

Memo

To: Emile Saindon

Cc: Tom Parker, Jean Waldner

From: Amanda Jardine

Date: October 4, 2016

Project #: CP15-CPC-02-00

Subject: Public Open House Summaries

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE SUMMARIES

The Crowsnest-Pincher Creek (CNPC) Landfill Association has retained Integrated Sustainability Consultants Ltd. (Integrated Sustainability) to provide regulatory support for an *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act* (EPEA) amendment application for the addition of an incinerator at the landfill.

As part of the project scope of work, Integrated Sustainability assisted CNPC in facilitating the Public Open House Sessions that occurred from September 12th to 14th. A total of three public open houses with six presentation sessions were attended by Emile Saindon and Jean Waldner of CNPC, Steve Meldrum of Eco Waste Solutions (Eco Waste), Cody Halleran of North Shore Environmental (North Shore), Tom Parker, Gilbert Gagnon and Amanda Jardine of Integrated Sustainability.

The sessions consisted of an hour presentation to provide information to the public regarding the incinerator and the perceived associated health and environmental risks associated with incineration. At the end of each session a question and answer period followed by a general discussion was scheduled. The purpose of this memo is to provide CNPC with a summary of the information that was collected during the sessions in the form of question and answer. The attached file presents the information captured by Integrated Sustainability during the open houses.

Action items from the sessions have been distributed by email and also provided in the quarterly report. If you have any questions about the content provided, please contact the under signed.

Sincerely,

Amanda Jardine

Date: September 12, 2016

Venue: Pincher Creek Gym

Hours: 3PM - approx. 7PM

Attendees: Approximately 30

22 Names recorded on the sign-in sheet.

Issues captured from general conversation:	Issue/Comment	CNPC Comments [post-meeting comments]
Issue 1	Concerns raised about odour and noise	Odour and noise are not expected to be significant
Issue 2	Concern that the public were given 'very late' notice of the open houses	Public notice was provided twice, on August 31st and September 7th, (in 'Shooting the Breeze, Pincher Creek Echo, and Crownsnest Pass Herald'); prior to open houses.
Issue 3	Concern that this issue is moving ahead at all - why is this happening	CNPC chose this technology after consideration of the other options available, and believe moving forward with it is appropriate
Issue 4	Concern raised about appropriateness of technology, that this will be 'another Swan Hills', and that there will be a government inquiry into this proposed project	CNPC believe the technology is appropriate, and that the nature of waste, volumes, and treatment is not at all like Swan Hills
Issue 5	Some confusion regarding the nature of waste that will be incinerated - concerns that dangerous or hazardous waste will be combusted.	CNPC will be combusting only biomass and polyethylene.

Questions and responses following presentation by CNPC	Question	CNPC Response:
Session 1 Question 1	General statement regarding concern about investing energy to make the landfill sustainable yet 30% of the waste is coming from across the BC border; the concern appeared to be about CNPC strategy generally, not the incinerator specifically.	
Session 1 Question 2	General statement: What percentage of emissions would you have if you didn't burn the waste?	
Session 1 Question 3	How can plastics be disposed of without harmful emissions?	In the case of the proposed CNPC incinerator, the plastics are non-chlorinated, there are no/extremely low HCL-related emissions. If the plastic is chlorinated, then emissions management is a much more significant concern, and additional pollution reduction technology would be required to manage this.
Session 1 Question 4	Concern regarding industrial waste input to the incinerator, and potential for variation in the waste mix in future operations	The waste mix will be specified in the application, and CNPC expects that any Approval will set out the requirements for the same. The waste mix will be a combination of biomass, polyethylene, and wood waste.
Session 1 Question 5	Why are you sourcing waste material from so far afield?	Due to economics. A few years prior to 2008 the landfill was struggling to operate financially, however the addition of regional waste assisted with this process. Also, CNPC has a mandate to operate as a regional landfill, with a catchment covering southern Alberta. If the community wants a smaller landfill, that's up to their mandate, however a consequence would be that the tipping fee's would increase by approx. \$25/ton.
Session 1 Question 6	If the CNPC board chooses to increase the tip fee, will the proposal stop?	If the Board votes to stop the proposal, then it will be stopped.
Session 1 Question 7	What is the capacity of the incinerator?	2 x 5 tonne chambers, each in order 2 x 6m in size.
Session 1 Question 8	Because of using forced air, what is the sound level?	If necessary can use a silencer, however noise is not expected to be of concern.
Session 1 Question 9	It would be good to have noise & odour 'wind rose' for the incinerator	
Session 1 Question 10	Will the incinerator result in an increase in tip fees?	No
Session 1 Question 11	Is CNPC holding it's own now, and will it be profitable in 5 years time?	Yes, and yes. CNPC only operates off the tip fee revenue that it generates; there is no other municipal, provincial or federal support for the operation.
Session 1 Question 12	From the previous March 25, 2015 meeting, the incinerator project was put on hold until a meeting took place between eco-waste and Suncor. What does Suncor have to do with this?	There seems to be a misunderstanding - Ecowaste travelled to Alberta, met with CNPC, then consequently met with Suncor on an entirely different matter of their own business.
Session 1 Question 13	How many years are left in the landfill?	19, with potential to expand for another 85-90 years.
Session 1 Question 14	What is the longevity of the incinerator?	The oldest running incinerator on this technology is 20 years old.
Session 1 Question 15	Who is paying for the incinerator?	CNPC
Session 1 Question 16	In the event of a cell leak, or contamination etc., who covers this?	CNPC

