### ELM STREET LANDFILL SITE/COMPOST SITE

**Public Liaison Committee (PLC)**

**Notes of Meeting**
**Wednesday May 3, 2006**
**7:00 p.m.**

Carrie Lynn Pinard Community Centre

#### Present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edward Kaczmarczyk</td>
<td>Co-Chair, Welland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Greenizan</td>
<td>Welland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Labatt</td>
<td>Welland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Wiggins</td>
<td>Port Colborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Larouche</td>
<td>City of Welland Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Shore</td>
<td>Port Colborne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Berketo</td>
<td>Niagara Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Winters</td>
<td>Niagara Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Eckhart</td>
<td>(recorder)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Regrets:

- Dan O'Hara

### 1.0 Introductions

Lisa Benvenuti from MOE and one area resident attended.

### 2.0 Minutes from Previous Meetings – March 1, 2006 and February 1, 2006, and April 5, 2006

Discussion. MOE advised the PLC that no formal response will be made by the MOE to the report. The report will form part of the MOE review for approval to CofA (air) amendment.

It was noted that attendance at meetings includes regrets only and doesn’t list “no shows”.

February/06 -Minutes addition.

Discussion on why the plant out east was shut down (30 yr old facility). It was no longer cost effective for continued operations and it couldn’t meet requirement of new CofA (air).

April/06 minutes addition/correction.
Page 3: Item J; Want description (title) of CofA
Page 4: Add only. PLC was under the impression that it would only be used in an odour event.

Discussion to reinforce PLC is not in favour of using misting system at all.

Remaining business deferred to after RWDI report discussion with MOE.

### 3.0 Business Arising from Previous Minutes

No discussion.
4.0 PLC Comments on RWDI Report

PLC: Want to remove reference in document that PLC agreed with process. As PLC we asked for money to have study by ORTECH, why would we do that if we were in agreement? Wanted another company to do the study and were told that wasn’t possible. We want it on record that we are not in agreement with report. What is the best way to get it done? See 5 different copies out there.

MOE suggests that references be removed. The only report the MOE is aware of is the November report. PLC should channel comments through Lisa and she will forward to the Approvals section.

PLC feels that’s insufficient because Regional Council will vote on report as it stands.

Action: Region to provide all copies of the reports issued on the odour be provided to PLC.

MOE requires that submissions for CofA application include a model as part of the submission. Reports are largely similar and she suggests committee review and make notes of comments. Submission modeled composting facility only and cannot remain as final as only portion of facility model was submitted. Information was received that revised copies rely on baseline information from the August 2005 report.

PLC: To prevent this again, the number of reports, could they come to the PLC before they are submitted to MOE?

MOE: Any applications can be submitted at any time and incorporate any comments they want to submit. MOE would not object to that process; however it is up to the Region on how to proceed.

If the reports were reviewed by PLC before submission the MOE would not have to shuttle as many of the comments back and forth.

PLC: Could the Region request subsequent reports be numbered as amended reports with revision number?

Action: Region will inquire.

Amendments made to reports keep it changing so it is not a final.
MOE: Reports circulated to PLC members will probably not get full agreement.

| Motion: PLC want all references of PLC approval of procedures and methodology that is mentioned in RWDI reports removed. |
| Moved by: B. Greenizan | Carried. |
| Seconded by: Jim Larouche |

Action: Region will provide all known reports by the end of the week. Action: PLC will comment by highlights and notes on report and reply.

PLC: RWDI report – doesn’t state that the testing was performed while the facility was run at 50% capacity and that would mislead the MOE.
MOE advised that the report has to model the odours that would be produced at 12,000 tonnes, not 6000 tonnes.

PLC: Reports don’t identify sampling days and are not specified at what capacity it was running and believes report was done as facility was running at 50%.

Motion: PLC requests that RWDI report states that the testing was done at approximately 50% of the site’s capacity and should be documented stating that up front and throughout the report.
Moved by: J Larouche
Seconded by P. Shore
Carried

PLC: Is that 50% of 6,000 or 12,000 tonnes?
MOE saw sampling at 6,000 in November's report.

**Action: Region will get clarification and email PLC members.**

Motion: At the time of the testing clarify whether the sampling was done at 50% of 6,000 or 12,000 tonnes.
Moved by: D Wiggins
Seconded by: B. Greenizan
Carried

MOE stated that the Region was not aware of capacity limit until September.

PLC members can email Drew any remaining questions.

### 5.0 Weight/Tonnage Information from Composting Facility

Inbound /outbound records for the first 3 months of the year, by month, was distributed. Reports were generated from scales at landfill sites.

PLC: How much capacity remains, what is the tonnage on site?

CMA reports weekly, based on protocol of physical tonnage measured on site.

MOE’s April report from CMA reported 4,136 tonnes and did not exceed 5,400 tonnes.

PLC: How much of pad space is available?
CMA: about 40%.

PLC: Why apply for change to CofA to 12,000 if operating at 5,000 looks full?
CMA: Density of incoming materials is light with little rainfall this spring makes the volume appear higher. Large areas, that are certified, are not in use.

PLC: Will the pad area need to be doubled?

The facility operates 12,000 tonnes. We have enough physical space to do that job. In April, when minimal compost sales materials remain stockpiled on site that volume is part of that 12,000 tonnes. Windrows absorb the rain and weight on site changes.
PLC: How is density applied?

CMA: Variety of standard densities. Density constantly changes; in really dry weather water is added. Calculations would be costly and wouldn’t speak to the production of odour. There are well cared for and managed windrows on site.

