Appendix 6

QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN MAILED BUSINESS SURVEY MARCH, 1981

MISSISSAUGA EVACUATION RESEARCH PROJECT

Business Survey

1. This firm was closed _____ working days due to the evacuation.

2. What is the major product or service of this firm? _____

_____

3. Into which category does your business fall?

☐ Retail ☐ Wholesale

☐ Manufacturing ☐ Services

4. Due to the evacuation, this firm's annual revenue for 1979 was affected, as closely as can be judged, as follows: (check the appropriate box)

☐ (a) Annual revenue was unaffected.

☐ (b) Revenue fell, but less than in proportion to the number of days closed.

☐ (c) Revenue fell in proportion or more than in proportion to the number of days closed.

5. Due to the evacuation, this firm's annual expenses for 1979 were affected, as closely as can be judged, as follows: (check the appropriate box)

☐ (a) Total expenses for 1979 were unaffected.

☐ (b) Total expenses for 1979 increased (e.g., inventory spoilage, overtime pay)

☐ (c) Total expenses for 1979 were lower than they otherwise would have been (e.g., lower fuel costs, temporary staff employed)

Comments:

Appendix 7

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE TEST

In this appendix, the results of some of the main statisical analyses applied to the survey data are given. The most common test used is the Chi-square Test. This is a general test which can be applied to nominal data with any number of categories. It is used to test whether or not frequencies, which have been empirically obtained for different sets of data, differ significantly from those which would be expected, assuming that there are no difference between the data sets (that is, they all belong to a single population). For example, the test can be used to see if the people who went to Evacuation Centres are significantly different from other evacuees in income, or in the number of children they have.

The larger the differences between observed and expected frequencies, the larger the value of Chi-square. However, the observed and expected frequencies will rarely be exactly the same. If the value of Chi-square is larger than that expected by chance, then the frequencies are said to be significantly different.

The level of significance is determined by using a Chi-square table, in which values of Chi-square are given, for different degrees of freedom. A significance level of .001, for example, means that, if all assumptions are correct, the obtained value for Chi-square would occur by chance only one time in a thousand. It can reasonably be assumed, therefore, that a significant difference exists between the data sets.

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARED TESTS

Introduction

The following is a summary of contingency tables (crosstabulations) produced for selected pairs of dependent and independent variables. In all cases, the dependent variable is underlined and is followed by a list of independent variables against each of which it has been cross-tabulated. For each pair of variables, the chi-squared statistic and its significance is given. For the direction of the significant relationships see the text.

Key

λ = chi-squared
df = degree of freedom
p< = significant relationship
NS = no significant differences

SECOND MAIN MAILED SURVEY OF EVACUATION, JULY 1980 (see Appendix 3 for questionnaire used).

Question 8.
Where did you go first? (nearest main intersection or community)

Direction moved during evacuation

By:

Residential zone	λ = 84.457 91df NS 0.6727
*Distance travelled	λ = 117.075 56df p< 0.0000
Household size	λ = 44.426 49df NS 0.6588

Distance travelled during evacuation

By:

Residential zone	λ = 109.221 104df NS 0.3438
Safety concern	λ = 23.760 16df NS 0.0949
Household size	λ = 60.352 56df NS 0.3214

Question 32.
Where do you live? (analysis only includes evacuation zones closest to accident (zones 1 to 8))

By:

Occupation	λ =	37.512	36df	NS 0.3996
Age	λ =	26.162	24df	NS 0.2141
Income	λ =	8.425	12df	NS 0.7510
Sex	λ =	2.974	6df	NS 0.8121
*Own or rent house	λ =	16.380	6df	$p \leq$ 0.0119

Question 34.
How many of these are young children aged 0 - 9 years?

By:

Occupation	λ =	32.230	18df	NS 0.0206
*Age	λ =	127.517	21df	$p \leq$ 0.0000
Income	λ =	13.631	9df	NS 0.1360
Residential zone	λ =	53.081	39df	NS 0.0657
Own or rent house	λ =	9.389	3df	NS 0.0245

Question 37.
What is the approximate age of the head of the household?

By:

*Occupation	λ =	93.981	6df	$p \leq$ 0.0000
Sex	λ =	0.726	1df	NS 0.3939
Residential zone	λ =	15.386	13df	NS 0.2839
Own or rent house	λ =	0.753	1df	NS 0.3855

Question 6.
Did any member of your household go back into the evacuated area (for example, to check on pets, property)?
(Responses: yes, no)

By:

Occupation	λ =	11.230	6df	NS 0.0815
Sex	λ =	0.0	1df	NS 1.0000
Residential zone	λ =	13.974	13df	NS 0.3756
Days away from home	λ =	15.041	8df	NS 0.0563

Question 9.
Did you have ENOUGH information about;
(Responses: yes, no)

a) your pets left behind?