Session 1 Question 17	Is the coverage adequate?	Yes, according to our auditors.
Session 1 Question 18	General statement 'as long as you keep tipping fees low, you encourage waste'	
Session 1 Question 19	If CNPC decides to sit on their hands, what happens in December 2016	Clarification provided between EPEA renewal, and EPEA amendment.
Session 1 Question 20	What is the timeline for the incinerator?	6-12 months for regulatory review (application intended to be submitted January 2017); + 6-8 months for fabrication and installation.
Session 2 Question 1	What other options have been considered instead of the incinerator?	Composting - however the compost must still be landfilled due to prions, and the liquids need to be disposed of. It's a long process, difficult, and the end outcome is not ideal.
Session 2 Question 2	Edmonton sells compost, so why not CNPC?	Edmonton doesn't include composted cattle and hence it's a different disease risk scenario
Session 2 Question 3	What other options have been considered instead of the incinerator?	Also looked at landfill for livestock, however it would be very messy and still a need to deal with liquids.
Session 2 Question 4	Will CNPC look to provide equipment for dead stock bins?	Yes, this is preferable to CNPC as it ensures chain-of-custody and contamination issues are controlled by CNPC.
Session 2 Question 5	Will CNPC put dead stock bins in a non-predator environment?	Yes, CNPC works with appropriate groups to achieve this.
Session 2 Question 6	So CNPC may provide dead stock services region-wide?	Yes.

Feedback forms	Comment:	CNPC Note
#1	Excellent presentation from Steve', 'Cody's presentation was probably too technical for most', 'Clarified some questions, [however] I continue to question what all 'industrial wastes' constitutes'	The last point was raised in concern about the composition of waste that would be put into the incinerator; CNPC indicated during the presentation what the waste composition would be and that it would not be 'all' industrial waste

Date: September 13, 2016
 Venue: Elks Hall, Blairmore
 Hours: 3PM - approx. 7PM
 Attendees counted: Approximately 27
 19 Names recorded on the sign-in sheet.

Issues captured from general conversation:	Issue/Comment	CNPC Approach
Issue 1	Public consultation process - what is the process, how does it work.	AEP will dictate any public consultation required. CNPC is conducting the open houses to help inform the community of the incinerator project, and following application submission AEP will inform us if consultation is still required.
Issue 2	Statement: Community member grateful for provision of plastic recycling process by CNPC - 500 cattle/winter feed operation.	
Issue 3	Question regarding background air conditions - how was the background air quality taken into consideration in the air modelling.	The model was prepared based upon available background data for the area.

