CONCERNS

<u>Service/Facility</u>	<u>None/ Minor</u>	<u>Traffic</u>	<u>Nuisance</u>	<u>Aesthetics</u>	<u>Displacement of Clients</u>	<u>Water Pollution</u>	<u>Loss of Wildlife</u>	<u>Loss of Land Value</u>
SCHOOLS								
Alloa Public School		x	x		x			
Mayfield Secondary School		x	x		x			
CHURCHES								
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints		x	x					
Home United Church		x			x			
Jehovah's Witnesses Assembly Hall		x		x		x		
Canadian Reformed Church		x				x		
Norval United Church	x							x
Norval Presbyterian Church	x							
Bramalea Christian Fellowship Church		x						
Salem United Church					x			
Huttonville United Church	x							
CEMETERIES								
Alloa Pioneer Cemetery				x				
Memorial Gardens Cemetery		x	x					
St. Mary's Anglican Cemetery	x							
Brampton Cemetery	x							
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES								
Peel Regional Police Association Recreation Centre		x	x	x		x		
Castlemore Golf and Country Club		x	x	x				
Caledon Recreation Centre			x					
Upper Canada College Boys Camp		x	x			x	x	x
OTHER								
Chinguacousy Health Services Centre (Proposed)	x							
Mormon Tabernacle Church (Proposed)	x							

Note: "x" indicates that a specific category of concern was identified by owners/operators; it does not indicate degree of concern.

TABLE 24: DISRUPTION OF SERVICES/FACILITIES - POTENTIAL DISRUPTION 0 - 500M

<u>Service/Facility</u>	AREA I <u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	AREA II <u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	AREA VI <u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
SCHOOLS								
Alloa Public School								
Mayfield Secondary School								
CHURCHES								
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints			•		•			
Home United Church								
Jehovah's Witnesses Assembly Hall								
Canadian Reformed Church								
Bramalea Christian Fellowship Church								
Salem United Church								
CEMETERIES								
Alloa Pioneer Cemetery			•	•		•		
Memorial Gardens Cemetery								
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES								
Peel Regional Police Association Recreation Centre	•	•						
Castlemore Golf and Country Club							•	•
Caledon Recreation Centre								
Upper Canada College Boys Camp								
NUMBER POTENTIALLY DISRUPTED	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1

Note: "•" indicates that the serviced facility may be disrupted; it does not indicate degree of disruption.

TABLE 25: DISRUPTION OF SERVICES/FACILITIES - POTENTIAL DISRUPTION 500M - 1000M

<u>Service/Facility</u>	AREA I <u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	AREA II <u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	AREA VI <u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
SCHOOLS								
Alloa Public School								
Mayfield Secondary School								•
CHURCHES								
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	•			•		•		
Home United Church								
Jehovah's Witnesses Assembly Hall								
Canadian Reformed Church				•		•		
Bramalea Christian Fellowship Church								•
Salem United Church								
CEMETERIES								
Alloa Pioneer Cemetery	•	•						
Memorial Gardens Cemetery				•				
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES								
Peel Regional Police Association Recreation Centre			•	•				
Castlemore Golf and Country Club								
Caledon Recreation Centre								•
Upper Canada College Boys Camp								
NUMBER POTENTIALLY DISRUPTED	2	1	1	4	0	2	0	3

Note: "•" indicates that the service/facility may be disrupted; it does not indicate degree of disruption.

TABLE 26: DISRUPTION OF SERVICES/FACILITIES - POTENTIAL DISRUPTION BEYOND 1000M

<u>Service/Facility</u>	AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
SCHOOLS								
Alloa Public School	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Mayfield Secondary School	•	•	•	•	•	•		
CHURCHES								
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints								
Home United Church	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Jehovah's Witnesses Assembly Hall	•	•	•	•	•	•		
Canadian Reformed Church								
Bramalea Christian Fellowship Church								
Salem United Church							•	•
CEMETERIES								
Alloa Pioneer Cemetery								
Memorial Gardens Cemetery								
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES								
Peel Regional Police Association Recreation Centre								
Castlemore Golf and Country Club								
Caledon Recreation Centre							•	
Upper Canada College Boys Camp	•	•						
NUMBER POTENTIALLY DISRUPTED	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	2

Note: 1. "•" indicates that the service/facility may be disrupted; it does not indicate degree of disruption.
 2. The • shown for each of the schools and churches shown above does not indicate that the school or church is necessarily located in the sub-area; what it indicates is that if the school or church is disrupted, this impact may affect quality of life in the sub-area. Thus, for example, disruption of the Home United Church, which is located in Area I, may have repercussions in Areas I and VI.

TABLE 27: DISRUPTION OF SERVICES/FACILITIES - CHARACTERISTICS 0 - 500M

<u>Services/Facilities Potentially Disrupted</u>	<u>Number of Clients</u>	<u>Service Area</u>	<u>Role in Community</u>	<u>Operating Hours</u>
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints	800+ members 120 other users	Regional	MODERATE Membership is increasing; facility used for various community groups	Mainly evenings and weekends
Alloa Pioneer Cemetery	N/A	Local	LOW Historic feature	N/A
Peel Regional Police Association Recreation Centre	1,000+	Regional	LOW-MODERATE Banquet hall rented out; exhibition soccer games; plan further services for community	Days and evenings throughout week
Castlemore Golf and Country Club	800+	Regional	LOW-MODERATE Rent out facilities for company tournaments; meeting place for community groups	Days and evenings throughout week

NOTE: Assessment of "Role in Community" based on importance of facility from perspective of local residents (i.e. the use they make of it and extent to which it can be regarded as a community social resource) and not necessarily from the perspective of facility owner/operator (i.e. their assessment of the role of the facility in serving local users versus other users in the Region and beyond). This distinction is important. A facility that is "regional" may draw only a small percentage of its clients from the local area; yet, from the perspective of local users the facility may be regarded as quite important to their quality of life. Thus, instead of rating the role of the facility in the community as "low" (based on percentage of local versus non-local users), it would warrant a higher rating.

