
Port Fuels & Material Services, Inc.

Meeting Minutes

Date: January 20, 2015

Location: Boardroom, Eva Rothwell Resource Centre at Robert Land (460 Wentworth St N, Hamilton)

Chair: Bob Clark, PFMSI

Facilitator: Greg Zilberbrant, JBI

Minutes: Maria Topalovic, JBI

Participants: James Kaspersetz (Clean Air Hamilton), Keith Reid (PFMSI), Stephen Rowe (KNA), Lynn Stewart (McMaster), Melanie (SSNH), Ellen Morris (Gala Hub), Gordon R (CRA), Blair (CRA), Tej G (CRA), Steve Harris (CRA)

Regrets: Peter DeBoer (City of Hamilton Fire Dept), Ilona Feldmann (BARC), Linda Lukasik (Environment Hamilton), Chris McLaughlin (BARC)

Welcome & Introductions

New members introduced: Ellen is a new addition representing the Gala Hub. Melanie is the SSNH rep, replacing Laurence.

Approval of Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve minutes by Lynn, seconded by James. All in favour. Minutes from the October 16, 2014 meeting approved.

Presentation of Environmental Screening Report Technical Studies (CRA)

- Keith noted the review period is longer than 60 days. Blair clarified that as per the regulation, a holiday period was added and is not included in the 60 days.
- Melanie asked who sets the screening criteria. Blair explained it is from the Ontario Environment Assessment Act, Guide for Waste Mgmt Projects in Ontario.
- Bob indicated that PFMSI looked at the distinction between the ESR and the EA process. Through suggestions PFMSI received from Open House #1, PFMSI decided go beyond the ESR and add the technical requirements similar to what would be required in an EA.

- Ellen asked if PFMSI went beyond the minimum requirements. Blair indicated yes from the screening perspective. Bob indicated that from a technical perspective, everything is met. The EA process would consider multiple alternative locations, but PFMSI wants to stay in the Hamilton community.
 - Ellen asked if this is a business reason since there is industry to support it. Bob agreed.
- Melanie asked if every waste mgmt project has the exact same screening criteria and if public could comment on the screening criteria?
 - Blair explained this was done at the first open house and two criteria were modified as a result of public comment.
 - James suggested there is public confusion on why the ESR was done vs. an EA. PFMSI followed what would have been done on an individual EA with the additional information in the ESR, but that has not been easy to convey and some in the community continue to hold on to that, suggesting an EA should be done.
- Ellen asked for clarification on if PFMSI required the rail line to be removed, if trains still use the line, and if PFMSI have an interest in having access to rail.
 - Bob explained this is an active “through” line and it currently runs through the middle of the property. PFMSI asked for the line to be moved to one end of the property so it would not interfere with PFMSI business. It is a through line but he does not know how often or what it is currently used for. He indicated that over time they might have an interest because of the inter-modal capability. Commercial and industrial waste goes to landfill, so this is an opportunity to transfer this waste to a useful purpose.

Tej presented on the Design & Operations Report

- Ellen asked for clarification on the Refuse-Derived Fuels (RDF) category and if this involves making pellets. Bob explained RDF is a way of uniformly sizing the material for processing. It is not creating pellets.
 - Ellen asked if the waste is currently ending up in landfill. Bob explained yes, so now instead of sending it to landfill, they could send it to PFMSI (pre-sized).
- Stephen asked if the plant in York Region (Dongara) example would be used by PFMSI. Tej explained this was just an example of a plant that uses RDF, not the plant that PFMSI would use. Bob added that a local Hamilton company has offered to create the RDF.
- Bob explained that this overview of the input categories are about the technical capabilities of the process, and that only a non-hazardous application can be approved under this application, there is no intention that hazardous wastes will be accepted.
 - Stephen asked for clarification that this is a list of potential sources, but the targeted waste will be the Industrial, Commercial and Institutional (IC&) and Construction and Demolition (C&D).
 - Bob explained yes, PFMSI has to list all the capabilities in the application but the target by far is IC&I and C&D, within 5 miles of the site.

- Ellen asked what PFMSI's relationship will be with the companies that process municipal waste. Bob explained they have not planned to get involved nor interfere with the current municipal waste and that PFMSI's focus is commercial and industrial waste.
- Bob asked if anyone was familiar with municipal recycling facilities (MRF's), which use sorting so they are able to get everything of value removed for recycling and reuse. Similarly, this would be the start of the PFMSI process.
- Melanie asked for clarification on the energy used in the area and Tej provided clarification that the equivalent amount of energy produced by the facility would power about 17,000 homes (or 8% of Hamilton households).
- Steve indicated that the biggest user of energy in Ontario is ArcelorMittal Dofasco and he knows this because he used to work for the biggest user (Xstrada, which is no longer in operation).
- Melanie asked if the energy output is dependent upon the input, and the input is variable, then how is the output not variable.
 - Bob explained that the Gasplasma® input waste stream will be of a standard size and moisture content and an average calorific value which is steady-state so the output will be consistent.
 - Melanie asked if the composition of the Plasmarok® is also consistent? Ellen suggested it would be good to see a sample.
 - Bob did not have a sample but explained the type of Plasmarok® looks like rocks/aggregate and has a proven commercial use for aggregate used in roads, insulation purposes, slag form for molds, etc.
 - Melanie asked if a similar compound is produced at a variety of other facilities and if it is common. Bob said there are 90 commercial operations now (Tetronics) and has been around globally since 1965 (several in the US but not in Canada).
 - Stephen asked if it was similar to a slag. Bob said it is.