Questions and responses following presentation by CNPC	Question	CNPC Response:
Session 1 Question 1	Do you still process plastic bags?	Yes. Currently no market for it, but we are collecting, baling and stockpiling it.
Session 1 Question 2	Clarification around waste bin/regional clean up days - when/how often etc.	CNPC confirmed that each community is allowed one free day each per community (Crownsnest Pass has a slightly different process)
Session 1 Question 3	From where do the wildlife carcasses come from?	Locally, and within the Volker Stevin road maintenance jurisdiction - AB/BC Border to Fort McLeod; and Chain Lakes to Waterton Park
Session 1 Question 4	What about PCB emissions?	No PCB emissions or concerns, as it's not in our input feedstock. We are not Swan Hills. We are only inputting biomass, non-PVC plastics, and wood waste.
Session 1 Question 5	Comment - the location map doesn't show all the residents who are nearby.	This was acknowledged and agreed, however the model itself does not require this information in order to be accurate. The resident locations shown are provided for information and background context only.
Session 1 Question 6	Comment - model is based on predicted data only.	Agreed - the model can only be a prediction as the facility is not built and operating. The stack emissions however, are measured emissions data.
Session 1 Question 7	The emissions model doesn't speak to the need for the project	Agreed - the 'need' for the project was discussed earlier in the presentation.
Session 1 Question 8	Could you elaborate on the purpose of the open house - is it for the amendment?	The open house is to assist public awareness of the project, and in particular about the intent to apply for an EPEA amendment. AEP will dictate any consultation requirements for the amendment process.
Session 1 Question 9	What/when is our opportunity to provide input on the project	Response: general discussion about the amendment process, and how the consultation process will work. Also general discussion about previous amendment processes at the landfill.
Session 1 Question 10	Is this information available for us to obtain?	CNPC website includes the Board minutes, released after the following Board meeting.
Session 1 Question 11	Is this information available today available for us to view online?	Will be, once uploaded. We tried to upload today, however had a technical challenge. The presentation will be uploaded soon. Also AEP will have information available on their website once the application is submitted.
Session 1 Question 12	Is there a projected cost for the incinerator?	Not at this point - costs will be addressed likely in 18 months or so. The funds will come from landfill operations.
Session 1 Question 13	Thanks for the presentation, well presented. In this area when BSE hit, many ranchers chose inadequate disposal methods. However, industry improved and chose local initiatives that are excellent initiatives, e.g. Bear Bin program. Concerned that some of the statements reflect in the presentation poorly on the local community. To put our animals in a truck and take to landfill will not happen due to aesthetics concerns etc. How will it impact Southern Alberta Rendering and Alberta biosphere.	Five years ago, the Board, through the MD, asked CNPC to look at solutions. Looked at composting etc. Answer interrupted.
Session 1 Question 14	How will you get dead animals to the landfill?	Through the same process as used now - disposal bins etc. The MD has stated there is still a need for the bin program and disposal. If everybody was in the bin program, then there would not be a problem.
Session 1 Question 15	Comment: somebody has to pay for this process (dead animals removal from ranches)	
Session 1 Question 16	BSE material - goes to the research centre. You are not approved for BSE.	Not for now, but with CFIA approval, CNPC will be able to receive BSE biomass
Session 1 Question 17	Why do you include Canmore in your application for EPEA renewal.	Because we looked at a contract with them, and may again.
Session 1 Question 18	We have local issues and local solutions. I don't understand the vision of the landfill going forward to contract out to bring in dead carcasses.	We aren't contracting out for dead animals. The wildlife carcasses are from the local area + Volker Stevin input.
Session 1 Question 19	The standard for incinerators are quite high. A local incinerator in Frank has very dirty emissions. Is anyone looking at that?	That's a wood burning furnace system. There's also one at Hillcrest. There have been complaints to the MD about this. Those systems are not monitored or regulated.
Session 1 Question 20	What happens if there are air quality issues.	Eco Waste would work with CNPC to improve performance if there is a problem. AEP will hold CNPC responsible for the correct operation of the facility.
Session 1 Question 21	Comment: not many people are particularly informed about the project.	
Session 1 Question 22	This was billed as an open house, which is why I came 20 minutes late. The brochure says 'currently the landfill receives over 2,000 tons of material per year that requires incineration. Safety concerns are raised. Where's the data?	This question wasn't answered as a number of questions immediately followed.
Session 1 Question 23	This seems to be serving as a niche desire rather than a need.	This question wasn't answered as a number of questions immediately followed.
Session 1 Question 24	Where is the due diligence to show that polyethylene will only be burned, not adding PCBs or such.	The process is intended to incinerate only polyethylene plastic.
Session 1 Question 25	There's been no major incineration in the US, they have been shut down.	
Session 1 Question 26	Landfills are taking silage bags and recycling their plastic.	They are taking the plastic and recycling it provided it meets their criteria, that it is clean.
Session 1 Question 27	The point is, what are the initiatives to reduce waste? Incineration should be the last alternative for waste. Why haven't ranchers been informed on the clean silage recycling process?	The Board has communicated initiatives for recycling previously, continues to do so.
Session 1 Question 28	Should we voicing our displeasure with our councilors about the incinerator since they directed you to move ahead with the incinerator?	In general discussion during the presentation, the process was reviewed for input to local councilors and Board decision process.
Session 1 Question 29	Still want to go back to the idea of why no recycling (silage bags).	Question not answered as another question followed immediately.
Session 1 Question 30	Please explain the process of Board decision to move forward with the decision on the incinerator by the Board.	The Board members will report back to their councilors. The decision to move forward remains with the landfill Board.
Session 1 Question 31	Do conflicted CNPC leave the vote?	The landfill Board makes the decision. CNPC members, once sitting on the Board, are sitting on the landfill Board, they are not councilors.
Session 1 Question 32	[Counsellor in audience]: Council will capture and make a decision and move forward on the issue.	[Post-meeting comment]; CNPC acknowledges that council may choose to support or not support the project, however the sanction decision is made by the CNPC Board.
Session 1 Question 33	Concern about people not knowing about the process	That's part of the reason why we are having open houses.
Session 1 Question 34	Clarification questions around composition of CNPC Board - member constituents etc.	Responded to in general discussion.
Session 1 Question 35	Our son's residence looks directly out at the landfill. Thinking about viewscape etc. What does the installation look like?	The furnace is contained within a building, with stack up to 40 feet above ground level. The building will be located at the landfill, besides the new recycle building in the landfill.
Session 2 Question 1	Clarification question re. recycling facility and how it will operate	Clarification provided about waste separation and what materials will be dealt with in the building.
Session 2 Question 2	How do you achieve combustion (in the primary chamber) without air?	It's sub-stoichiometric, it's not pyrolysis - it's a starved air environment, however there is some air that seeps in.
Session 2 Question 3	It's a backdraft flashover process?	It's a natural draft induced pressure in the 2nd chamber, with an oxidation process in the 1st chamber. - So essentially, yes.
Session 2 Question 4	Clarification question regarding %ages shown on Wind Rose Figure - what do they mean?	Shows the wind is coming from a certain direction 'x%' of the time, if the wind rose crosses one of the 'x'%age thresholds.
Session 2 Question 5	Ref. Air dispersion model - what does the average mean? (for example, 24 hour average)	It's a statistical threshold, focused on certain health affects - acute or chronic exposure. The averaging periods help inform as to acute or chronic exposure scenarios
Session 2 Question 6	Where will the volume of wood come from to support the operation?	We separate clean and dirty wood - pallets, trees, branches etc. It then gets grinded. Clean wood will be kept separate from dirty (e.g. painted etc.). We'll grind and use clean wood for the incinerator, grind and use painted wood as a cover at night for open landfill to reduce odour etc.
Session 2 Question 7	How many toxins will be emitted from plastic incinerator etc.	The air model describes the emissions regime for the incinerator, and the releases involved.