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	6.418	6df	NS 0.3780
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	3.937	3df	NS 0.2683
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	0.682	1df	NS 0.4087
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	2.689	1df	NS 0.1010

b) the security of your property?

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	2.242	6df	NS 0.6440
Presence of absence of young children in family	λ =	3.913	3df	NS 0.2709
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs)people	λ =	1.621	1df	NS 0.2029
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	1.646	1df	NS 0.1994

Question 10.
Which INFORMATION SOURCES about the danger did you feel were most reliable?
(Responses: radio, TV, newspaper, police, mayor, friends, etc.)

By:

Was there enough information about:

What was happening?	λ =	9.997	8df	NS 0.2652
The amount of danger?	λ =	9.266	8df	NS 0.3203
When you might be evacuated?	λ =	14.123	8df	NS 0.0786

Question 10 continued.

When you could return?	λ =	5.860	8df	NS 0.6628
Did you feel you were getting the real story?	λ =	17.111	16df	NS 0.3784
Time between accident and warning to evacuate.	λ =	4.882	8df	NS 0.7700

Question 11.
Which MEDIA REPORTS did you feel were most accurate?
(Responses: radio, TV, newspaper)

By:

Was there enough information about:

What was happening?	λ =	1.281	2df	NS 0.5270
The amount of danger?	λ =	2.100	2df	NS 0.3498
When you might be evacuated?	λ =	3.937	2df	NS 0.1397
When you could return?	λ =	7.279	2df	NS 0.0263
Time between accident and warning to evacuate.	λ =	0.191	2df	NS 0.9085

Question 12.
Did you feel that you were getting the real story during the emergency?
(Responses: yes, no, not sure)

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	10.244	12df	NS 0.5945
*Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	18.675	6df	$p \leq$ 0.0047
*Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	8.432	2df	$p \leq$ 0.0148
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	3.179	2df	NS 0.2040

Question 15.
Would you say you were concerned about this (hazardous goods transport) before the accident?
(Responses: very concerned, concerned, not concerned)

By:

Sex	λ =	6.300	2df	NS 0.0428
Age	λ =	9.517	14df	NS 0.7965
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	3.485	6df	NS 0.7460
Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	8.744	12df	NS 0.7245
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs)people	λ =	1.092	2df	NS 0.5791
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	0.435	2df	NS 0.8041

Question 16.
How concerned are you TODAY about it?
(Responses: very concerned, concerned, not concerned)

By:

Sex	λ =	0.692	2df	NS 0.7072
Age	λ =	14.095	14df	NS 0.4426
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	2.282	6df	NS 0.8919
Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	9.103	12df	NS 0.6940
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	0.586	2df	NS 0.7458
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	2.134	2df	NS 0.3440

Question 13.
Even though the length of the evacuation could not be predicted, do you think the evacuees should have been warned that the evacuation might last for several days?
(Responses: yes, no)

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	3.231	6df	NS 0.7793
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	0.916	3df	NS 0.8214
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	0.023	1df	NS 0.8920
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	0.002	1df	NS 0.9568

Question 27.
At any time during the emergency, were you seriously concerned for your own or your family's safety?
(Responses: very concerned, concerned, not concerned)

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	9.872	12df	NS 0.6272
Residential zone	λ =	20.409	26df	NS 0.7718
Household size	λ =	23.023	14df	NS 0.0599
*Sex	λ =	10.572	2df	$p \leq$ 0.0051
*Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	21.085	6df	$p \leq$ 0.0018
Presence of absence of older children in family	λ =	6.937	8df	NS 0.5434
*Money needed to fully compensate the accident experience	λ =	61.493	10df	$p \leq$ 0.0000
*Reasons they were concerned for families safety	λ =	177.992	16df	$p \leq$ 0.0000
*Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	12.584	2df	$p \leq$ 0.0019
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	0.298	2df	NS 0.8612

Question 28.
What were the *longer term* good and bad effects for you, personally?
(Responses: more aware, more nervous, more prepared, more confident in government, appreciate life, no effects, long-term health effects)

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest the accident (zones 1-8)	λ = 52.742	48df	NS	0.2958
*Presence or absence of young children in family	λ = 59.712	24df	$p \leq$	0.0001
Younger (20-49yrs) versus Older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ = 17.086	8df	NS	0.0292
Whether they attempted to return	λ = 8.410	8df	NS	0.3944

