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
   - [] Manufacturing
   - [] Wholesale
   - [] 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 statistical 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

\( \lambda \) = 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 \( \lambda = 84.457 \) 91df NS 0.6727
*Distance travelled \( \lambda = 117.075 \) 56df \( p < 0.0000 \)
Household size \( \lambda = 44.426 \) 49df NS 0.6588

Distance travelled during evacuation

By:

Residential zone \( \lambda = 109.221 \) 104df NS 0.3438
Safety concern \( \lambda = 23.760 \) 16df NS 0.0949
Household size \( \lambda = 60.352 \) 56df NS 0.3214
Question 32.
Where do you live? (analysis only includes evacuation zones closest to accident (zones 1 to 8))

By:

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

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

By:

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

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

By:

*Occupation \( \lambda = 93.981 \) 6df \( p < 0.0000 \)
Sex \( \lambda = 0.726 \) 1df NS 0.3939
Residential zone \( \lambda = 15.386 \) 13df NS 0.2839
Own or rent house \( \lambda = 0.753 \) 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 \( \lambda = 11.230 \) 6df NS 0.0815
Sex \( \lambda = 0.0 \) 1df NS 1.0000
Residential zone \( \lambda = 13.974 \) 13df NS 0.3756
Days away from home \( \lambda = 15.041 \) 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) \( \lambda = 6.418 \) 6df NS 0.3780

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 3.937 \) 3df NS 0.2683

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 0.682 \) 1df NS 0.4087

Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 2.689 \) 1df NS 0.1010

b) the security of your property?

By:

Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8) \( \lambda = 2.242 \) 6df NS 0.6440

Presence of absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 3.913 \) 3df NS 0.2709

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 1.621 \) 1df NS 0.2029

Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 1.646 \) 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? \( \lambda = 9.997 \) 8df NS 0.2652

The amount of danger? \( \lambda = 9.266 \) 8df NS 0.3203

When you might be evacuated? \( \lambda = 14.123 \) 8df NS 0.0786
Question 10 continued.

When you could return? \( \lambda = 5.860 \) 8df NS 0.6628

Did you feel you were getting the real story? \( \lambda = 17.111 \) 16df NS 0.3784

Time between accident and warning to evacuate. \( \lambda = 4.882 \) 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? \( \lambda = 1.281 \) 2df NS 0.5270

The amount of danger? \( \lambda = 2.100 \) 2df NS 0.3498

When you might be evacuated? \( \lambda = 3.937 \) 2df NS 0.1397

When you could return? \( \lambda = 7.279 \) 2df NS 0.0263

Time between accident and warning to evacuate. \( \lambda = 0.191 \) 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) \( \lambda = 10.244 \) 12df NS 0.5945

*Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 18.675 \) 6df p< 0.0047

*Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 8.432 \) 2df p< 0.0148

Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 3.179 \) 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 $\lambda = 6.300$ 2df NS 0.0428
Age $\lambda = 9.517$ 14df NS 0.7965
Presence or absence of young children in family $\lambda = 3.485$ 6df NS 0.7460
Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8) $\lambda = 8.744$ 12df NS 0.7245
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people $\lambda = 1.092$ 2df NS 0.5791
Whether they attempted to return $\lambda = 0.435$ 2df NS 0.8041

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

By:

Sex $\lambda = 0.692$ 2df NS 0.7072
Age $\lambda = 14.095$ 14df NS 0.4426
Presence or absence of young children in family $\lambda = 2.282$ 6df NS 0.8919
Residence in evacuation zones nearest to accident (zones 1-8) $\lambda = 9.103$ 12df NS 0.6940
Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people $\lambda = 0.586$ 2df NS 0.7458
Whether they attempted to return $\lambda = 2.134$ 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) \( \lambda = 3.231 \) 6df NS 0.7793

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 0.916 \) 3df NS 0.8214

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 0.023 \) 1df NS 0.8920

Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 0.002 \) 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) \( \lambda = 9.872 \) 12df NS 0.6272

Residential zone \( \lambda = 20.409 \) 26df NS 0.7718

Household size \( \lambda = 23.023 \) 14df NS 0.0599

*Sex \( \lambda = 10.572 \) 2df \( p \leq 0.0051 \)

*Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 21.085 \) 6df \( p \leq 0.0018 \)

Presence of absence of older children in family \( \lambda = 6.937 \) 8df NS 0.5434

*Money needed to fully compensate the accident experience \( \lambda = 61.493 \) 10df \( p \leq 0.0000 \)

*Reasons they were concerned for families safety \( \lambda = 177.992 \) 16df \( p \leq 0.0000 \)

*Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 12.584 \) 2df \( p \leq 0.0019 \)

Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 0.298 \) 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) \( \lambda = 52.742 \) \( 48 \text{df} \) NS 0.2958