Session 2 Question 8	What will be the long term effects of these emissions on the surrounding areas? How long will it take before the surrounding areas are contaminated?	The longer term averaging periods used in air modelling help inform the potential for this problem - potential impacts to plants, animals etc. Also - could similarly ask how long you run a diesel tractor before it contaminates. If you are exceeding limits, then that may become a concern. Also, that's part of GoA initiative under e.g. South Saskatchewan Regional Plan to help manage cumulative impacts to reduce/avoid such problems from occurring. But you are looking at cases like Lethbridge where they are starting to look at things like that.
Session 2 Question 9	What's the government inspection regime for this operation?	We'll expect to do constant monitoring of the facility, any EPEA Approval will dictate the monitoring requirements for the facility. AEP will have to answer how often they will visit the facility.
Session 2 Question 10	Will there be public disclosure/annual reporting?	That will be part of the annual report to AEP, which will be a public document, which will be available online. Presently the landfill reports on groundwater, leachate etc.
Session 2 Question 11	Statement - you've answered the questions on prion, BSE, etc.- I was concerned about stack emissions etc.	
Session 2 Question 12	What's the economic benefit of having this?	Reduces landfill volumes, and inevitably carcasses present handling complications in the pit. There is also cost of management as the MDs are subsidizing the carcass removal of beef cattle in the region - hence the landfill was directed to look at other options. Rendering companies are charging 10c/kg to handle the dead animals. Procedure with CFIA requires cleaning, tagging etc. to minimize re-contamination risk. There's no revenue in it for CNPC, but it will be close to cost-neutral.
Session 2 Question 13	We know where the wind comes from, but where will the contaminants go?	We are talking about the plume that is dispersed. The max concentrations all occur within the landfill itself. Because it's dispersion, the further away from source, the less the concentration in the air.
Session 2 Question 14	Wind speed is a factor. On what day did you run the model?	On five full years of wind data. The stronger the wind, it improves the dispersion. The calmer the day, the more it would aggregate locally.
Session 2 Question 15	What are you taking into consideration/putting into place to have consultations with direct neighbours of the landfill	Once we submit the amendment - which is an amendment to operate, not a licence to build; AEP will dictate the consultation process. AEP will review the application and determine what consultation is required, and in what form.
Session 2 Question 16	I understand your perspective, however I'd like to see it go a little further; being a landfill neighbor, in view of the landfill, my concerns are very deep within the land that we own. What I'd like to suggest, is that the landfill takes steps to ensure information is being provided/sent out. It's a suggestion to ensure those needs are met and information being given.	Point taken; it has been in the papers, on the radio, and on our website. CNPC don't think we are at the stage yet, as we are progressing to learn what AEP will dictate to us. What we tried to do here, is bring the people to answer your questions. We haven't been trying to hide it. We are just trying to get the best format to inform the public. Suggest you reach out to AEP if you have concerns - it is your right as a landowner or somebody interested in the project to reach out to them.
Session 2 Question 17	Confirmation that presentation will be posted on the website.	Yes, by the end of week.
Session 2 Question 18	I work in forestry, we have 3rd party certification to show we are meeting environmental standards. Is that something the landfill could obtain?	We don't have that as a plaque on the wall as such, but we get audited by 2-3 firms that review our facility and provide reports. Also much enviro monitoring is 3rd party.
Session 2 Question 19	What %age of your waste will be targeted for your incinerator?	In an average year, approximately 5%
Session 2 Question 20	Who will permit/approve your process?	AEP, similar to the current Approval
Session 2 Question 21	If you wanted to change the combustion list, you'd have to amend the approval?	Yes.
Session 2 Question 22	Any potential to modify that combustion list?	Anything's possible, however for now the issue is carcasses, which are in ever-increasing quantities. Because it's a batch plant, it doesn't need to run if volumes are low. Approval will be for a ten-year term; would still need to apply to amend if we renew the application. Carcasses are a growing concern and difficult to manage - e.g. pigs keep on popping up to the landfill surface.
Session 2 Question 23	Confirmed it's not continuous burn?	Correct - 10-12 hour burn - let it cool down, clean it out, then re-start again.
Session 2 Question 24	How many days of the year will this be operating?	Based on numbers, particularly if ranchers are supportive, probably operate at about 3 days/week. Calving season will be higher.
Session 2 Question 25	Are we looking at removing the bear bins that are provided for ranchers?	No. We would be involved in the positioning and delivery of the bins, so it is self-contained, no third party handling.
Session 2 Question 26	When an animal dies, we call the phone number, and they come and pick it up. Will CNPC take over that contract?	That's up to the MD and how they want to structure the process. That's discussion we need to have with them down the road.
Session 2 Question 27	Comment: very informative presentation.	
Feedback forms	Comment:	CNPC Note
	No feedback forms were received.	