TABLE 28: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING - DISRUPTION OF SERVICES AND FACILITIES

IMPORTANCE OF INDICATOR INCREASING ↓		AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
		<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
	Number Beyond 1000m								
	- Schools, Churches, Cemeteries	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	2
	- Recreation	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
	Number 500 - 1000m								
	- Schools, Churches, Cemeteries	2	1	0	3	0	2	0	2
	- Recreation	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
	Number 0 - 500m								
	- Schools, Churches, Cemeteries	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0
	- Recreation	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Characteristics 0 - 500m								
	- Clients	1,000+	1,000+	800+ N/A	N/A	800+	N/A	800+	800+
	- Service Area	Reg.	Reg.	Reg. Local	N/A	Reg.	N/A	Reg.	Reg. Local
	- Role in Community	Low- Mod.	Low- Mod.	Moderate Low	N/A	Mod.	N/A	Low- Mod.	Low- Mod.
	-Main Operating Hours	Days S-S	Days S-S	Evenings Weekends		Evenings Weekends		Days S-S	Days S-S
	Impact Rating	M-H	M	L	L	L	L	M	M-H
	Impact Ranking	7	5	4	2	3	1	5	8

TABLE 30: DISPLACEMENT OF ON-SITE RESIDENTS - FARM OPERATIONS

<u>Type of Operation</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Number of Farm Households ¹	1	2	3	3	0	2	1	4
Number Interviewed	0	0	3	3	N/A	0	1	2
Response Rate	0%	0%	100%	100%		0%	100%	50%
Farm								
Full-Time Operation	-	-	2	1		-	0	1
Part-Time Operation	-	-	0	0	N/A	-	1	1
Hobby Farm	-	-	1	1		-	0	0
Agri-Business								
Custom Work	-	-	2	2		-	0	1
Horse Training/Boarding	-	-	0	0		-	1	1
Equipment Sales and Services	-	-	0	0		-	0	0
Construction	-	-	0	0		-	0	0
Feed Mill	-	-	0	0	N/A	-	0	0
Market Garden	-	-	0	0		-	0	0
Specialized Livestock	-	-	0	0		-	0	0
Orchard	-	-	0	0		-	0	0
Other	-	-	1	1		-	0	0

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

2. Note: "-" indicates that no survey data is available due to no response.

TABLE 31a: DISPLACEMENT OF ON-SITE RESIDENTS - KEY CHARACTERISTICS

<u>For Households Surveyed</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Average Household Size	2.0	2.0	3.6	3.5	2.5	-	4.0	4.2
Households With Children	0	0	7	6	0	1	2	3
Average Number of Children/ Household	0	0	2.3	2.0	0	1	3.0	3.3
Households Without Children	1	1	5	5	2	3	4	5
Number of Persons 0 - 4 Years	0	0	2	2	0	-	1	3
Number of Persons 5 - 14 Years	0	0	8	7	0	-	5	5
Number of Persons 65 Years +	0	0	4	4	3	2	1	3
Number of Properties Owned	1	0	9	8	2	2	3	7
Number of Properties Rented	0	1	3	3	0	1	3	1
Number of Households On-Site ¹	4	3	14	12	3	4	7	13
Number Interviewed	1	1	12	11	2	0	6	8
Response Rate	25%	33%	86%	92%	67%	0%	86%	62%

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 31b: DISPLACEMENT OF RESIDENTS - KEY CHARACTERISTICS (ADJUSTED SURVEY RESULTS)

<u>For Households Surveyed</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Average Household Size	(3.8)	(4.0)	3.6	3.5	2.5	(3.4)	4.0	4.2
Households With Children	(2)	(2)	7	6	0	1	2	3
Average Number of Children/ Household	(2)	(2.2)	2.3	2.0	0	1	3.0	3.3
Households without Children	(1)	(1)	5	5	2	3	4	5
Number of Persons 0-4 Years	(2)	(2)	2	2	0	(1)	1	3
Number of Persons 5-14 Years	(2)	(2)	8	7	0	(3)	5	5
Number of Persons 65 Years+	(1)	(1)	4	4	3	2	1	3
Number of Properties Owned	(3)	(2)	9	8	2	2	3	7
Number of Properties Rented	(1)	(1)	3	3	0	1	3	1
Number of Households On-site ¹	4	3	14	12	3	4	7	13
Number Interviewed	1	1	12	11	2	0	6	8

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986

Note: Figures in brackets are adjusted survey responses derived using survey data for the primary impact study area (0-1000m), on the assumption that the characteristics of residents on-site can be expected to be similar to those of residents in the primary impact study area.

TABLE 32: DISPLACEMENT OF ON-SITE RESIDENTS - LENGTH OF RESIDENCE

	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
At Current Address								
Less Than 3 Years	0	0	1	1	0	-	1	1
3 - 5 Years	0	1	1	0	0	-	2	3
6 - 10 Years	0	0	3	3	1	-	0	0
11 - 15 Years	1	0	3	4	0	-	0	3
16 - 20 Years	0	0	0	0	0	-	1	0
More Than 20 Years	0	0	4	3	1	-	2	1
In the Community								
Less Than 3 Years	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	1
3 - 5 Years	0	0	1	0	0	-	2	2
6 - 10 Years	0	0	3	2	1	-	0	0
11 - 15 Years	0	0	2	3	0	-	0	2
16 - 20 Years	0	1	1	1	0	-	1	1
More Than 20 Years	1	0	5	4	1	-	2	1
No Response	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1

TABLE 33: DISPLACEMENT OF ON-SITE RESIDENTS - ANCESTRAL TIES

	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Property Previously Owned by Family Member								
Yes	0	1	4	3	1	-	1	2
No	1	0	8	8	1	-	5	6
Number of Years Property in Family								
11 - 20 Years	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	2
21 - 30 Years	0	0	1	1	0	-	0	0
31 - 40 Years	0	0	0	1	0	-	1	0
91 - 100 Years	0	0	1	0	0	-	0	0
Over 100 Years	0	1	1	1	1	-	0	0
Number of Households On-Site ¹	4	3	14	12	3	4	7	13
Number Interviewed	1	1	12	11	2	0	6	8

