Present:  
- Dan O’Hara  Co-Chair, Port Colborne
- Ed Kaczmarczyk  Co-Chair, Welland
- Beatrice Greenizan (part time)  Welland
- Allan Labatt  Welland
- Pat Shore  Port Colborne
- Gary Bruno (part time)  Port Colborne Councillor
- Vance Badawey (part time)  Regional Councillor
- Peter Kryger  Niagara Region
- Barry Friesen  Niagara Region
- Donna Eckhart-Oettinger (recorder)  Niagara Region

Regrets:  Diana Wiggins

1.0 Introductions  
Introductions were made. No visitors were present.

2.0 Election of Chair (Co-Chairs)  
Dan O’Hara acted as chair to begin meeting.  
Nominations for chair/co-chairs were opened.  
Al Labatt nominated Dan O’Hara and Ed Kaczmarczyk.  
Pat Shore seconded the nominations.  
Dan and Ed agreed to stand.  
Carried.

3.0 Notes of Previous Meeting – December 6, 2006

| Motion: To approve minutes of December 6, 2006. |
| Moved by: A. Labatt |
| Seconded: E. Kaczmarczyk |
| Carried |

4.0 Business Arising from Previous Minutes  
Action items reviewed. Correspondence was received by email after the last meeting. No issues or requests for information are outstanding.  
All correspondence will continue to be directed through the Chair, Dan O’Hara.

5.0 PLC Terms of Reference  
Revised Terms of Reference, approved by Regional Council were included in distribution of the meeting package.
6.0 Closure Plan
Conestoga-Rovers and Associates (CRA) has been retained to complete the closure plan. Staff is in the process of scheduling a start-up meeting with CRA to review the requirements of the Closure Plan and discuss timeframes. As part of developing the Closure Plan, CRA will be participating in two public meetings. One of the meetings will include discussions on end use and closure plans.

*PLC stated that they feel the sooner the public meets the better. With the end in sight, getting public opinion early in the process will help to advance the decisions on the end use.*

Niagara Region stated that the first meeting date has not been established at this time.

*PLC inquired about the timeline for completion.*
It is estimated that it could be completed fairly quickly, however, a more accurate timeline could be determined once a meeting has occurred with CRA.

*Region: Once a more accurate timeline has been defined this information will be provided to the PLC.*

The PLC questioned when the Site would be closing.
On an annual basis capacity studies are conducted to evaluate the amount of remaining capacity relative to the approved final contours. Given that information including the rate of fill, compaction rate and other parameters are still variable, a firm closure date is predictable but not set in stone. A report entitled “LANDFILL CAPACITY OPTIMIZATION” is being prepared that summarizes a consultant’s study related to landfill capacities.

*Region: will provide a copy of this report to the PLC once completed.*

PLC Asked if the Closure Plan addresses the compost site too.
Yes, the closure plan will address the entire Site.

*What is the plan, will it be similar to the St. Catharines (Glenridge) Site? Will the PLC continue to have input on the plan?*
The PLC stated that they have already begun to receive input related to potential end use plans (i.e., a dog walking park, return to wetlands, asphalt pad retained for use as tennis courts, parking facility for rowing which would include a link to the trail). It was noted that Mud Lake is across the street and that might play a role in determining the end-use of the Site.

Region: the Consultant will be focusing on the engineering side of the Closure Plan. It was stated that post closure and end-use plans are only one aspect of the overall Closure Plan. It should be noted that cost is also a factor that needs to be considered.
7.0 Annual Monitoring Report
A hard copy of the Annual Monitoring Report and Annual Operations Report were provided to the Chair for circulation, along with a hard copy of the Executive Summary from the Annual Monitoring Report that was distributed to all in attendance. A copy of the text from the Annual Operations Report was provided earlier in the day via email.

The PLC requested that the text from the Monitoring Report be provided via email.

Region will provide an electronic copy of textual portion of the Monitoring Report.

8.0 SSO RFP
A verbal update was given. 11 submissions were received. Technologies and financial issues were considered in addition to the approvability of the facility proposed by the proponents. Based on the RFQ the list of proponents was short listed to four (4). Orgaworld/CRA (has a facility in London that is already approved), IMS Walkers & Miller Waste Systems (based on Spring Creek Site) and & Maple Reinders (plant in Hamilton). IMS Walker/Miller combined on a proposal with two separate technologies brought to the table as possible options. The Region can not provide details regarding proponent selection until such time as the recommendations are presented to Committee and Council (and approved).

What is the Site being identified in the Walker proposal?
Spring Creek Site in Lincoln.