Date: September 14, 2016
 Venue: Lundbreck Citizens Council hall
 Hours: 3PM - approx. 7PM
 Attendees counted: 20
 18 Names recorded on the sign-in sheet.

Issues captured from general conversation:	Issue/Comment	CNPC Approach
Issue 1	Discussion regarding operating requirements and potential for CNPC to put incorrect material into the incinerator - discussion appeared to revolve around trust issues.	

Questions and responses following presentation by CNPC	Question	CNPC Response:
Session 1 Question 1	Why the significant increases in recycling tonnage in recent years?	Increased tonnage of metals primarily, and this year it will be another significant jump.
Session 1 Question 2	What was the emissions temperature in the combustion chamber?	1000 degrees in the secondary chamber, and 850 in the primary.
Session 1 Question 3	How many animals will be accepted at the landfill?	The landfill primary chambers will handle 10,000kg of material in total in one batch.
Session 1 Question 4	The CNPC incinerator will be way, way, way bigger than the example you are showing?	It will be larger, but not massively so - it will be two primary chambers feeding into one secondary chamber. Maybe twice the size of the one we are showing you on the slide.
Session 1 Question 5	What is the power source?	Probably natural gas for heating, and electricity for the blower.
Session 1 Question 6	Question - the type of plastic - is it just meltables? Is it recyclable?	It is polyethylene and can be recyclable, however recycling requires a certain quality of material to be accepted for recycling.
Session 1 Question 7	Comment: I spoke to a gentleman at Merlin plastics. They accept agricultural plastic with 5% dirt (and pay you for it). They do accept the dirty stuff, but they won't pay you for that, as they have to clean it.	
Session 1 Question 8	No odour?	Correct
Session 1 Question 9	Query around wind direction	Responded to by Northshore as part of slide presentation
Session 1 Question 10	The Figure (Project Area Map) should show all the landowners	The model is relevant to the public access area; some of the local residents are shown for context.
Session 1 Question 11	Concern about contaminants on Oldman River lake	Northshore to respond as part of slide presentation
Session 1 Question 12	Who does that air quality test for Eco-Waste?	Eco-Waste is not an air testing company. Eco-Waste uses accredited 3rd party monitors to test emissions on their technology. It's common to test with continuous monitors once installed.
Session 1 Question 13	Do you have incinerators in Alberta? [Question directed to Eco-Waste]	No. Most incinerators in Alberta to date are single stage units.
Session 1 Question 14	You will test every conceivable product you will burn?	In accordance with Approval requirements
Session 1 Question 15	Do you do any testing to show what is being burned?	Continuous monitoring will be used to monitor combustion to ensure quality
Session 1 Question 16	Is that done by a 3rd party?	Daily basis for monitoring - plus 3rd party for a source test is frequently required for operations.
Session 1 Question 17	It's quite ridiculous to test after the fact.	That's what the air emissions model is for; to predict in advance what the emissions will be; and then Government of Alberta says 'that's great, then prove it'.
Session 1 Question 18	The existing landfill as it stands now. Are the gasses now being assessed as it stands today?	The original cell is the only one that has been capped. Wells installed are monitored regularly for gas. There's no gas being produced in the open, as you need a closed area to produce methane - it's an anaerobic process.
Session 1 Question 19	Are you aware of any facility being out of compliance in Alberta? And if so, how does the Government of Alberta respond	[Northshore] Yes. Facilities are required to report on non-compliances, and the Government will follow-up and require operators to stop and correct any emissions.
Session 1 Question 20	Does the government give warning before they show up?	It depends on the type of audit that the government is conducting - sometimes will give notice as lots of info required; sometimes snap audit.
Session 1 Question 21	How do these emission figures compare the rules in another province? Is there any difference?	Alberta has some requirements that we relied upon, however also we looked at other jurisdictional requirements and how we compared to that also, if Alberta didn't have a limit.
Session 1 Question 22	What are PAHs?	Poly-Aromatic Hydrocarbons - a product of combustion.
Session 1 Question 23	Not familiar with the units on dioxins and furans?	It's pico-gram - or a billionth of a gram per cubic metre; a very small number.
Session 1 Question 24	Are these parameters from the current government, or the PC government?	Current government
Session 1 Question 25	Is the limit for Alberta, or for Ontario?	Most of the limits are Alberta, but if Alberta doesn't have the limit, we used other jurisdictions, e.g. Canada wide standards for PM2.5