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 34: DISPLACEMENT OF ON-SITE RESIDENTS - FRIENDSHIP TIES

	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Of Three Closest Friends, Number in Community								
One	0	1	2	2	0	-	0	0
Two	0	0	1	3	1	-	2	2
Three	0	0	7	5	0	-	0	3
None	0	0	2	1	1	-	4	3
Number of Households On-Site ¹	4	3	14	12	3	4	7	13
Number Interviewed	1	1	12	11	2	0	6	8
No Response	3	2	2	1	1	4	1	5

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 35: DISPLACEMENT OF ON-SITE RESIDENTS - ANTICIPATED DIFFICULTIES IN MOVING

<u>Difficulties</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Reduced Property Value	0	1	6	4	0	-	0	2
Attached to the Area	0	1	5	3	1	-	2	3
Can't Find Equivalent	0	0	4	3	0	-	3	2
Family Ties	0	0	2	1	0	-	0	0
Nuisance/Stress	0	0	2	1	1	-	0	1
Health/Too Old	1	0	1	1	1	-	0	0
Retirement Plans Lost	1	0	0	0	0	-	0	0
Difficult to Transfer Business	0	0	1	1	0	-	0	1
Hard for Kids	0	0	1	1	0	-	1	0
Won't Be Able to Sell	0	0	1	0	0	-	0	0
Job Obligations in Area	0	0	0	0	0	-	1	0
Number of Households On-Site ¹	4	3	14	12	3	4	7	13
Number Interviewed	1	1	12	11	2	0	6	8

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986

TABLE 36: DISPLACEMENT OF ON-SITE RESIDENTS - PROBLEMS REGARDING FARM RELOCATION

	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
If relocated, continue operations?								
Yes	-	-	-	-	N/A	-	0	1
No	-	-	-	-		-	0	1
Don't Know	-	-	3	4		-	1	0
Number of Farm Households ¹	1	2	3	3	0	2	1	4
Number Interviewed	0	0	3	3	-	0	1	2

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986

TABLE 37: SOCIAL PROFILE - PROBLEMS REGARDING FARM RELOCATION
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
If relocated, continue operations?			
Yes	50% (4)	27% (3)	44% (7)
No	50% (4)	27% (3)	44% (7)
Don't Know	0%	46% (5)	13% (2)
If no, why not?			
Too Old	50% (2)	33% (1)	29% (2)
Not Economical	25% (1)	0%	29% (2)
Depends on Where and Quality	0%	0%	14% (1)
Depends on Market	0%	0%	14% (1)
Could Not Justify Replacing Existing Farm	25% (1)	67% (2)	0%
Other	0%	0%	29% (1)
Number of Farm Households Interviewed	11	15	16

Note: Number in brackets refer to the number of respondents who answered the question.

TABLE 38: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING: DISPLACEMENT OF RESIDENTS - ATTACHMENT TO PLACE

SUB-AREA	LENGTH OF RESIDENCE		ANCESTRAL TIES		IMPACT RATING	IMPACT RANKING
	More Than 20 Years at Address	More Than 20 Years in Community	Property Owned By Ancestors	Property in Family More Than 100 Years		
IB	0	1	0	0	L	1
IC	0	1	1	1	L-M	3
IIB	4	5	4	1	H	8
IIC	3	4	3	1	H	7
IIE	1	1	1	1	M	5
IIF ¹	1	1	1	1	M	5
VIA	2	2	1	0	L-M	2
VIB	1	1	2	0	L-M	4

1. There was no response from on-site IIF households; since the characteristics of these households were similar to those of IIE, the results for IIE were applied to IIF.

TABLE 39: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING: DISPLACEMENT OF RESIDENTS - NUMBER DISPLACED

	AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Residents ¹	14	10	47	41	10	14	26	46
Households ¹								
- Non-Farm	3	1	11	9	3	2	6	9
- Farm	1	2	3	3	0	2	1	4
Impact Rating	L-M	L-M	H	H	L	L-M	M	H
Impact Ranking	3	2	8	6	1	4	5	7

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

IMPORTANCE OF
SUB-INDICATORS
INCREASING



TABLE 40: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING: DISPLACEMENT OF RESIDENTS - CHARACTERISTICS (ADJUSTED SURVEY RESULTS)

	AREA I		AREA II			²	AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Tenants	1	1	3	3	0	1	3	1
0 to 14 Years of Age	4	4	10	9	0	4	6	8
65 Years or Older	1	1	4	4	3	2	1	3
Property Owners	3	2	9	8	2	2	3	7
Impact Rating	L	L	H	H	L	L	M	M
Impact Ranking	3	2	8	7	1	4	5	6

1. The data shown above are adjusted survey results taken from Table 31b.

2. Information provided by community representatives.

TABLE 41: COMPARISON AND RANKING OF SUB-AREAS: DISPLACEMENT OF RESIDENTS

	AREA I		AREA II			AREA VI		
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
IMPACT RATING								
- Attachment to Place	L	L-M	H	H	M	M	L-M	L-M
- Number Displaced	L-M	L-M	H	H	L	L-M	M	H
- Characteristics	L	L	H	H	L	L	M	M
IMPACT RANKING								
- Attachment to Place	1	3	8	7	5	5	2	4
- Number Displaced	3	2	8	6	1	4	5	7
- Characteristics	3	2	8	7	1	4	5	6
OVERALL RATING	L-M	L-M	H	H	L	L-M	M	M
OVERALL RANKING	3	2	8	7	1	4	5	6

IMPORTANCE OF INDICATORS
INCREASING
↓

TABLE 42: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - NUMBER DISRUPTED BY SITING OPTION 0 - 1000m

<u>Indicators</u> ¹	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Number of Residents	193	204	266	214	245	224	303	281
Number of Households	57	60	78	63	72	66	84	78
Number of Non-Farm Households	36	42	54	41	46	43	64	66
Number of Farm Households	21	18	24	22	26	23	20	12