Question 29.
If someone were to offer a sum of money to you, how much would you consider necessary to FULLY compensate your household for all the effects of the emergency?
(Responses: no money necessary, $1-$500, $500-$1,000, $1,000-$2,000, over $2,000, no amount can fully compensate us)

By:

*Residential zone	λ = 108.832	65df	$p \leq$	0.0005
Residence in evacuation zones nearest the accident (zones 1-8)	λ = 31.904	30df	NS	0.3720
Income	λ = 14.500	15df	NS	0.4879
*Occupation	λ = 60.821	30df	$p \leq$	0.0007
Own or rent house	λ = 5.536	5df	NS	0.3539
*Presence or absence of young children in family	λ = 46.272	15df	$p \leq$	0.0000
*Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ = 20.077	5df	$p \leq$	0.0012
Whether they attempted to return	λ = 12.310	5df	NS	0.0208

Question 30(a).
Do you think the evacuation was justified?
(Responses: yes, no)

By:

Residence in evacuation nearest the accident (zones 1-8)	λ = 4.574	6df	NS	0.5994

Question 30(a) continued.

Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	2.165	3df	NS 0.5388
Younger (20-49yrs) versus Older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	0.543	1df	NS 0.4608
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	0.992	1df	NS 0.3190

Question 30(b).
Please comment on why you thought the evacuation was (not) justified.
(Responses: yes - danger, first of kind; yes/no - overreaction, insufficient information; no - not enough danger)

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest the accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	36.297	42df	NS 0.7188
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	13.811	24df	NS 0.9508
Younger (20-49yrs) versus Older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	15.823	8df	NS 0.0450
*Whether they attempted to return	λ =	20.438	8df	$p \leq$ 0.0088

Question 31.
If you were evacuated again, what would you do differently?
(Responses: take more clothing, go to a hotel, take pets, take medication, anticipate long stay, etc.)

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest the accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	73.180	60df	NS 0.1180
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	27.901	45df	NS 0.9787
Younger (20-49yrs) versus Older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	8.200	15df	NS 0.9155
*Whether they attempted to return	λ =	12.118	15df	NS 0.6701

Question 23.
Did you apply for compensation from CP rail?
(Responses: yes, no)

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	5.162	6df	NS 0.5232
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	6.375	3df	NS 0.0947
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	0.005	1df	NS 0.9422
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	1.363	1df	NS 0.2429

Question 25.
Do you have any comments about the way CP Rail compensated evacuees?
(Responses: generally fair, some were compensated, too much haste, process was courteous, process was not courteous, complaint regarding waiver)

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8)	λ =	35.386	42df	NS 0.7372
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	31.119	24df	NS 0.1504
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people	λ =	10.203	8df	NS 0.2510
Whether they attempted to return	λ =	7.047	8df	NS 0.5316

Question 17.(a)
For the following events, could you please indicate what you think the chances are of the event happening in Southern Ontario in the next ten years?
(Responses: very likely, likely, unlikely, very unlikely)

By:

i) Another derailment as serious as Mississauga

Sex	λ =	1.897	3df	NS 0.5940
Age	λ =	23.751	21df	NS 0.3053
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	14.074	9df	NS 0.1197

ii) Road accident involving dangerous release of hazardous chemicals

Sex	λ =	0.780	3df	NS 0.8541
Age	λ =	21.730	21df	NS 0.4152
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	18.360	9df	NS 0.0348

iii) Plane crash involving many deaths

Sex	λ =	4.715	3df	NS 0.1939
Age	λ =	22.459	21df	NS 0.3734
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	13.274	9df	NS 0.1506

iv) Nuclear reactor accident as serious as 3 Mile Island

Sex	λ =	20.795	21df	NS 0.4715
*Age	λ =	28.005	3df	$p \leq$ 0.0000
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	3.173	9df	NS 0.9570

SURVEY OF EVACUATION CENTRE USERS, JULY 1980 (see Appendix 3 for questionnaire used).