Session 1 Question 26	Do you prove the model with air quality tests, or soil tests etc.?	The first thing to do is the model, which predicts the emissions. Secondly comes the need to demonstrate air quality once operating - including ambient air quality monitoring.
Session 1 Question 27	Do you (Northshore) monitor south of Calgary.	No - we are a modelling company. Independent laboratories conduct monitoring, which provides some further separation between the client and the monitoring company.
Session 1 Question 28	I don't think you can model wind here - it's very different to Calgary. To me, it would be pertinent to expand those tests for this area.	
Session 1 Question 29	Question about Shell - missed the topic.	We used wind data for the Cowley area, the wind model is representative of the area.
Session 1 Question 30	Is anybody going to consider testing water in the reservoir? Those contaminants may end up in the reservoir.	
Session 1 Question 31	From the ratepayers point of view, what is the size, what is it going to cost?	Northshore - can't speak to that - however with wind comes dispersion.
Session 1 Question 32	What kind of residue will be left?	A 10-ton batch plant, cost depends on what we need for the design. The cost will be absorbed by the landfill. Unit cost in the order of a million dollars, including building for the incinerators.
Session 1 Question 33	How will it be contained and go to landfill?	It will go to landfill - the ash has been tested for prion/absence. It's non-toxic, non-leaching inert material as a result of the process.
Session 1 Question 34	Good presentation, really enjoyed it. Where is Waterton Biosphere on this project?	In a fully-enclosed self-contained dumpster, kept within the building. If the wind is blowing, we will keep the dumpster inside until the wind drops down.
Session 1 Question 35	Can Lethbridge rendering take this material?	CNPC has had some discussions with them, however they are waiting to see the results of the regulatory process.
Session 1 Question 36	Lethbridge rendering takes the bear bins currently?	They can - however they are not taking a lot of stuff that comes into the landfill. In terms of roadkill, CNPC doesn't think they'll take that.
Session 1 Question 37	[Didn't quite capture question] about how CNPC started looking for this technology	Yes
Session 1 Question 38	Comment: The bear bins are provided by the MD, at the cost of the MD.	It started a few years ago primarily with BSE issue, CNPC looked at composting etc.
Session 1 Question 39	CFIA process - if you don't get CFIA approval, you won't be able to incinerate BSE.	
Session 1 Question 40	You showed pigs in the photo, what else are you modelling to burn?	[Counsellor or Board member response] If we don't get CFIA approval, we won't move forward. Eco Waste - referenced previous reporting by CFIA and Ontario MOE that describes emissions etc. resulting from their incineration technology.
Session 1 Question 41	None of the waste mix will create dioxins?	Input material (with non-chlorinated plastic) results in low emissions - only dioxins from carcasses, from low chlorine levels in the animal. The Eco Waste process creates very difficult conditions to create dioxins.
Session 1 Question 42	Could chlorine from the body react with the plastics?	No chlorine in the plastic; the chlorine in the bodies won't react with the plastics. Otherwise would need scrubber to resolve this. Local crematoriums, diesel trucks etc. are highly likely to be a significant sources of particulate matter.
Session 1 Question 43	Comment - some of the problem is the social stigma of incinerators.	
Session 1 Question 44	What about PCBs	Model shows zero emissions
Session 1 Question 45	Operating cost - will it run on natural gas	[Side discussion with CNPC after the meeting]
Session 1 Question 46	Request for a list of Eco Waste operating facilities	Eco Waste promised to provide it.
Session 1 Question 47	You don't do waste-to-energy?	[Eco Waste] No, however just acquired a new company that may provide that service.
Session 2 Question 01	We haven't tried burning silage bags in the emissions model?	No, however have burned polyethylene which comprises silage bags
Session 2 Question 02	Are there toxics in that plastic?	Components of PE are carbon, hydrogen.
Session 2 Question 03	Silage bags are not recyclable because they are not clean. If you know they are not clean, how do you guarantee their cleanliness?	Used silage bags are typically have plastic and grain. May also include dirt, manure. The inspection process will be required to ensure they are not including other contaminants.
Session 2 Question 04	Will you wash the silage bags?	No
Session 2 Question 05	You don't get the silage bags baled?	No - comes in as a big ball from the feedlot, will need to be cut up and inspected prior to burning
Session 2 Question 06	Are silage bags recyclable?	They are - provided they meet cleanliness requirements. Not sure what other operators do with the non-clean waste
Session 2 Question 07	Comment - other operator will take all silage bags, but if unclear, they will still take it, but not pay for it.	