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 43: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - NUMBER DISRUPTED BY SITING OPTION 0 - 500m

<u>Indicators</u> ¹	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Number of Residents	65	61	58	58	78	68	101	101
Number of Households	19	18	17	17	23	20	28	28
Number of Non-Farm Households	9	11	10	10	13	13	18	22
Number of Farm Households	10	7	7	7	10	7	10	6

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 44: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - NUMBER DISRUPTED BY SITING OPTION 500 - 1000m

<u>Indicators</u> ¹	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Number of Residents	129	142	208	156	166	156	202	180
Number of Households	38	42	61	46	49	46	56	50
Number of Non-Farm Households	27	31	44	31	33	30	46	44
Number of Farm Households	11	11	17	15	16	16	10	6

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 45a: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - KEY CHARACTERISTICS BY SITING OPTION 0 - 1000m

<u>For Households Surveyed</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Average Household Size	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.4	4.2	4.0
Households With Children	21	19	29	23	22	21	22	25
Average Number of Children/ Household	2.0	2.2	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.9
Households Without Children	13	7	14	12	15	19	23	21
Person 0 - 4 Years	15	15	11	9	10	10	10	11
Persons 5 - 14 Years	22	20	34	24	28	26	17	22
Persons 65 Years +	6	7	8	10	8	13	13	11
Property Owned	29	24	33	28	29	34	39	41
Property Rented	7	5	11	10	9	8	7	7
Number of Households 0 - 1,000m ¹	57	60	78	63	72	66	84	78
Number Interviewed	36	29	44	38	38	42	46	48

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

2. Note: For some siting options the number of households "with" and "without" children does not equal the number of households interviewed due to the fact that some respondents declined to provide information regarding children.

TABLE 45b: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS-KEY CHARACTERISTICS BY SITING OPTION 0-1000m (PERCENTAGES)

<u>For Households Surveyed</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Average Household Size	3.8	4.0	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.4	4.2	4.0
Households with Children	58%	66%	66%	61%	58%	50%	48%	52%
Average Number of Children/ Household	2.0	2.2	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.9
Households without Children	36%	24%	32%	32%	39%	45%	50%	44%
Persons 0-4 Years	11%	13%	7%	6%	8%	7%	5%	6%
Persons 5-14 Years	16%	17%	20%	17%	21%	18%	9%	11%
Persons 65+	4%	6%	5%	7%	6%	9%	7%	6%
Property Owned	81%	83%	75%	74%	76%	81%	85%	85%
Property Rented	19%	17%	25%	26%	24%	19%	15%	15%
Number of Households 0-1000m ¹	57	60	78	63	72	66	84	78
Number Interviewed	36	29	44	38	38	42	46	48
Response Rate	63%	48%	56%	60%	53%	64%	55%	62%

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Survey Data, 1986.

Note: To calculate the % of Person 0-4 Years for each siting option, the number of persons 0-4 was divided by the product of the number of households and the average household size (that is, by an estimate of the total number of persons) and then converted to a percent. The same procedure was used to calculate the % of Persons 5-14 Years and % of Persons 65+ Years.

Note: For some siting options the percentage of households "with" and "without" children does not total 100%. This is because some respondents declined to provide information regarding children.

TABLE 46a: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - KEY CHARACTERISTICS BY SITING OPTIONS 0-500m

<u>For Households Surveyed</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Average Household Size	3.9	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.9
Households With Children	6	4	6	7	9	8	8	7
Average Number of Children/ Household	2.0	2.5	1.8	2.3	1.9	2.0	1.5	2.0
Households Without Children	2	4	6	5	8	10	4	8
Persons 0 - 4 Years	6	3	1	2	4	4	1	2
Persons 5 - 14 Years	4	5	6	11	10	10	5	5
Persons 65 Years +	3	2	4	4	6	8	4	5
Property Owned	7	7	9	7	15	13	10	13
Property Rented	3	2	3	5	3	5	3	3
Number of Households 0 - 500m ¹	19	18	17	17	23	20	28	28
Number Interviewed	10	9	12	12	18	18	13	16

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

2. Note: For some siting options the number of households "with" and "without" children does not equal the number of households interviewed due to the fact that some respondents declined to provide information regarding children.

TABLE 46b: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS-KEY CHARACTERISTICS BY SITING OPTION 0-500m (PERCENTAGES)

<u>For Households Surveyed</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Average Household Size	3.9	3.3	3.5	3.8	3.4	3.3	3.8	3.9
Households With Children	60%	44%	50%	58%	50%	44%	62%	44%
Average Number of Children/ Household	2.0	2.5	1.8	2.3	1.9	2.0	1.5	2.0
Households Without Children	20%	44%	50%	42%	44%	56%	31%	50%
Persons 0-4 Years	15%	10%	2%	4%	7%	7%	2%	3%
Persons 5-14 Years	10%	17%	14%	24%	16%	17%	10%	8%
Persons 65+ Years	8%	7%	10%	9%	10%	14%	8%	8%
Property Owned	70%	78%	75%	58%	83%	72%	77%	81%
Property Rented	30%	22%	25%	42%	17%	28%	23%	19%
Number of Households 0-500m ¹	19	18	17	17	23	20	28	28
Number Interviewed	10	9	12	12	18	18	13	16
Response Rate	53%	50%	71%	71%	78%	90%	46%	57%

1. Regional Municipality of Peel. Land Use Data, 1986.

Note: To calculate the % of Persons 0-4 Years for each siting option, the number of person 0-4 years was divided by the product of the number of households interviewed and the average household size (that is by an estimate of the total number of persons) and then converted to a percent. The same procedure was used to calculate the % of Persons 5-14 Years and the % of Persons 65+ Years.

Note: For some siting options the percentage of households "with" and "without" children does not total 100%. This is because some respondents declined to provide information regarding children.