PLC asked if Walkers is selected, has any thought gone into whether or not the two facilities (landfill and compost facility) could be combined?
Two different processes were used for the Walker Landfill and this SSO RFP. This sentiment has been expressed previously. Our goal is to ensure the brush is utilized for the most beneficial use and that it does not end up being buried. Transportation costs were part of the equation and were considered when evaluating proposals.

Where will waste be directed after the Closure of Elm St?
Self hauled residential waste now going into Elm St will be directed to Humberstone or Station Rd until they reach capacity. Curbside pickup will be directed to Station Rd.

When is the Report going to Council?
Date is yet unknown.
The PLC feels credibility is in question because dates have changed several times in this whole process.
Staff noted that we are meeting our requirements and that April 1, 2009 is a real date for the site to stop operating and close. We are doing our best to preserve the integrity of process while exercising due diligence.

The PLC stated that dates have been given for this process and they have not been met.
Staff noted that significant progress has been made, odours are down and RFP has been set.

The PLC noted that information was released to the PLC about 6/7 months ago. The letter did not completely close out the possibility of the continuation of receipt of leaf and yard waste at Elm St.

Is it possible that the Region will stop composting of food waste and continue leaf and yard waste at this Site?
Staff noted that the letter was written with what information we had at the time. RFP has been written such that all materials are dealt with.

The PLC stated that with Site closure pending, any form of continued operations would result in some of the end-use ideas being incompatible with an active site.
Staff noted that it would be possible to maintain a drop off depot if enough interest was received and it was also understood that the leaf & yard composting was completed without incident for many years.

The PLC stated that the operation has not been run cleanly which added to the lost credibility. Drop off at Humberstone is not that far away.

A discussion took place where the PLC stated they would like it shut down completely, however recognized that public input is still required.

Direction is given by Council, but the PLCs recommendation will be taken into consideration.

PLC – Was it only Port Colborne leaf & yard waste that went to Elm St. prior to 2004? If it was, then only local leaf and yard waste should be received post closure in the drop off depot and not that of the entire Niagara Region.

The Region’s contract with CMA may have been for the entire Region not just Port Colborne.
Action: Staff will clarify and report back to the PLC the information.

The PLC would like to recommend that it be shut down completely upon termination of the contract with CMA.
Staff noted that there is no plan in place yet with respect to a drop off depot. No final decisions have been made. Two sites in the Region have a self haul drop off with on-site composting (Bridge St and NR-12).
The PLC requested that the process start immediately to capture public input as early on as possible in the process. CRA has been retained, through the approved purchasing process and purchasing is in the process of issuing the letter to notifying CRA of their retention. CRA will be notified that an early start to the consultative process is desired.

PLC stated that getting public input early could eliminate unknowns. By identifying the intent to close the Site, the stigma surrounding the Site will start to subside. Staff stated it would be a good idea to not to cut off all options. By starting with the consultative process early, the public opinion as to whether it is open as a drop-off depot/transfer site will be known up front.

The PLC questioned whether or not Regional Council voted to close the composting site years ago?

Action: Staff will look into this for the PLC and provide an answer.

Operating a drop off depot is different from a compost site, and would be received differently by the public. By advertising and holding public meetings, receiving the public’s input early on in the process, the public’s opinion will form part of the plan and the PLC will not be boxed in as they would if a recommendation was made.

Staff will meet with CRA in June/July and schedule a PLC Meeting/Open House inviting the public to attend. The consultant will take part in the portions of the meeting dealing with the closure/end use plans.

Staff stated that with the Humberstone site so geographically close there is a limited business case for a drop off depot or related operations to continue.

The PLC fears if they don’t come out strong with their opinions and experiences, then all the work they have done in the past 4 years is down the drain if the public wants it to remain open. The PLC felt that educating the public with respect to what they have accomplished is necessary. They discussed preparing an overview of their history for presentation as part of the public meeting.

The PLC was reminded that they are a PLC and have to represent the public. Their opinions (and their rationale for them) can be defended during the meetings.

The PLC noted that they need to stand strong, united and give their history first, as to how our lives have been affected.
Staff stated that the PLC should refer to experiences and findings (not opinions) and ensure the process is followed closely and emphasize it is a Closure Plan. Staff would like to start at that point too. Revisiting the history is not valuable and we are working towards the same end – Closure.

PLC felt that once people read that Site is closing they will be pleased and not show up, however those that would like to see it remain open will show up and override the opinions that the Site must be closed, thus swaying the public opinion.

It was noted that no votes are cast at an open house. The Advertisement should state there is an open house to evaluate post closure options.

9.0 Phase IV LCS
Staff stated that the Waste approval was passed along to the PLC, however Niagara Region is still waiting on sewage approval. The exact time frame for construction will be dependant on when the sewage approval is received, when the tender is issued and a contractor retained. Construction could likely occur sometime late fall, if not winter.