Session 2 Question 08	Comment - you could refuse the load - and require them to clean it prior to acceptance	Yes - that's the CNPC Board's option if they wish to pursue it. However, presently if it turns up un-announced I have to deal with it.
Session 2 Question 09	Yesterday - you told me - why should I have to look after your plastic. Why aren't you doing what's best environmentally?	[didn't capture the response to this question]
Session 2 Question 10	Who pays for the incinerator?	The landfill.
Session 2 Question 11	Will it add to tipping fees?	No; the revenue from the incinerator will be close to cost-neutral.
Session 2 Question 12	Are we looking for grants for the incinerator	Yes - from provincial and federal agencies - however the capital cost will be born by the CNPC.
Session 2 Question 13	You have looked at other options, I understand that a facility in Lethbridge will take it. Have you looked at that?	There is a facility in Lethbridge that handles SRM, however they don't do the rest.
Session 2 Question 14	When BSE hit, there was inadequate disposal. I feel one of the things that hasn't been presented to the non-ranching community is that ranchers did find solutions, established with the Waterton Biosphere the bear bin program. Within our area, there's bear bins, tagging etc. Further to that, if there is other material that we don't want to deliver, we can call Southern Alberta Processing, they pick it up for free. They do a sustainable program with Southern Alberta Rendering. I'm unclear why we have a program that's working - I'm unclear as to the need for change.	The project began 5 or 6 years ago; a needs assessment was requested by the Board, we provided it, including wildlife carcasses etc. We looked at composting, we looked at mass burial, with incineration being the preferred technology.
Session 2 Question 15	How will you receive the bovine carcasses	Via the same type of bins presently used.
Session 2 Question 16	There's not a demonstrated need for this program compare to the Biosphere program	[audience member]CNPC can process the animals for half the cost
Session 2 Question 17	Want to understand the capital/economic case for this program	The Biosphere program is dependent upon grants; however the CNPC can operate for half the cost.
Session 2 Question 18	Clarification question around EPEA Approval number	Confirmed the amendment number sequence process for the CNPC landfill
Session 2 Question 19	The process has been confusing - from the EPEA renewal advertisement, it's difficult to understand what we are here for. I feel like we are being 'told' what's happening.	
Session 2 Question 20	Please elaborate on carcasses coming from 'various areas'	Carcasses coming from Volker Stevin working area to the landfill
Session 2 Question 21	Why are we applying for a permit, if the decision hasn't been made to go ahead with the incinerator?	The application will inform us if we move ahead, however sanction decision to construct the incinerator will follow.
Session 2 Question 22	Is there opportunity for further involvement with Alberta Environment?	Yes - general discussion on the application renewal process.
Session 2 Question 23	Will the MD send out letters?	CNPC - we've heard that a few times. We have no issue with doing that; if that's something that people want, that's fine.
Session 2 Question 24	Suggestion on additional utility department at MD.	
Session 2 Question 25	I have a concern at the long-term vision of where the landfill is going.	At the site we have now, we have about 19 years, then the next quarter to the south has about 75 years.
Session 2 Question 26	Comment that the Board needs to be involved in the process to help inform on the process.	CNPC - can't speak to that, my mandate is driven by the Board.
Session 2 Question 27	Is this step 1 of a larger incinerator to be installed in future?	No - the landfill doesn't have plans for anything larger.
Session 2 Question 28	Who is the CNPC's recycle partner in Airdrie, and can your recycle to waste ratio be better?	e-cycle in Airdrie. They take electronic waste.
Session 2 Question 29	You talked about the ash the incinerators create - query re. toxins in the ash.	Eco Waste has ash analysis, happy to share.
Session 2 Question 30	If we take 10 tons of garbage, how much weight would we end up with. End up with 700kgs, with concentration of toxins building up in landfill.	Don't accept that we are concentrating toxins. Look at the data; not sure of the basis on which you are saying. To be non-hazardous, there needs to be <5% carbon in the ash. Incineration leaves you with <5% carbon vs significant carbon, plus water. Speaking in generalities isn't helpful - we need to look at the data. Understand your concern about the word incinerator - it concerns people, our perspective is to bring real information to the conversation.
Session 2 Question 31	SRM ash - rendering plant has CFIA approval, and regulations on how to deal with that ash; depending on regulations determines, and whether the prions are destroyed. Does the Eco Waste incinerator destroy the prions?	Eco Waste incinerator waste is non-toxic; will require dialogue with CFIA to manage ash. CNPC has had preliminary discussion with vet at CFIA, they are interested in it, however there is a process we have to go through with it as well. A condition of approval may be ash test requirements to demonstrate output quality.
Session 2 Question 32	How long does a batch take?	Depending upon input moisture, 8-12 hours for burn; plus cool down period before the ash can be removed. So full 24 hour cycle, but the burn is only for about half of it.
