

AGENDA

PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC) MEETING 3 LYSTEK SOUTHGATE ORGANIC MATERIALS RECOVERY CENTRE

DATE: Tuesday, March 27, 2012

TIME: 7 pm

LOCATION: 40 Main Street N., Dundalk Ontario, N0C 1B0

ATTENDEES:

Glen Irwin Mary Fowler Sarah Mason - Minutes Grant Preston Karen Cheeseman Steve Redmond – Chair

Guest: Kevin Litwiller (Lystek)

Community Members: John Pugliese (Site Forman at Dundalk OMRC site), Mary Redmond (Dundalk Herald)

Absent: Guy Treadwell

AGENDA TOPICS:

Item	Description	Action By
1.	Acceptance of Previous Meeting Minutes	Moved by: Mary
	Discussed that the previous meeting minutes have not yet been posted on the Lystek website as they are revamping their website to be more user friendly. The newly approved final minutes are expected to be up by the end of this week. Following approval of minutes they will be forwarded to the township whereby they are expected to be posted there about	Fowler Seconded by: Grant Preston



	a week following Lystek's posting (approximately 1-2 weeks following final approval)	
2.	Motion to Elect an Official Secretary Moved by Mary that Sarah be the official secretary for the PAC for all remaining meetings.	Moved by: Mary Fowler
		Seconded by: Karen Cheeseman
3.	Public and Media Attendance – Notification of Question Period	PAC members
	The PAC agreed to have a question period at the end of the each meeting, if time permits. The goal is to schedule a meeting that is approximately 2 hours in length (ending at 9pm). Questions that have been forwarded to the Chair, in writing, prior to the meeting will be addressed first.	
	As previously discussed Steve will manage the question period in his capacity as chair.	
4.	Community Advisory – Q&A Document	
	All Questions & Answers (Q&A) will be recorded as a living document that the PAC can work with on a monthly basis. When the PAC agrees, by consensus, with an answer then the Question & Answer can be released and posted on Lystek and Southgate websites.	PAC members
	The Q&A document will then grow in size and scope as time progresses and more questions are answered.	
	Septage Question:	
	Question(from Glen) in regards to whether or not there are strict regulations on the septage that will be accepted at the OMRC because this material is not tested, like sewage biosolids that are tested at as they are produced at the municipal waste water treatment plants.	
	(This is an example of a question that will be answered in the Q&A document).	



Г	The PAC began to discuss the following questions:	
	 What are the details regarding the exact distances between the facility and the public school? 	
	 The Lystek process' ability to remove pathogens and not metals? 	
	 Will Dundalk become a dumping ground for Toronto's waste? 	
	- The Township's royalty of \$0.25 per tonne?	
	 Will the OMRC emit Nitrous Oxide from its stack? 	
	 Will the stack emit harmful "smoke" into the air? 	
	- There will be 25 trucks a day coming through town?	
	 Will there be uncovered trucks bringing raw septage to the centre? 	
	 Raw, untreated septage will be delivered using "open" vehicles. 	
	 Height of centre was reduced to 11 metres, will this create more odours? 	
	 Will operation of the Lystek facility assist Dundalk with their wastewater treatment? 	
	 Lystek is only in this to make a 'quick buck' and has no concern for the community in doing so 	
a N t	Answers will be written for each of these questions and after approval by the PAC a finalized version (the Q&A document) will be posted following April's meeting. PAC members felt hat there were some details that need to be verified prior to releasing the answers.	
4	Approvals Update	
k	ystek continues to provide information to the MOE and, based on our understanding, expects to have the draft approvals within the next few weeks.	Kevin Litwiller



	A letter was issued by the MOE on March 1 st stating that Lystek should not move forward with any work related to the processing operations, including the finished product storage lagoons. Lystek responded on March 5 th stating that construction activities at the site were related to site access, pre-grading activities, temporary controls, site servicing activities and building foundations for a prefabricated structure etc. We further acknowledged that works comprising the waste processing system and conversion of organic materials into a commercial fertilizer are subject to MOE review and approval, which is ongoing, and that no such works will be completed, commissioned and/or operated until such time as all MOE Approvals have been issued.	
6.	Comparison of Setback Distances for Land Application (ASM vs. NASM vs. Comm. Fertilizer)	Presentation by Steve Redmond
	Information requested by Glen at previous meeting	
	See attached document with selected pages from the NASM (Non-Agricultural Source Material) Plan Developer's Course – Module 5.	
	Municipal Wells: The regulations require a 100-metre setback back from municipal wells for ALL materials (Ag source materials, such as manure, NASM or commercial fertilizer.	
	Other Wells: including dug wells have the greatest differences in setbacks in regards to application standards for different materials. The NASM regulations are much stricter and require a 90-metre setback and a material defined as a commercial fertilizer requires only a 3-metre setback.	
	Surface Water: Ag-source materials require either a 3-metre or 13-metre setback from surface water. If the field has a vegetative buffer (minimum width of 3 metres) and the material will be incorporated or injected into the soil, or is applied to a living crop, then the 3 m setback is acceptable. If these conditions do not apply then the 13-metre setback must be followed (see documents for additional details).	



		-
	Farmers are encouraged through Best Management Practices (BMP's) to adopt greater setbacks than the minimums in the Nutrient Management Regulations. Kevin added that the CFIA certification of the Lystek product, as a Commercial Fertilizer, is 'site specific' and that the Southgate OMRC material will require a new approval from CFIA. The approval from the Lystek facility in Guelph cannot be transferred, or used, for the material generated in	
	Southgate.	
7.	Question and Answer – Public	
	No questions addressed by community members present	
8.	Action Items and Next Steps	
	Keep working on Q & A document	
	The PAC is planning to have a meeting "on-site" during May's meeting (May 29 th). Members are requested to bring safety boots and hard hats and to meet on site at 7:00 pm.	
	The pre-engineered steel for the processing facility is to be delivered to the site on April 17 th .	
9.	Adjourn Meeting	Moved by: Mary Fowler
		Seconded by: Glen Irwin

Next Meeting: April 24th 7:00 pm



Action Items for PAC

Item	Who	When
Comparison of Setback Distances (NASM vs. Commercial Fertilizer) (documents to be scanned)	Steve Redmond	April
Question & Answer Document (version 1)	All	April
Record new Questions from Public	All	Ongoing