PLC: Feels that if increased to 12,000 tonnes, odour impact would increase so that would double the problem they have experienced in the past 2 years.

PLC inquired about a newspaper that reported material was diverted last year. CMA: By CMA’s choice for concern of odour impact to community due to nature of material.

It was noted that the discrepancy between the 2 certificates dates back to 1999.

PLC: What happened to the overs? It should be added to the outbound.

That went to the landfill.

6.0 Misting System

PLC members were under the impression that when the system was approved, it was approved as part of the odour abatement plan of action for use in an odour event. Misting system was installed without approval and included for approval when the odour abatement plan was submitted.

Procedure is not being followed; otherwise it would show up in monthly surveys. Now it is being used anytime you want. What is the MOE’s interpretation as to when the misting system should be used?

MOE: An odour event has to be reported to both the Region and the MOE. Misting system was in response to odour issues. Order requires submission of odour abatement plan and to satisfy the requirement, it has the misting system included. Nothing specific in plan speaks to how and when it will be used. It is identified as one of the odour control plans. Region submits plan, yes it was already installed. MOE reviewed and granted approvals. Two have been issued air CofA and amendment to the waste site CofA. Even those approvals are not specific as to how the misting system will be used. Two months after you start using the system, provide an update in operations manual on how it is used. This was done the end of October. MOE suggests Region could provide document to PLC because it identifies how the system is used.

PLC state they have documentation to show it ran 24 hrs.

MOE: If the Region wants to change how they use it, they have to come back for approval from the MOE. Therefore, if they don’t want to use it now, they have to identify how they will operate. Waste disposal site CofA provides reasons and date changes were complete.

PLC requests the Region stop using the misting system. If we only want it used in the case of an odour event, how do we proceed?
MOE: Take that portion of the current existing operations manual and suggest those changes. MOE has advised the Region they have to use the system the way the approval allows. MOE has received two different versions of requests from the public, one to stop completely and one to use only in odour event.

PLC: It’s operating on 1/3 of perimeter, is it approved for the entire area?

MOE: It is approved for maximum use.

CMA: Construction is pre-approved for the entire site but have no plans to go ahead. Only using 1/3 of the area currently. System is already in use this season since last Monday and the testing started a week prior. CMA operates within parameters of CofA. Misting system is for the prevention of odour and they have a legal obligation to the Region to reduce odour events. This is our tool to fulfill this obligation.

PLC: Doesn’t think we know enough about the environmental effects on environmentally sensitive people to authorize the use of a misting system all day.

MOE: Everyone should have a look at the document that identifies the use.

**Action: Region will provide to PLC for review.**
MOE suggested the PLC come to an agreement before they make recommendations to changes and then go to the Region. Then the Region can approach the MOE for approval to change use.

PLC: states the location is the problem, the site is in a residential area. If perfume is removed, smell would cause odour events and there is not enough information from the Region to the PLC. Report by Dobroff (air quality analyst from Hamilton) dated February 05 states the misting system is an odour masking system, effects of which is unknown. Suggests it should be tested before continued use.

| Motion: The Region pay for bench scale testing for all 3 of those agents and a representative composite sample of the odorous compost materials at a fully accredited odour laboratory and do a full esdm report. |
| Moved by: A Labatt |
| Seconded by: D. Wiggins |
| Carried |

Region: We are following the CofA and have provided MSDS sheets to Committee. They have been reviewed by toxicologists at the MOE and approved by the FDA in the US.

PLC asked where the products come from.

One is from US, another is Canadian. CMA is not aware of chemical constituents.

PLC: Does the Region have we any fragrance free buildings. Some Departments are but it’s unknown if entire buildings are fragrance free.

MOE suggests PLC contact Standards Development Department of MOE to learn what the review procedure is.
CMA: – by way of context, we’re using 3 approved substances, based on whatever approvals standards. If there is this profound concern are you going to investigate all the local industries, known polluters. Eucalyptus oil is one of the substances and it’s used by water and sewage plants. A community concerned about health impacts should then consider all exposure risks to be concerned about, not just the misting system. Truly toxic substances, in context, the misting system would be the least likely problem.

PLC: Don’t have input into local industries but do have a say on the landfill. PLC doesn’t value MSDS as they don’t identify the source. Studies do not address the odour impact. Don’t think enough is known about this.

Steps are going to be;
First come up with some agreement on using the misting system only in an odour event and not daily. When it does get turned on, identify it as an odour event.
PLC wants Region to prove it prevents odours.

When PLC knows that what it reads is final than can proceed.

7.0 Update – Composting Facility RFP
11 companies submitted, down to 4 for distribution of RFP. First set was for RFQ. Technical problems currently but should be let for a month probably in a week. RFP will likely be dated for reply in June.

PLC: How would we find out who the 4 are?

Region: will advise when information can be released.

8.0 Other Business
- Application for Amendment to Certificate of Approval (Air) No. 8-4448-67ASAS (supplied To the Co-chair Ed Kaczmarczyk)

CMA employee is going around the neighborhood in a yellow truck. Truck now has a magnetic sign on it for identification. Residents threatened employee last summer so sign was removed for his safety.

Next meeting: first Wednesday of June in Port Colborne.

General discussion continued.

After four years of meetings, little progress has been made to solve problem, lots of Regional faces have changed. Odour problems continue. No odours were noticed before 3 years ago. When will the Region admit there is a problem and correct it? MOE is as guilty as the Region.

9.0 Adjournment

Motion: To adjourn 10:16 p.m.
Moved by: B. Greenizan
Seconded by: D. Wiggins
Carried.