Gordon presented the air quality results

- Stephen asked if all of the waste processing takes place indoors. Gordon explained yes and it is all under negative pressure (air can't get out of the building, it is always going in). The only place air gets out is at controlled points (identified in a distributed handout).
- Melanie asked for clarification on how scrubbers work.
 - Bob stated that the scrubbers were all standard technologies for cleaning the exhaust gasses.
 - Stephen stated that he lives four blocks from the proposed plant and with his industrial background, he knows that filters in industry can handle anything, so he is comfortable with this plant being in his backyard.
 - Greg confirmed with Melanie whether her question on scrubbers was answered. Melanie acknowledged it was. Greg reminded Melanie and the group that all the reports, including the information on scrubber technologies, was available online.
 - James added that you can easily build scrubbers to meet the purest form, but it is extremely costly.

- James asked if the modeling is based on the analytical data from the pilot plant in England.
 - Gordon explained that data both standard engineering data such as baghouse data, as well as 3 years of stack testing data from facility in England scaled up to this plant size
 - James wanted clarification that CRA was comfortable with the approach. Gordon explained that scaling up is a common engineering practice. He noted that in the local news, it was suggested this facility is 3400 times bigger than the England facility, which is not true. The actual scaling when looking at throughput of waste is much less, 125 to 150.

Source Summary Table was distributed as Gordon described it

Greg asked if everyone was ok to stay for another half hour to finish the presentation

- James indicated he will have to leave shortly, but from his group's perspective, they are interested in the air quality aspect and this has been covered

Human Health Risk Assessment (Steve, CRA)

- Steve explained they chose the type of chemicals that could be released from this type of facility.
- Melanie asked if the assessment is limited to the interactions of humans and chemicals, suggested that social and community health and other stressors on the body should be included.
 - Steve explained that they assessed the potential for there to be a health outcome due to the chemicals released from this facility.
 - James asked if the chemicals in the cumulative area were considered? Steve said yes, explained they estimated base conditions in a 5 km area, the facility only, and the addition of the two to look at a cumulative effect (and how risks from facility contribute to that).
- Gordon clarified that as previously mentioned in the presentation, Gala Hub effects were lower than other residential areas closer to the facility, therefore it wasn't looked at. Ellen indicated she understood.
- Melanie asked why there are different pathways for residential and industrial
 - Steve clarified that workers are not necessarily residents, so they have to be considered. If a worker is also a resident, they would be covered in the residential analysis too.
- Stephen asked for clarification on scientific numbers notation. Steve clarified.

James excused himself from the meeting at 9:08pm.

- Stephen suggested that if all the numbers are calculated based on readings when Stelco was operating, the data should improve if Stelco isn't operating.
- Gord said the data is from 2011-2013.

Blair continued with the presentation - Land-use & socio-economic

- Melanie asked if making lease payment is contingent on PFSMSI getting approval and that they don't pay the Port Authority currently. Bob indicated they currently pay a due diligence lease and if they go into operation, we would pay an increased lease in addition to any taxes.

Cultural heritage was presented

ECA process

- Melanie asked for more info on the ECA process and if it replaces CofAs
 - Blair explained that three ECAs will be sought (air/noise, waste, industrial sewage works) on a site wide basis and the technical reports are already at the detail required for ECAs.
 - Melanie asked if there is a public review period. Blair explained there is a public comment period after ECAs are posted to the EBR.

Part II request

- Melanie asked if this was being reviewed because a Part II order had already been submitted. Blair indicated no, this was not the case. He brought it up because people have suggested there should be a full EA before technical documents were even completed. It was for general information purposes.
- Melanie asked about CLC meeting frequency. She wants the opportunity for more dialogue as her neighbours have concerns. Since she was new, she didn't want to raise concerns already discussed, but wants to know if she has the opportunity before the review period is over.
 - Bob suggested questions can be sent to them anytime PFMSI has already met with the Sherman Hub, responded to their "open letter", posted all there information online, and will continue to respond as requested. He also encouraged the CLC to be pro-active with the entities they represent to consolidate and bring the questions forward. Similar to our new CLC members coming up to speed, community members may also be new to this.
 - Melanie suggested that people are very uncomfortable and that email response questions do not have the same effect as in-person discussions.
 - Ellen agreed because their neighbor concerns are emotional. Highly charged concerns could still use some conversation in a more informal way. Group discussion would be better than a Q&A by email.
 - Greg asked all CLC members to suggest agenda items/topics within the next week and then we can discuss how to be more effective in reaching the community and responding to questions.
 - Stephen thought this was a great approach. He explained that the Keith Hub has had open and ongoing conversations with PFMSI since April last year. All of Keith Hub's concerns are met. Stephen notes that the Keith Hub passed a unanimous decision that they support the PFMSI facility proposal.

- Ellen attends both Sherman & Gala meetings and that this is a difficult proposal for people to understand. Many of her neighbours are different from Keith residents who are 2, 3, 4th generation industrial vs. new neighbours. Even though there are really articulate responses, they haven't been received well because it is a highly emotionally charged issue. She is a Toronto transplant so it is difficult to digest the industrial city.
- Stephen explained that in April, PFMSI approached all neighbourhoods, but only the Keith hub accepted the invite.

Everyone agreed with the approach. Bob thanked everyone for their participation in the CLC.

Adjourn - Meeting adjourned at 10:08pm.