*Presence or absence of young children in family
\( \lambda = 59.712 \) \( 24 \text{df} \) \( p \leq 0.0001 \)

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people
\( \lambda = 17.086 \) \( 8 \text{df} \) NS 0.0292

Whether they attempted to return
\( \lambda = 8.410 \) \( 8 \text{df} \) 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
\( \lambda = 108.832 \) \( 65 \text{df} \) \( p \leq 0.0005 \)

Residence in evacuation zones nearest the accident (zones 1-8)
\( \lambda = 31.904 \) \( 30 \text{df} \) NS 0.3720

Income
\( \lambda = 14.500 \) \( 15 \text{df} \) NS 0.4879

*Occupation
\( \lambda = 60.821 \) \( 30 \text{df} \) \( p \leq 0.0007 \)

Own or rent house
\( \lambda = 5.536 \) \( 5 \text{df} \) NS 0.3539

*Presence or absence of young children in family
\( \lambda = 46.272 \) \( 15 \text{df} \) \( p \leq 0.0000 \)

*Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people
\( \lambda = 20.077 \) \( 5 \text{df} \) \( p \leq 0.0012 \)

Whether they attempted to return
\( \lambda = 12.310 \) \( 5 \text{df} \) NS 0.0208

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

By:
Residence in evacuation zones nearest the accident (zones 1-8)
\( \lambda = 4.574 \) \( 6 \text{df} \) NS 0.5994
Question 30(a) continued.

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 2.165 \) 3df NS 0.5388

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 0.543 \) 1df NS 0.4608

Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 0.992 \) 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) \( \lambda = 36.297 \) 42df NS 0.7188

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 13.811 \) 24df NS 0.9508

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 15.823 \) 8df NS 0.0450

*Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 20.438 \) 8df p< 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) \( \lambda = 73.180 \) 60df NS 0.1180

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 27.901 \) 45df NS 0.9787

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 8.200 \) 15df NS 0.9155

*Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 12.118 \) 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) \( \lambda = 5.162 \quad 6\text{df} \quad \text{NS} \quad 0.5232 \)

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 6.375 \quad 3\text{df} \quad \text{NS} \quad 0.0947 \)

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 0.005 \quad 1\text{df} \quad \text{NS} \quad 0.9422 \)

Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 1.363 \quad 1\text{df} \quad \text{NS} \quad 0.2429 \)

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) \( \lambda = 35.386 \quad 42\text{df} \quad \text{NS} \quad 0.7372 \)

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 31.119 \quad 24\text{df} \quad \text{NS} \quad 0.1504 \)

Younger (20-49yrs) versus older (50-over 80yrs) people \( \lambda = 10.203 \quad 8\text{df} \quad \text{NS} \quad 0.2510 \)

Whether they attempted to return \( \lambda = 7.047 \quad 8\text{df} \quad \text{NS} \quad 0.5316 \)
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

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>( \lambda = 1.897 )</td>
<td>3df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>( \lambda = 23.751 )</td>
<td>21df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence or absence of young children in family</td>
<td>( \lambda = 14.074 )</td>
<td>9df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii) Road accident involving dangerous release of hazardous chemicals

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>( \lambda = 0.780 )</td>
<td>3df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>( \lambda = 21.730 )</td>
<td>21df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence or absence of young children in family</td>
<td>( \lambda = 18.360 )</td>
<td>9df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii) Plane crash involving many deaths

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>( \lambda = 4.715 )</td>
<td>3df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>( \lambda = 22.459 )</td>
<td>21df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence or absence of young children in family</td>
<td>( \lambda = 13.274 )</td>
<td>9df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iv) Nuclear reactor accident as serious as 3 Mile Island

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>( \lambda = 20.795 )</td>
<td>21df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Age</td>
<td>( \lambda = 28.005 )</td>
<td>3df</td>
<td>p&lt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence or absence of young children in family</td>
<td>( \lambda = 3.173 )</td>
<td>9df</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>λ  = 38.488 42df NS 0.6259</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>λ  = 37.568 42df NS 0.6657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>λ  = 16.947 14df NS 0.2590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>λ  = 10.377 7df NS 0.1682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Residential zone</td>
<td>λ  = 184.717 91df p&lt; 0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own or rent house</td>
<td>λ  = 14.921 7df NS 0.0370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>λ  = 28.005 30df NS 0.5701</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>λ  = 24.206 25df NS 0.5075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>λ  = 16.723 10df NS 0.0807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>λ  = 3.766  5df NS 0.5834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential zone</td>
<td>λ  = 73.356 60df NS 0.1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own or rent house</td>
<td>λ  = 2.582  5df NS 0.7640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

By:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evacuation centre visited</th>
<th>λ  = 12.018 14df NS 0.6048</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres</td>
<td>λ  = 8.817 10df NS 0.5495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>λ  = 4.334  12df NS 0.9766</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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  $\lambda = 22.238 \ 14\text{df} \ NS \ 0.0738$
   People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres  $\lambda = 6.859 \ 10\text{df} \ NS \ 0.7387$
   Age  $\lambda = 16.379 \ 12\text{df} \ NS \ 0.1745$

b) Sleeping
   By:
   Evacuation centre visited  $\lambda = 12.555 \ 14\text{df} \ NS \ 0.5618$
   People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres  $\lambda = 13.023 \ 10\text{df} \ NS \ 0.2224$
   *Age  $\lambda = 26.623 \ 12\text{df} \ p<0.0088$

c) Washrooms
   By:
   Evacuation centre visited  $\lambda = 10.809 \ 14\text{df} \ NS \ 0.7009$
   People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres  $\lambda = 13.096 \ 10\text{df} \ NS \ 0.2183$
   Age  $\lambda = 21.510 \ 12\text{df} \ NS \ 0.0434$

d) Recreation
   By:
   Evacuation centre visited  $\lambda = 23.109 \ 14\text{df} \ NS \ 0.0585$
   People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres  $\lambda = 9.879 \ 10\text{df} \ NS \ 0.4512$
   Age  $\lambda = 21.106 \ 12\text{df} \ NS \ 0.0488$

e) Health Care
   By:
   Evacuation centre visited  $\lambda = 21.889 \ 14\text{df} \ NS \ 0.0809$
   People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres  $\lambda = 8.547 \ 10\text{df} \ NS \ 0.5722$
   Age  $\lambda = 10.681 \ 12\text{df} \ NS \ 0.5564$
Question 43 continued.

f) Information
By:
Evacuation centre visited $\lambda = 16.870 \ 14\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.2631$

People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres $\lambda = 5.810 \ 10\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.8310$

Age $\lambda = 12.495 \ 12\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.4068$

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

a) your pets left behind?
By:
Evacuation centre visited $\lambda = 5.408 \ 7\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.6102$

People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres $\lambda = 8.088 \ 5\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.1514$

b) the security of your property?
By:
Evacuation centre visited $\lambda = 10.308 \ 7\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.1718$

People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres $\lambda = 4.220 \ 5\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.5181$

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 $\lambda = 8.352 \ 7\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.3025$

People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres $\lambda = 2.459 \ 5\text{df} \ \text{NS} \ 0.7826$
Question 12.
Did you feel that you were getting the real story during the emergency?
(Responses: yes, no, not sure)

By:

Evacuation centre visited $\lambda = 7.242$ 14df NS 0.9250

People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres $\lambda = 7.700$ 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 $\lambda = 213.954$ 119df p< 0.0000

People that stayed more than one night in evacuation centres $\lambda = 76.610$ 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 $\lambda = 2.066$ 4df NS 0.7235

Residence in perimeter zone close to accident versus zones far from accident $\lambda = 0.657$ 2df NS 0.7200

Presence or absence of young children in family $\lambda = 13.723$ 8df NS 0.0893

Age $\lambda = 2.322$ 2df NS 0.3131

Own or rent house $\lambda = 1.601$ 2df NS 0.4489

Why they decided to evacuate $\lambda = 0.450$ 4df NS 0.9782
Question 8.
How concerned are you TODAY about it?
(Responses: very concerned, concerned, not concerned)

By:

Residential perimeter zone \( \lambda = 4.020 \) 4df NS 0.4033

Residence in perimeter zone close to accident versus zones far from accident \( \lambda = 1.795 \) 2df NS 0.4075

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 10.099 \) 10df NS 0.3498

Age \( \lambda = 1.022 \) 2df NS 0.5999

Own or rent house \( \lambda = 0.110 \) 2df NS 0.9464

Why they decided to evacuate \( \lambda = 5.284 \) 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 \( \lambda = 16.199 \) 6df p< 0.0127

Residence in perimeter zone close to accident versus zones far from accident \( \lambda = 5.733 \) 3df NS 0.1253

Presence or absence of young children in family \( \lambda = 9.811 \) 15df NS 0.8312

Age \( \lambda = 6.948 \) 3df NS 0.0736

Own or rent house \( \lambda = 1.680 \) 3df NS 0.6414

Why they decided to evacuate \( \lambda = 11.832 \) 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 \( \lambda = 6.644 \) 10df NS 0.7540
Question 5 continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>$\lambda$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>9.532</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NS 0.4824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS 0.7450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential perimeter zone</td>
<td>5.792</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NS 0.2152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own or rent house</td>
<td>3.865</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NS 0.1448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

EMERGENCY OPERATIONS CONTROL GROUP
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)