Question 40.
Which evacuation centre did you stay in?
(Responses: International Centre, Morningstar SS, Brampton SS, Sherway Gardens, Square One, Erindale SS, Streetsville SS, Vic Johnson Arena)

By:

Occupation	λ =	38.488	42df	NS 0.6259
Age	λ =	37.568	42df	NS 0.6657
Income	λ =	16.947	14df	NS 0.2590
Sex	λ =	10.377	7df	NS 0.1682
*Residential zone	λ =	184.717	91df	$p \leq$ 0.0000
Own or rent house	λ =	14.921	7df	NS 0.0370

Question 7.
How many days did you stay in the evacuation centre?
(Responses: 1 day to 7 days)

By:

Occupation	λ =	28.005	30df	NS 0.5701
Age	λ =	24.206	25df	NS 0.5075
Income	λ =	16.723	10df	NS 0.0807
Sex	λ =	3.766	5df	NS 0.5834
Residential zone	λ =	73.356	60df	NS 0.1153
Own or rent house	λ =	2.582	5df	NS 0.7640

Question 43.
In your opinion, how well was the evacuation centre run?
(Responses: very well, adequately, poorly)

By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	12.018	14df	NS 0.6048
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	8.817	10df	NS 0.5495
Age	λ =	4.334	12df	NS 0.9766

Question 42.
How did you feel about the following facilities in the evacuation centre?
(Responses: Excellent, adequate, inadequate)

a) Food quality
By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	22.238	14df	NS 0.0738
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	6.859	10df	NS 0.7387
Age	λ =	16.379	12df	NS 0.1745

b) Sleeping
By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	12.555	14df	NS 0.5618
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	13.023	10df	NS 0.2224
*Age	λ =	26.623	12df	$p \leq$ 0.0088

c) Washrooms
By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	10.809	14df	NS 0.7009
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	13.096	10df	NS 0.2183
Age	λ =	21.510	12df	NS 0.0434

d) Recreation
By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	23.109	14df	NS 0.0585
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	9.879	10df	NS 0.4512
Age	λ =	21.106	12df	NS 0.0488

e) Health Care
By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	21.889	14df	NS 0.0809
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	8.547	10df	NS 0.5722
Age	λ =	10.681	12df	NS 0.5564

Ouestion 43 continued.

f) Information
By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	16.870	14df	NS 0.2631
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	5.810	10df	NS 0.8310
Age	λ =	12.495	12df	NS 0.4068

Question 9.
Did you have ENOUGH information about:
(Responses: yes, no)

a) your pets left behind?

By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	5.408	7df	NS 0.6102
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	8.088	5df	NS 0.1514

b) the security of your property?

By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	10.308	7df	NS 0.1718
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	4.220	5df	NS 0.5181

Question 13.
Even though the length of the evacuation could not be predicted do you think the evacuees should have been warned that the evacuation might last for several days?
(Responses: yes, no)

By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	8.352	7df	NS 0.3025
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	2.459	5df	NS 0.7826

Question 12.
Did you feel that you were getting the real story during the emergency?
(Responses: yes, no, not sure)

By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	7.242	14df	NS 0.9250
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	7.700	10df	NS 0.6573

Question 31.
If you were evacuated again, what would you do differently?
(Responses: take more clothing, go to a hotel, take pets, take medication, anticipate a longer stay, etc.)

By:

Evacuation centre visited	λ =	213.954	119df	$p \leq$ 0.0000
People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres	λ =	76.610	65df	NS 0.1536

TELEPHONE SURVEY OF HOUSEHOLDS OUTSIDE THE EVACUATION ZONE (see Appendix 4 for questionnaire used).

Question 7.(a)
Would you say you were concerned about this (hazardous goods transport) BEFORE the accident?
(Responses: very concerned, concerned, not concerned)

By:

Residential perimeter zone	λ =	2.066	4df	NS 0.7235
Residence in perimeter zone close to accident versus zones far from accident	λ =	0.657	2df	NS 0.7200
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	13.723	8df	NS 0.0893
Age	λ =	2.322	2df	NS 0.3131
Own or rent house	λ =	1.601	2df	NS 0.4489
Why they decided to evacuate	λ =	0.450	4df	NS 0.9782

Question 8.
How concerned are you TODAY about it?
(Responses: very concerned, concerned, not concerned)

By:

Residential perimeter zone	λ =	4.020	4df	NS 0.4033
Residence in perimeter zone close to accident versus zones far from accident	λ =	1.795	2df	NS 0.4075
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	10.099	10df	NS 0.3498
Age	λ =	1.022	2df	NS 0.5999
Own or rent house	λ =	0.110	2df	NS 0.9464
Why they decided to evacuate	λ =	5.284	4df	NS 0.2593

Question 9.
Did you feel that you were getting the real story during the emergency?
(Responses: yes, no, not sure)

By:

*Residential perimeter zone	λ =	16.199	6df	$p \leq$ 0.0127
Residence in perimeter zone close to accident versus zones far from accident	λ =	5.733	3df	NS 0.1253
Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	9.811	15df	NS 0.8312
Age	λ =	6.948	3df	NS 0.0736
Own or rent house	λ =	1.680	3df	NS 0.6414
Why they decided to evacuate	λ =	11.832	6df	NS 0.0658

Question 5.
Why did you decide (not) to evacuate?
(Responses: not asked, not enough risk, not in evacuation zone, in case of danger, saw others go, advised to go, frightened, etc.)