TABLE 47a: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - KEY CHARACTERISTICS BY SITING OPTION 500m - 1000m

<u>For Households Surveyed</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Average Household Size	3.7	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.5	4.3	4.1
Households with Children	15	15	23	16	13	13	14	18
Average Number of Children/ Household	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.4	1.8
Households Without Children	11	3	8	7	7	9	19	13
Persons 0 - 4 Years	9	12	10	7	6	6	9	9
Persons 5 - 14	18	15	28	13	18	16	12	17
Person 65 Years +	3	5	4	6	2	5	9	6
Property Owned	22	17	24	21	14	21	29	28
Property Rented	4	3	8	5	6	3	4	4
Number of Households 500m - 1000m ¹	38	42	61	46	49	46	56	50
Number Interviewed	26	20	32	26	20	24	33	32

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 47b: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS-KEY CHARACTERISTICS BY SITING OPTION 500m-1000m (PERCENTAGES)

<u>For Households Surveyed</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Average Household Size	3.7	4.1	4.0	3.7	3.6	3.5	4.3	4.1
Households With Children	58%	75%	72%	62%	65%	54%	42%	56%
Average Number of Children/ Household	2.1	2.1	2.0	1.8	2.1	2.1	2.4	1.8
Households Without Children	42%	15%	25%	27%	35%	38%	58%	41%
Persons 0-4 Years	9%	15%	8%	7%	8%	7%	6%	7%
Persons 5-14 Years	19%	18%	22%	14%	25%	19%	8%	13%
Persons 65+ Years	3%	6%	3%	6%	3%	6%	6%	5%
Property Owned	85%	85%	75%	81%	70%	88%	88%	88%
Property Rented	15%	15%	25%	19%	30%	13%	12%	13%
Number of Households ¹ 500m-1000m	38	42	61	46	49	46	56	50
Number Interviewed	26	20	32	26	20	24	33	32
Response Rate	72%	48%	52%	57%	41%	52%	59%	64%

I. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

Note: To calculate the % of Persons 0-4 Years for each siting option, the number of persons 0-4 years was divided by the product of households interviewed and the average household size (that is by an estimate of the total number of persons) and then converted to a percent. The same procedure was used to calculate the % of Persons 5-14 Years and the % of Persons 65+ Years.

Note: For some siting options the percentage of households "with" and "without" children does not total 100%. This is because some respondents declined to provide information regarding children.

TABLE 48: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - ACTIVITIES PERCEIVED TO BE POTENTIALLY DISRUPTED 0 - 500m

<u>Activities</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Gardening	10	9	11	10	17	16	12	13
Entertaining Friends/Relatives	10	9	11	12	18	18	12	14
Family Barbeques	8	8	11	12	16	16	12	12
Children's Activities	9	7	9	11	15	14	11	9
Swimming	3	2	2	4	7	5	1	6
Cross-Country Skiing	2	3	6	8	8	8	6	9
Snowmobiling/ATV	1	2	6	4	8	8	4	8
Fishing	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4
Hunting	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2
Leisure/Relaxation/Enjoying Nature	1	3	1	0	1	1	1	0
Hobby Farming	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Sports	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
Other	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	1
Number of Households 0 - 500m ¹	19	18	17	17	23	20	28	28
Number Interviewed	10	9	12	12	18	18	13	16

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986

TABLE 49: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - ACTIVITIES PERCEIVED TO BE POTENTIALLY DISRUPTED 500 - 1000m

<u>Activities</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Gardening	24	19	29	24	18	23	26	28
Entertaining Friends/Relatives	26	20	30	25	20	24	32	30
Family Barbeques	25	19	29	24	20	23	29	28
Children's Activities	21	19	27	23	19	23	23	28
Swimming	7	5	14	13	7	8	6	5
Cross-Country Skiing	12	8	10	12	4	6	8	12
Snowmobiling/ATV	7	4	7	9	6	7	16	11
Fishing	1	3	1	3	1	1	6	5
Hunting	0	0	1	3	0	1	2	3
Leisure/Relaxation/Enjoying Nature	4	0	1	4	3	5	6	5
Other Sports	0	3	4	1	2	1	0	2
Other	1	3	5	4	3	3	1	1
Number of Households 500-1000m ¹	38	42	61	46	49	46	56	50
Number Interviewed	26	20	32	26	20	24	33	32

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986

TABLE 50: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS - ACTIVITIES POTENTIALLY DISRUPTED 0 - 1000M

<u>Activities</u>	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Gardening	94%	97%	91%	90%	92%	93%	86%	89%
Entertaining Friends/Relatives	100%	100%	93%	97%	100%	100%	100%	96%
Family Barbeques	92%	93%	91%	95%	95%	98%	93%	87%
Children's Activities	83%	90%	82%	90%	90%	88%	77%	80%
Swimming	28%	24%	36%	45%	37%	31%	16%	24%
Cross-Country Skiing	39%	38%	36%	47%	32%	33%	32%	46%
Snowmobiling/ATV	22%	21%	30%	34%	37%	36%	46%	41%
Fishing	3%	14%	2%	11%	5%	7%	23%	20%
Hunting	0%	0%	2%	8%	3%	5%	7%	11%
Leisure/Relaxation/Enjoying Nature	14%	10%	5%	11%	10%	14%	16%	11%
Hobby Farming	3%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other Sports	3%	10%	9%	5%	5%	5%	0%	4%
Other	6%	17%	11%	13%	8%	10%	2%	2%
Number of Households 0-1000m ¹	57	60	78	63	72	66	84	78
Number Interviewed	36	29	44	38	38	42	46	48

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 51: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING: DISRUPTION - NUMBER POTENTIALLY AFFECTED 500-1000m

	AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Residents ¹	129	142	208	156	166	156	202	180
Households ¹	38	42	61	46	49	46	56	50
Impact Rating	L	L-M	H	L-M	M	L-M	H	M
Impact Ranking	1	2	8	3	5	3	7	6

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

IMPORTANCE OF
SUB-INDICATORS
INCREASING
↓

TABLE 52: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING: DISRUPTION - NUMBER POTENTIALLY AFFECTED 0 - 500m

	AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Residents ¹	65	61	58	58	78	68	101	101
Households ¹	19	18	17	17	23	20	28	28
Impact Rating	M	L-M	L	L	M	M	H	H
Impact Ranking	4	3	1	1	6	5	7	7

