

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

1. Welcome

DurhamCLEAR Election 2010

Email: durhamgreen@gmail.com

To all current and prospective councillors in Durham Region:

Thank you for responding to our environmental questionnaire.

Who we are and why we are doing this

We are a group of environmentally-concerned citizens. We believe that some of the greatest opportunities to improve the environment exist at the local level and we would like to see our municipal councils as environmental leaders.

To this end we are looking towards the 2010 municipal election. We wish to identify candidates (incumbents or otherwise) who share our environmental ideals and will implement a much greener agenda.

We recognize that government is complex and that politicians have an obligation to do what their constituents want. However, we believe that the public will readily support good environmental policies provided they are fiscally sound.

The questionnaire consists of 38 multiple-choice questions which should take you about 25 - 35 minutes to complete. Each question has space for your comments and, in addition, the last page is reserved for general comments.

There are no incorrect answers.

Note that it is important to use the specific coded link in the email you received - this will prevent someone else from submitting answers in your name. Also, this coded link will allow you to complete the questionnaire at your own pace. You can return to it as often as you like, provided you access it from the same computer each time.

DurhamCLEAR would like to thank the CAW - Durham Region Environmental Council for their financial support of this initiative.

*** 1. Identity**

Your Name	<input type="text"/>
Municipality	<input type="text"/>
What Elected Positions Have You Held & When?	<input type="text"/>
Phone # (in case we need to verify any of your answers)	<input type="text"/>

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

2. Health and the Environment

"Proper environmental management is the key to avoiding the quarter of all preventable illnesses which are directly caused by environmental factors." *World Health Organization.*
For more information see [the WHO site.](#)

2. Do you accept the conclusion of the Canadian Medical Association that air pollution such as currently exists in Durham Region is an immediate health hazard which is contributing to reduced lifespan and quality of life. Read conclusions from the [CMA report - No Breathing Room.](#)

	Strongly Agree	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

3. Do you agree that any exposure to carcinogenic substances should be avoided at all costs?

	Strongly Agree	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

4. Do you accept that governments should apply the 'precautionary principle'. i.e. governments should severely restrict any initiatives where there is a likelihood of waste discharges, emissions or other side-effects where the harmful effects are either unknown or poorly understood?

	Strongly Agree	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

5. Do you accept that pollution is cumulative and that the harmful potential of all developments (both new and existing) needs to be evaluated in the context of the environment as a whole rather than each development individually?

	Strongly Agree	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Disagree
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

6. Would you support a local by-law to extend the provincial ban on cosmetic pesticide use to include golf courses and other recreational properties not currently included?

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

3. Planning and Development

How municipalities are planned has fundamental impacts on the environment. See [Sierra Club of Ontario - Smart Growth](#) for background.

7. As a councillor, would you seek restrictions on any new developments (industrial, commercial, residential, etc.) which do not meet exceptional standards for air and water pollution abatement?

	Severe restrictions	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Loosen existing restrictions
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

8. Would you favour high density residential or mixed development at transportation hubs (particularly GO stations) in order to maximize the population near these hubs and reduce the use of private cars?

	Strongly Favour	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

9. In order to mitigate the detrimental affects of urban sprawl (servicing costs, transit costs, etc.) would you support a general increase in zoning densities in order to create more compact communities? This is in line with policies of the provincial government.

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

10. As a councillor, would you support the protection of Class 1 farmland from further urban development except in exceptional circumstances?

	Highest Priority	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Crazy Idea
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

11. As a councillor, would you support changes to zoning regulations to require buffer zones around environmentally sensitive areas (e.g. Second Marsh) to protect them from potentially high impact developments (such as the proposed ethanol plant)? Only minimal impact development would be allowed within these buffer zones.

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

12. Would you support a tree protection by-law in which a permit would be required to cut any mature tree (even on private or development land) and, that even when permitted, replacement trees would have to be planted or fees paid to a municipal environmental fund in compensation? For information on Toronto's by-law, click [here](#).