By:

Presence or absence of young children in family	λ =	6.644	10df	NS 0.7540

Question 5 continued.

Age	λ =	9.532	10df	NS	0.4824
Sex	λ =	0.670	2df	NS	0.7450
Residential perimeter zone	λ =	5.792	4df	NS	0.2152
Own or rent house	λ =	3.865	2df	NS	0.1448

Appendix 8

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CONTROL GROUP

Appendix 8

The composition of the Emergency Operations Control Group (EOCG) altered substantially over the course of the week of the derailment emergency. It began originally as a "think tank" made up of senior police officers from Peel Region, and, indeed, may strictly be said to have remained a "think tank" although it became substantially enlarged and more often referred to as the EOCG. The term EOCG, as outlined in Chapters 2 and 3, comes from the Mississauga municipal and Peel Region regional emergency plans, which were not officially invoked.

As the emergency progressed, the police officers were first augmented by the Fire Chief, Gordon Bentley, the Mayor of Mississauga, Hazel McCallion, and Peel Regional Chairman Frank Bean. The Control Group was further enlarged with substantial provincial involvement late on Sunday morning (November 11) of members of the O.P.P., the Ministry of the Solicitor General, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of the Environment. Through Sunday, more and more representatives from government and industry became part of the Control Group, until such time as it became too large and unwieldy. At this point, on Monday (November 12), a smaller Control Group was organised. For the rest of the week, relevant personnel were invited to the Control Group meetings to advise or to make presentations. Beginning on Wednesday (November 14), a transcript of the proceedings was made, with the names of members and attendees appended. What follows is a consolidation of that appended list:

Mr. David Allen, Communications Director, Office of the Attorney General
Mr. Russell S. Allison, Vice-President, Canadian Pacific Railway
Mr. William Appleton, Chairman, Board of Commissioners of Police, Peel Region
Mr. Frank Bean, Chairman, Region of Peel
Chief Gordon Bentley, Mississauga Fire Department
Detective Boyd Brown, Peel Regional Police Force
Chief Douglas K. Burrows, Chief of Peel Regional Police Force
Dr. Lillian Cherkas, Department of Public Health, Region of Peel
Deputy Commissioner Jim Erskine, Ontario Provincial Police Force
Mr. Robert Frewin, Director of Information Branch, Ministry of the Environment

Dr. Max Fitch, Ministry of Labour, Occupational Health Branch

Mr. Don Hamilton, Dow Chemical (Chlorep)

Mr. Fred Hamlin, Production Manager, Chlor-alkali, Dow Chemical, Chlorep

Chief Cyril Hare, Fire Prevention Officer, Mississauga Fire Department

Mr. A. Hill, General Manager of Eastern Region, Canadian Pacific Railway (then)

Mr. John Hilton, Deputy Solicitor General

Mr. Otto Jelinek, M.P., Assistant to the Federal Ministry of Ontario

Mr. David Johnson, Operations Manager, Superior Propane

Mr. Terry Jones, M.P.P., Mississauga North

Mr. Walter Karskavich, Canadian Transport Commission

Mr. Douglas R. Kennedy, M.P.P., Mississauga South

Staff Inspector Barry V. King, Peel Regional Police Force

Dr. Robert J. MacBride, Principal Program Advisor, Emergency Health Services

Staff Inspector Ewen MacDonald, Peel Regional Police Force

Mayor Hazel McCallion, City of Mississauga

Mr. John McGee, Assistant to the Minister, Canadian Transport Commission

The Honourable Roy McMurtry, Solicitor General for Ontario

The Honourable Harry Parrott, Minister of the Environment (then)

Miss S. Reid, Secretary, Peel Regional Police Force (then)

Mr. Graham Scott, Deputy Minister of the Environment

Mr. L. Shenfeld, Supervisor of Air Quality, Ministry of the Environment

Mr. Kenneth Sider, Superintendent, Peel Regional Police Force

Mr. Basil Singh, Manager of Technical Support Section, Ministry of the Environment

Deputy Chief W. Teggart, Peel Regional Police Force

Dr. Gregg Van Volkenburgh, Director of Air Resource Branch, Ministry of the Environment

Deputy Chief Art Warner, Mississauga Fire Department (then)