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 53: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING: DISRUPTION - CHARACTERISTICS OF RESIDENTS 500-1000m

	AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>			<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Tenure								
- Tenant	15%	15%	25%	19%	30%	13%	12%	13%
- Owner	85%	85%	75%	81%	70%	88%	88%	88%
Children 5 - 14 Years	19%	18%	22%	14%	25%	19%	8%	13%
Time on Property								
- 0 to 4 years	9%	15%	8%	7%	8%	7%	6%	7%
- 65 years or older	3%	6%	3%	6%	3%	6%	6%	5%
- Farm households ¹	11	11	17	15	16	16	10	6
Impact Rating	L-M	L-M	H	M	M	H	L-M	L
Impact Ranking	3	4	8	6	5	7	2	1

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 54: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING: DISRUPTION - CHARACTERISTICS OF RESIDENTS 0 - 500m

	AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Tenure								
- Tenant	30%	22%	25%	42%	17%	28%	23%	19%
- Owner	70%	78%	75%	58%	83%	72%	77%	81%
Children 5 - 14 Years	10%	17%	14%	24%	16%	17%	10%	8%
Time on Property								
- 0 to 4 years	15%	10%	2%	4%	7%	7%	2%	3%
- 65 years or older	8%	7%	10%	9%	10%	14%	8%	8%
- Farm households ¹	10	7	7	7	10	7	10	6
Impact Rating	L-M	L	L	L	H	L-M	L-M	L
Impact Ranking	6	4	2	3	8	5	7	1

IMPORTANCE OF
SUB-INDICATORS
INCREASING
↓

1. Regional Municipality of Peel, Land Use Data, 1986.

TABLE 55: COMPARISON AND RANKING OF SUB-AREAS: DISRUPTION OF RESIDENTS

	AREA I <u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	AREA II <u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	AREA VI <u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Impact Rating								
- Number 500 to 1000m	L	L-M	H	L-M	M	L-M	H	M
- Characteristics 500 to 1000m	L-M	L-M	H	M	M	H	L-M	L
- Number 0 to 500m	M	L-M	L	L	M	M	H	H
- Characteristics 0 to 500m	L-M	L	L	L	H	L-M	L-M	L
Impact Ranking								
- Number 500 to 1000m	1	2	8	3	5	3	7	6
- Characteristics 500 to 1000m	3	4	8	6	5	7	2	1
- Number 0 to 500m	4	3	1	1	6	5	7	7
- Characteristics 0 to 500m	6	4	2	3	8	5	7	1
Overall Rating	L-M	L-M	L-M	L	H	M	M	L-M
Overall Ranking	4	3	5	1	8	6	7	2

TABLE 56: SOCIAL PROFILE - LENGTH OF RESIDENCE
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
At Current Address			
Less Than 3 Years	25%	23%	20%
3 - 5 Years	10%	7%	7%
6 - 10 Years	30%	25%	20%
11 - 15 Years	10%	15%	24%
16 - 20 Years	5%	10%	10%
More Than 20 Years	20%	20%	20%
In the Community			
Less Than 3 Years	18%	15%	18%
3 - 5 Years	8%	6%	7%
6 - 10 Years	20%	22%	19%
11 - 15 Years	8%	10%	18%
16 - 20 Years	5%	13%	12%
More Than 20 Years	43%	33%	27%

TABLE 57: SOCIAL PROFILE - FARMING OPERATIONS
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Type of Operation</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
% of Farm Households in Area	36%	33%	22%
Farm			
Full-time Operation	80%	86%	43%
Part-time Operation	10%	7%	29%
Hobby Farm	10%	7%	29%
Agri-Business			
Custom Work	18%	47%	13%
Horse Training/Boarding	9%	13%	19%
Feed Mill	9%	0%	0%
Market Garden	0%	0%	6%
Specialized Livestock	0%	0%	6%
Embryo Transfer	18%	13%	0%
Tree Farm/Nursery	18%	13%	0%
Other	9%	0%	6%

TABLE 58: SOCIAL PROFILE - FARMING OPERATIONS/FUTURE PROSPECTS
OVER NEXT FIVE YEARS
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Prospects Over Next 5 Years</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Increase/Expansion of Operation	64%	57%	25%
Decrease in Operations	18%	0%	6%
No Change	0%	14%	56%
Don't Know	18%	29%	13%
<u>Basis for Outlook</u>			
Getting Older/Near Retirement	18%	7%	7%
Will Sell to Developers/ Speculators	9%	0%	7%
Must Remain Competitive	27%	14%	7%
Depends on Landfill Decision	9%	14%	27%
Sons Will Inherit Farm	27%	0%	0%
Market Improving	9%	14%	7%
Will Remain Family Size Operation	0%	0%	20%
Uncertainties Related to Farming (e.g. weather, prices)	0%	14%	0%
Recent Investments/Expect Growth	0%	0%	7%
On Quota	0%	7%	0%
Not Specific/Unclear	0%	29%	13%

TABLE 59: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING - LOSS OF COMMUNITY CHARACTER

IMPORTANCE OF INDICATORS INCREASING ↓		<u>AREA I</u>	<u>AREA II</u>	<u>AREA VIA</u>	<u>AREA VIB</u>
	Environmental Characteristics	Low	Low	Low-Moderate	Low-Moderate
	Historical Characteristics	Low	Low	Low	Low-Moderate
	Visual Intrusion	Low-Moderate	Low-Moderate	Low	High
	Sociological Intrusion	High	High	Low	Moderate
	Impact Rating	Low-Moderate	Moderate	Low	Moderate-High
	Impact Ranking	2	3	1	4

Note: Refer to Section 3.5 of "Social Impact Assessment of Landfill Siting Options: Report of Findings" for an explanation of the terms "Environmental Characteristics", "Historical Characteristics", "Visual Intrusion", and "Sociological Intrusion".