The 15m buffer zone has been established. The LCS will be located on the interior of the buffer zone.

The PLC asked about the status of the contour extension application. Staff stated that the application to raise the contours is still pending.

10.0 Meeting Schedule for 2007
Past practice was that this PLC met every month and they stated this is not necessary now. Bimonthly would be sufficient now to meet the requirement for 2007. Thus the first Wednesday in August was desired and it was suggested that this could also be the first public meeting.

Staff will confirm the consultant’s schedule, and will suggest the August meeting as the first public meeting. The advertisement will be distributed to the PLC members for input, prior to publishing.

During the meeting in August the remainder of the meeting schedule for this year can be determined.

It was agreed that all meetings be held in Port Colborne versus the Dain City centre, but for the public meetings could re-consider venues. Committed public would make an effort to attend.

PLC to get input from Welland Councillor, however for the purposes of the Open House Port Colborne City Hall would be more appropriate.
11.0 Other Business
The City’s allocation of the Waste Management budget will remain the same upon closure of the Site, as it covers all collection costs based on the number of households in each municipality.

The PLC stated that odour impacts between now and April 1, 2009 will still occur and Niagara District Office has been very lenient in dealing with odour emissions. It was expressed that the court case was a joke. Overall it was felt that the MOE was much more lenient on Niagara Region as opposed industry.

Moved by Al Labatt:
The PLC retain the services of Ortech to further investigate and review the odour events of this facility.

2nd Gary Bruno

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Staff asked why the PLC wants to pass a motion of this nature?

PLC responded that they wanted to see the Region charged again if the odour limits are exceeded. It was stated that when there is an odour, the squeaky wheels get the grease. We would not be at this stage if things had moved forward. A lot of politicians outside of this community have no idea what it was like. It was felt that a motion of this nature would help get a recommendation to shut down operations through council. Staff can make the recommendations and they can be over-turned by the council. It was felt that if the cost of the new proponent was too dear then the whole RFP could be over-turned and Elm St would remain open. If there are no odour complaints to support the process it could be over-turned.

It was stated by staff that we keep revisiting the same issue and it makes it difficult to make progress and move forward.

The PLC noted that they are trying to make it apparent to other councillors who don’t believe there is an odour problem.

Staff noted that we do have approval to do this but the process has to be followed. After a year and a half, the site is now at half capacity.

PLC stated that the only reason the Site is at half capacity was because of their efforts and the MOE approvals branch read between the lines.
PLC asked: Wasn’t a motion passed in February already to end commercial haulage to this site?

Staff stated that if the PLC retain Ortech it would exhaust their entire budget and no money would be available for additional reviews or closure plan options. Staff
asked to be given until the August meeting to provide some form of assurance that the process was moving forward.

The PLC mentioned that the worst odour problems occurred in the summer and a lot has happened to bring us to this point. The PLC believes that Niagara Region wants to resolve it and end it as much as the PLC does. Things have sped up since the capacity was reduced. Pressure on the MOE caused that to happen, not the Region. The pressures placed on the Region have made a difference. Until we have the assurance that the process goes forward we will be diligent.

The motion was withdrawn until the meeting in August.

Discussion took place on odour sampling. The discussion focused on hiring Ortech to respond immediately and/or having Ortech train one of the PLC members to sample.

Staff noted that only 3 complaints have been reported since December.

The PLC expressed its displeasure with the responses to recent odour complaints. Why are the complaints being challenged?

Staff noted that we are required to respond. Not all odour events are from the Site. We have to respond and record our observations. The sources are variable and intermittent. There is no check box in the report to say whether or not the complaint is an ‘odour event’.

PLC stated that by the time the MOE responded it was hours after the complaint was issued. Staff indicated we would look at the reporting process again. Complaints are intermittent and the source is not known in advance. The information must be reported to MOE with this amount of detail.

PLC stated that how long staff have been at the site before they investigate the complaint could impact the results. During the last response Staff was only on-Site for a few minutes before responding. Staff also reported that the 6 month retesting was recently performed pursuant to the OAPA.

PLC noted that Ortech said it was nothing more than a screening test. Sensitivity testing is required.

Staff noted that Pinchin has the same lab that Ortech uses, however there is not only a large cost involved but also the question of whether or not the detailed testing will show significantly different results.
If the RFP SSO has to go to a vote and it’s not a done deal, it is to the Region’s advantage to recognize the complaints as it gives more weight to final closure.

12.0 Adjournment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion: To adjourn at 9:03 p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moved by: D. O’Hara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seconded: G. Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>