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

4. Transportation

Transportation (principally cars and trucks) is the biggest contributor to air pollution.
See [Environment Canada >> Pollution Sources >> Transportation](#).

13. Would you advocate the expansion of local transit routes and their frequency, accompanied by promotions to encourage people to leave their cars at home?

	Highest Priority	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	No expansion required
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

14. Would you support an acquisition policy which required all newly purchased municipal service vehicles to be 'green', to the extent that such vehicles are available?

	Zero emissions	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

15. Would you support a policy which required all companies with long term contracts to the municipality (e.g. garbage & electrical services) to use 'green' vehicles where such vehicles are available?

	Zero emissions	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

16. Car idling creates pollution and greenhouse gases and also costs drivers money in fuel and wear and tear to their engines. As a councillor, would you support a ban on idling for longer than a few minutes as they have done in Toronto and other GTA communities? See [Natural Resources Canada 'Idle-Free Zone'](#).

	High Priority	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Crazy Idea
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

5

6

17. Drive-throughs create traffic congestion, encourage idling and result in reduced physical activity. As a councillor, would you support restrictions on drive-throughs?

	Ban Drive-throughs	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	No restrictions
Your Response		<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

5

6

18. Do you support the completion of Hwy 407 east to Hwy 35/115 as a divided, controlled-access highway?

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 10 - As quickly as possible | <input type="radio"/> 5 |
| <input type="radio"/> 9 | <input type="radio"/> 4 |
| <input type="radio"/> 8 | <input type="radio"/> 3 |
| <input type="radio"/> 7 | <input type="radio"/> 2 |
| <input type="radio"/> 6 | <input type="radio"/> 1 - Never |

Comments - optional

5

6

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

19. The environmental imperative strongly indicates that we need to reduce our reliance on private vehicles, and to this end we need to question all major road construction projects. As an alternative to the current design of the 407, would you support downgrading the 407 extension to 'as-needed' improvements to the existing road alignments, and widenings only as the specific need is demonstrated?

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja

Comments - optional

5

6

20. Would you support an end to all regional & local planning for an airport in north Pickering and encourage the federal government to stop further demolitions and return the land to agricultural uses where still practical?

See the [Land over Landings](#) website.

	Return Airport Lands to Agriculture	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Build Airport Now
Your Response	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja	ja

Comments - optional

5

6

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

5. Waste management

"In nature, everything is endlessly recycled - there is no waste."

21. As a councillor, will you seek to stop the proposed EFW / garbage incinerator in Clarington?

Yes, stop it

No, build it

Undecided

Comments - optional

22. The alternative to incineration and/or landfill is aggressive waste diversion - "Reduce, Reuse & Recycle". What level of diversion do you believe is feasible?

65%

70%

75%

80%

85%

90%

95%

100%

Comments - optional

23. Given your answer to the previous question, when should we aim to achieve that diversion goal?

2010

2015

2020

2025

2030

2035

2040

Comments - optional

24. Would you support an initiative which required all public events on public property to be 'zero garbage' as they currently do in Markham? All materials at such events are required to be recycled and there are no 'garbage' containers. (See [Markham's policy.](#))

Strongly Support

9

8

7

6

5

4

3

2

Strongly Oppose

Your response

Comments - optional

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

6. Energy Conservation

The only "free" energy is the energy you don't use. Every dollar spent on conservation = five dollars spent on generation. See [Energy Alternatives](#).

25. Municipal councils are the owners of all our local power utilities (Whitby Hydro, Veridian, Oshawa Public Utilities). Would you be prepared to use that leverage to insist that these utilities be 'greener'?