TABLE 60: SOCIAL PROFILE - FRIENDSHIP TIES
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Of Three Closest Friends, Number in Community</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
One	13%	16%	10%
Two	23%	19%	11%
Three	33%	44%	49%
None	30%	22%	31%

TABLE 61: SOCIAL PROFILE - KINSHIP TIES
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Relatives in the Community</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Yes	45%	46%	25%
No	55%	54%	75%

TABLE 62: SOCIAL PROFILE - VISITING WITH NEIGHBOURS
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Community</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Never	0%	3%	6%
Seldom (once a year)	8%	10%	21%
Sometimes (1 - 2 times a month)	28%	30%	25%
Often (1 - 2 times a week)	40%	30%	35%
Very Often (daily)	25%	26%	13%

TABLE 63: SOCIAL PROFILE - SOCIAL SUPPORT
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Help or Receive Help From Neighbour</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Never	0%	4%	10%
Seldom (once a year)	13%	12%	18%
Sometimes (1-2 times a month)	23%	28%	38%
Often (1-2 times a week)	41%	35%	28%
Very Often (daily)	23%	22%	6%

TABLE 64: SOCIAL PROFILE - INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Member of Community Group/ Association			
Yes	65%	61%	38%
No	35%	39%	61%
If yes, Type of Group/ Association:			
Agriculture Group	50%	62%	15%
Church Group	42%	62%	67%
Service Club	31%	38%	22%
Sports/Recreation Club	58%	52%	44%
Social Club	15%	24%	22%
Political Organization	15%	7%	0%
Ratepayer/Community Group	27%	14%	11%
Naturalist/Environmental Group	4%	0%	4%
Group Opposed to Landfill	19%	17%	4%
Professional Group/Board	12%	10%	4%
School Group	8%	5%	4%
Volunteer/Charitable Organization	8%	5%	4%
Cultural Group	0%	2%	4%
Number of households interviewed who said they would move if landfill located in their area	16	34	39
Of these, number on Executive of a Group	6 (38%)	11 (32%)	7 (18%)

TABLE 65: SOCIAL PROFILE - EXTENT OF RELIANCE ON LOCAL SERVICES
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Service</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Groceries	0%	25%	0%
Convenience Goods	25%	41%	67%
Gasoline	15%	47%	66%
Auto Repairs	6%	11%	14%
Doctor	5%	3%	0%
Dentist	3%	2%	0%
Drug Store Supplies	0%	13%	0%
Library	5%	3%	0%
Recreational Facilities	13%	11%	44%

TABLE 66: IMPACT RATING AND RANKING - LOSS OF COMMUNITY COHESION

IMPORTANCE OF INDICATORS INCREASING ↓		<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
	Disruption of Services and Facilities	L	L-M	L
	Displacement of Services	No Impact	L-M	No Impact
	Displacement of Residents	L	M	L-M
	Loss of Satisfaction with Place	M	M	L
	Impact Rating Impact Ranking	L-M 2	M 3	L-M 1

TABLE 67: COMPARISON OF SUB-AREA-OVERALL RANKING AND RATING RE IMPACT ON SERVICES/FACILITIES

IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS
INCREASING
↓

Factor	AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Rating								
Displacement of Services/Facilities	NI	NI	NI	NI	H	H	NI	L
Disruption of Services/Facilities	M-H	M	L	L	L	L	M	M-H
Ranking								
Displacement of Services/Facilities	1	1	1	1	8	7	1	6
Disruption of Services/Facilities	7	5	4	2	3	1	5	8
Overall Rating of Sub-Areas	L-M	L-M	L	L	M-H	M-H	L-M	M
Overall Ranking of Sub-Areas	5	3	2	1	8	7	4	6
Ranking of Areas	1		2				2	

Note: NI is "No Impact".

TABLE 68: COMPARISON OF SUB-AREAS-OVERALL RANKING AND RATING RE IMPACT ON RESIDENTS

Factor	AREA I		AREA II				AREA VI	
	<u>IB</u>	<u>IC</u>	<u>IIB</u>	<u>IIC</u>	<u>IIE</u>	<u>IIF</u>	<u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Rating								
Displacement of Residents	L-M	L-M	H	H	L	L-M	M	M
Disruption of Residents	L-M	L-M	L-M	L	H	M	M	L-M
Ranking								
Displacement of Residents	3	2	8	7	1	4	5	6
Disruption of Residents	4	3	5	1	8	6	7	2
Rating of Sub-Areas	L-M	L-M	M-H	L-M	M	M	M	L-M
Ranking of Sub-Areas	2	1	8	4	6	5	7	3
Ranking of Areas	1		3				2	

IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS
INCREASING
↓

TABLE 69: COMPARISON OF AREAS-OVERALL RANKING AND RATING RE IMPACT ON COMMUNITY

IMPORTANCE OF
INCREASING
↓

<u>Factor</u>	<u>AREA I</u>	<u>AREA II</u>	<u>AREA VI</u> <u>VIA</u>	<u>VIB</u>
Rating				
Loss of Community Character	L-M	M	L	M-H
Loss of Community Cohesion	L-M	M	L-M	L-M
Ranking				
Loss of Community Character	2	3	1	4
Loss of Community Cohesion	2	3	1	1
Overall Rating of Area	L-M	M	L-M	
Overall Ranking of Area	2	3	1	

TABLE 70: OVERALL EVALUATION OF AREAS

IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS INCREASING ↓	<u>FACTOR</u>	<u>AREA I</u>	<u>AREA II</u>	<u>AREA VI</u>
	Impact on Services/Facilities	1	2	2
	Impact on Residents	1	3	2
	Impact on Community	2	3	1
	Overall Ranking of Areas	2	3	1

Note: There is no significant difference between Area I and Area VI in terms of "Impact on Services/Facilities"; see "Social Impact Assessment of Landfill Siting Options: Report of Findings" Section 3.8 for explanation.