Session 2 Question 33	Proposing 2 x 5000 kg chambers?	Yes - that's what is being contemplated at present.
Session 2 Question 34	Secondary chamber is heated by natural gas?	Yes - it gets up to temp, however the input gas tends to make it operate self-sufficiently.
Session 2 Question 35	Additional infrastructure needed to build and operate the incinerator	Building to store animals, incinerator, with sump for leachate from carcasses.
Session 2 Question 36	There is a perception there is emissions in the air. Has anyone looked at the effect on property values?	Property values - have not looked at.
Session 2 Question 37	People here are getting info on the emissions, but the average guy on the street is not.	Agreed.
Session 2 Question 38	The facility owned by the Hunter family - how close is it to the nearest house?	The subdivision is <1km from the incinerator
Session 2 Question 39	Is the Hunter family facility a crematorium? Does it burn agricultural plastic?	They may, unsure. They have not been out of compliance.
Session 2 Question 40	What is involved in de-commissioning?	Taking it apart, and moving it; we haven't decommissioned it yet, I would look to the local bodies on what the requirements are.
Session 2 Question 41	Who approves the permit for the incinerator?	AEP, who will give permit to operate the incinerator; which will also include what they are permitted to incinerate.
Session 2 Question 42	Concern is - if you have a permit to burn those items, but what if they decide to put something in, how is it regulated.	That's a moral obligation on our part - CNPC employees are on the land.
Session 2 Question 43	In landfill notes, in 2013, CNPC wanted an incinerator to burn MSW, how are we not to expect this will be the case?	CNPC did investigate this - however after discussion with AEP, CNPC chose to not proceed with it.
Session 2 Question 44	What's to stop CNPC from adding other materials in future?	Would require an amendment process.
Session 2 Question 45	Comment: Hopefully a concern to be taken back to the Board - we appreciate the information and opportunity. We don't feel heard - we don't feel we've had an opportunity for dialogue with the Board. As a community we need to be proactive and establish better communication. Seeking that community can provide input to the Board on the direction and strategy of the landfill.	[Emile] will take back to the Board - if they want to establish volunteers to provide feedback. Saying that, we've had one delegation come to the Board in 9 years.
Session 2 Question 46	Representing the village of Cowley, and also on the landfill committee; we have a lot of concerns forwarded to me. You commented tonight - 'zero' smell?	Yes - odourless, smokeless
Session 2 Question 47	On a windless day, the highest concentration will settle in the landfill	Yes - the highest concentrations will be in the landfill
Session 2 Question 48	What about leachate with rain water?	There's two landfills - Industrial class 2, and MSW. Both have geomembrane liners, groundwater control systems, leachate system above, leachate collected in pond. CNPC pumps the leachate to the MSW leachate pond; from the industrial landfill, goes by vacuum truck to the landfill leachate pond.
Session 2 Question 49	What about soil monitoring?	It may become part of the Approval - CNPC may be required to monitor soils.
Feedback forms	Comment:	CNPC Note
#1	[Respondent provided contact details, which remain on the feedback form, and attended the Pinch Creek and Lundbreck open houses] After hearing the presentation for the 2nd time, and further Ranch discussions, at this point of time we cannot support the proposed biomass incinerator. The reason being, there has not been adequate consultation with the community and adjacent land owners on the long term vision of the landfill. Development of more infrastructure, along with the annexation of lands for future growth will impact the surrounding land values. We feel it is not a fair process. Please record as opposed. Thankyou.	

#1	<p>[Respondent provided contact details, which remain on the feedback form, which was collected after the Lundbreck Open House]</p> <p>A tremendous amount of information well presented. Thankyou. I feel like I was <u>told</u> lots. Difficult to hear and understand all of the data over this short period of time. Questions during presentation would have helped - not after. Incineration, in my opinion, is the very least desirable option to deal with waste.</p> <p>I am unclear about silage bags' ability to be recycled? If they are deemed "unclean" to recycle how can there be a "clean" guarantee to burn? SRM from bovine and CFIA regulatory processes will not allow ranchers to deliver deads to landfill as I currently understand. Our current systems works extremely well - why change? Our deads provide a sustainable supply to Southern AB processing who in turn use the entire animal. I can not support the construction of any further infrastructure at our local/regional landfill that supports out of area waste disposal. Air quality - I am an adjacent landowner remains a concern - particularly potential odours. I would welcome future opportunities for true and transparent consultation - hearing from the community and the Board both to further plan future CNPC developments. Please record my comments as opposed to a biomass incinerator application being submitted to EPEA.</p>	
----	---	--