	High Priority	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Bad idea
Using more fuel efficient vehicles	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq
Accelerate the implementation of 'smart' metering	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq
Assist with energy efficiency retrofits	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq
Provide incentives for local power generation (solar, wind)	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq
Insist that more green energy is available on the local grid	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq

Comments - optional

26. The vast majority of homes are heated by burning either gas or oil which creates significant greenhouse gases. In order to conserve energy and reduce global warming, municipalities could be encouraging the use of ground source and other high efficiency heat pumps by providing financing of the capital costs through the municipal lending authority, provided the savings more than covered the carrying costs. Residents would repay the loans on their individual tax bills from the savings on their heating bills. Would you support such an initiative?

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your response	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq	jq

Comments - optional

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

7. General Approach

27. Governments are frequently faced with difficult choices between hard monetary costs and potential health and social costs. Please indicate how you would rate the relative importance of these on the scale below.

jn Hard costs, taxes jn 9 jn 8 jn 7 jn 6 jn 5 jn 4 jn 3 jn 2 jn Social & Health Concerns

Comments - optional

28. It is important to set goals. Would you support a general initiative to make your community the greenest in Ontario (or one of the greenest in Canada)?

Great idea 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 Dumb Idea

Your response jn jn jn jn jn jn jn jn jn jn

Comments? What goal would you set?

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

8. Governance & Elections

In addition to the previous questions which focused on the environment, many people who have been involved in environmental issues have been frustrated by a 'democracy gap' in how environmental (and other) issues have been handled. The following questions are directed to that concern.

29. The Environmental Assessment process for the Clarington EFW / Incinerator has been contentious. Rate the process from 10 (very good) to 1 (very poor).

- 10 - EFW process was very good
- 9
- 8
- 7
- 6
- 5
- 4
- 3
- 2
- 1 - Process was bad

Comments - optional

30. For future projects, would you insist on a more open, consultative and responsive approval process?

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

31. Would you support an initiative to make the position of Regional Chair elected by voters?

- Yes - by direct public election
- No - continue as at present (appointed by Regional Council)
- Undecided / Don't know
- Some other option - please describe

Comments

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

32. Municipal elections generally have very low turnouts. There are many causes for this, but in an effort to spark greater interest and generate better funded campaigns, would you support tax credits for donations to municipal candidates as they do in Toronto and other communities? (See [Toronto's rebate policy.](#))

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

33. Will you accept / refuse campaign donations (directly or indirectly) from developers (any business, or individual working for such a company, which is likely to be asking Council for permission to change any form of land designation.

Accept

Refuse

Other / Comments

34. Will you accept / refuse campaign donations (directly or indirectly) from any business or individual which has or is likely to be seeking contracts with the municipality.

Accept

Refuse

Other / Comments

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

35. A common complaint about municipal elections is that there are too few opportunities for voters to meet and question candidates. Would you support subsidies to community groups who are willing to sponsor non-partisan all-candidates meetings - these subsidies would be used to rent halls and generate appropriate publicity?

	Strongly Support	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	Strongly Oppose
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

36. Would you support changes to the sign by-laws to severely limit both the number and size of election signs on public property (boulevards, etc.)? Signs on private property (with the owner's permission) would be unaffected.

	Ban signs on public property	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	No Restrictions
Your Response	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Comments - optional

37. Should election signs be banned from garbage? In other words should they be required to be recycled?

Signs must be recycled

Undecided / Don't know

No restrictions

Other, please specify

Comments

Environment Questionnaire - Election 2010

38. In the 1950s municipal elections were held every year. Politicians were responsive to citizens because they were never very far from the next election. Since then the terms for councillors have gradually increased, and in the last election, terms were extended to 4 years. The rationale is that politicians need time to get things done and some of these things might be unpopular ...but necessary. What do you think is the most appropriate term?

One year

Two years

Three years

Four years

Five years

Comments - optional

9. General Comments

39. General Comments.

If you would like to speak to someone directly, please send an email to durhamgreen@gmail.com



Please note that you are invited to submit a recent photograph by email to durhamgreen@gmail.com as well as a 250 word bio.