TABLE 71: RESIDENT ASSESSMENT OF OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN ABOUT AND
DISCUSS THE PROPOSAL
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

	<u>AREA I</u>	<u>AREA II</u>	<u>AREA VI</u>
Sufficient Opportunities to Learn About the Landfill Proposal?			
Yes	46%	58%	32%
No	44%	35%	61%
Don't Know	10%	7%	7%
Sufficient Opportunities to Discuss Landfill Proposal With:			
(a) Regional Officials/ Consultants?			
Yes	38%	43%	18%
No	55%	56%	76%
Don't Know	8%	2%	6%
(b) Regional Politicians?			
Yes	31%	30%	14%
No	56%	60%	79%
Don't Know	13%	10%	7%
(c) Brampton Politicians?			
Yes	28%	34%	16%
No	59%	52%	73%
Don't Know	13%	13%	11%
(d) Other Residents in Your Community?			
Yes	85%	88%	61%
No	13%	12%	38%
Don't Know	3%	0%	1%

Table 72: RESIDENT INVOLVEMENT IN THE SITING PROCESS

<u>Activities Undertaken</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Telephoned/Wrote/Spoke to local politicians	30%	34%	21%
Telephoned/Wrote/Spoke to other politicians	15%	27%	13%
Read regional reports	68%	65%	48%
Attended an open house organized by Region	53%	46%	38%
Attended meeting organized by citizens group	53%	56%	55%
Researched topic on landfill	40%	29%	35%
Attended a Council Meeting where issue was discussed	35%	34%	6%
Discussed issue with citizens group	13%	9%	0%
Prepared/Distributed flyers, handouts	0%	4%	1%
Wrote to Newspaper, spoke on radio	3%	2%	0%
No action taken	8%	13%	21%

Table 73: RESIDENT PERCEPTION OF THEIR INFLUENCE ON FINAL DECISION

Will you be able to influence the Final Decision?	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Yes	38%	40%	55%
No	45%	54%	35%
Dont't Know	18%	6%	10%
If No, Why Not?*			
Strictly Political Decision	67%	57%	68%
Lack Political Clout	33%	41%	40%
Decision Already Made	39%	32%	12%
Decision Not Based on Community/Social Factors	11%	8%	4%
Low Population/Not Organized	22%	13%	4%
Process Unfair	6%	3%	4%

*Note: Respondents could offer more than one reason.

TABLE 74: ISSUES - EFFECT OF SITING ANNOUNCEMENT ON HOUSEHOLD
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Effect on Household</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Anger/Appalled/Resent	40%	33%	38%
Desparate/Hopeless/Dismay	43%	39%	32%
Dissappointed/Disillusioned	28%	23%	25%
Indifferent	15%	12%	11%
May Move	13%	13%	7%
Loss of Investment	20%	16%	8%
Concern re: Environmental Effects	10%	12%	7%
Concern re: Health Effects	10%	7%	3%
Panic/Shock/Terrified	10%	7%	11%
Selling House/Property	3%	3%	3%
Wanted More Information	10%	3%	3%

TABLE 75: ISSUES - EFFECT OF SITING ANNOUNCEMENT ON RESIDENT PLANS
PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Have Plans to Change Home/ Property			
Yes	83%	91%	65%
No	18%	19%	35%
If yes, what plans?			
Property improvements/ Landscaping	70%	56%	52%
Home Renovations/Repairs	36%	44%	23%
House Additions	21%	20%	23%
Upkeep/Maintenance	12%	13%	9%
Buy More Property	6%	7%	11%
New Business on Property	6%	6%	7%
Infrastructure Improvement (e.g. sewers)	9%	9%	2%
Construction/Repairs/ Maintenance of Farm Buildings	6%	9%	2%
Other Farm Improvement/ Maintenance	3%	7%	5%
Sell All/Part of Property/ House	0%	0%	9%
Would landfill affect plans?			
Yes	91%	89%	91%
No	3%	5%	9%
Don't Know	6%	5%	0%
Effect?			
Plans on Hold	50%	45%	41%
Cancel Plans	23%	23%	38%
Wait and See Consequences	13%	21%	10%
May/Would Sell	10%	11%	5%
Loss in Equity/Property Value	10%	8%	5%
Only Do Necessary Repairs/ Maintenance	10%	5%	0%

TABLE 76: COMPENSATION - IMPORTANCE OF MEASURES
 (PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING MEASURE TO BE "VERY IMPORTANT"
 ON 1-5 SCALE)
 PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Measure</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Monitor Air and Water Quality	95%	97%	96%
Compensation for Loss of Land Values	95%	96%	94%
Monitor Contaminants in Soils and Crops	90%	96%	80%
Compensation for Direct Costs/Damages	87%	90%	87%
Monitor Contaminants in Livestock	84%	94%	82%
Monitor Public Health	84%	88%	87%
Pre-Servicing of Site	80%	91%	78%
Local Residents on Monitoring Committee	78%	90%	76%
Monitoring of Land Values/Economic Factors	70%	78%	73%
Public Reports on Facility Operations	57%	70%	68%

TABLE 77: COMPENSATION - PRIORITIES
 (RELATIVE RANKING OF "THREE MOST IMPORTANT" MEASURES)
 PRIMARY IMPACT STUDY AREA

<u>Measures</u>	<u>Area I</u>	<u>Area II</u>	<u>Area VI</u>
Monitoring of Air and Water Quality	55%	53%	52%
Monitoring of Public Health	32%	49%	59%
Compensation for Loss of Land Value	40%	46%	56%
Monitoring Contaminants in Soil and Crops	34%	29%	38%
Pre-Servicing to Provide Alternate Source of Water	24%	24%	21%
Compensation for Direct Costs and Damages	13%	21%	15%
Monitoring of Land Values/Economic Factors	5%	16%	18%
Monitoring of Contaminants in Livestock	8%	16%	9%
Regular Public Reports on Facility Operations	8%	9%	3%
Locate Elsewhere/Put in Industrial Area	11%	3%	3%
Larger Buffer Zone/Landscaping/Berming	3%	2%	0%
Fair Compensation	3%	2%	2%
Engineering Design to Minimize Impacts	3%	0%	0%
Seek Alternative Methods (recycling, etc.)	0%	1%	0%
Establish Policies Prior to Site Selection	0%	0%	2%