

Minutes

05 March 2026

Project name	Brooks Road Landfill	From	Christy Ho
Subject	2026 Brooks Road PLC #1	Tel	+1 647-617-4946
Date/Time	March 4, 2026 / 6:30pm - 7:30pm	Project no.	12662221
Attendees	Katrina McCullough (KM) – GHD Ben Kempel (BK) – GHD Tim Danyliw (TD) – BRE Dave Bruce (DB) – PLC Chair Laurie Woolner (LW) – PLC Member Diane Manto (DM) – General Public member John Metcalfe (JM) – Ward 2 Councillor Catharine Caldwell (CC) – MECP Hamilton Mackenzie Clarke (MC) – MECP Hamilton	Copy to:	All Attendees

Summary of Action Items and Commitments

- Share and upload draft November meeting minutes for review and approval at June meeting (KM)
- Provide an overview of the annual budget at the June PLC to enable PLC members to determine recipient organizations and funding amounts (TD)
- Confirm if Diane can become a PLC member (KM)

Upon convening at 6:30pm

Minutes	Action
Purpose and PLC Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – KM reviewed the purpose and PLC objectives.
Review of Previous Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – LW noted they did not receive the November draft minutes in advance, and they are not posted on the website so PLC members did not have a chance the review. – KM will send out the draft November minutes so PLC members can review and approve the November minutes at the upcoming June meeting.
Site Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD provided a site update. – TD provided a summary of the leachate volumes produced since the last meeting. – DB asked about the source of the leachate as the temperature has been below freezing. TD explained it was mostly coming from the thaw in January, as well as the rain and snow. – LW asked about the expected leachate level by March 27. TD confirmed that the March 27 deadline no longer applies and the leachate level needs to consistently be at 191 mASL.
Site Approvals – EA and ECA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BK provided an overview of the recent approvals for the site expansion and noted that there are no updates or additional approvals. – BK noted the excavation of Stage 9 cell is still on hold until April or May of this year because of the freezing conditions and the construction would take about 4-5 months. – DB asked to confirm that construction is not on the former railway. BK confirmed the limit of waste is not on the railway property, but the final cover will extend into this area.
Community Donations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD recapped the donations BRE made in 2025 Minor Hockey, 4-H, and Cayuga Minor Baseball, Food Bank and United Church Golf Tournament received funds. – LW asked how the donation amounts were determined and noted most of these organizations would benefit from more. TD explained the amounts were partially determined by organizations, for example if they have different sponsorship levels, but he is open to suggestions on how to allocate

Minutes	Action
	<p>funds. LW noted one option is to donate to fewer organizations and rotating recipients annually</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – LW asked if BRE would consider increasing its budget. TD confirmed it is \$20,000, but would ask about a potential increase. – JM agreed and suggested increasing the funding level from \$20,000 to \$30,000. – TD noted that he will follow up on the budget and report back at the June PLC. TD also advised that suggestions on fund allocation are welcome prior to June, as coordination requires lead time. – KM suggested that TD provide an overview of the annual budget at the June PLC, and PLC members bring suggestions for organizations, at which time PLC members can collectively determine recipient organizations and funding amounts. – TD noted that the United Church Golf Tournament is time sensitive. PLC members agreed BRE should donate \$500.
<p>MECP Update</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – JM asked for clarification on the scope of inspections, specifically what they entail (e.g., visual inspections, sampling, or other methods). MC explained that inspections may take several forms, including documentation reviews, verification of compliance with ECA conditions, and visual inspections. In some cases, samples may be collected, such as leachate or excess soils, if required. – JM asked if the trucks have bills of lading. MC confirmed that all trucks have bills of lading. TD noted that the site is not open to the public and currently receives approximately 6–8 trucks per day. All hauling is contracted to a single company. Test results and soil analysis are provided by the hauler, and trucks are not permitted on site without prior approval. – DM asked whether the site accepts plain garbage. TD confirmed that some Industrial, Commercial and Institutional I waste is accepted but the volume is not significant. – LW asked whether the site accepts soil from Haldimand County. TD confirmed that the site does accept soil from Haldimand County, as well as from other locations. The County disposes of its sweepings at the site. TD noted that,

due to trucking costs, material generally originates from nearby areas.

- DB asked whether MECP takes samples from monitoring wells. MC confirmed that MECP reviews monitoring data on a quarterly basis, which is provided by GHD.
- DB asked whether MECP measures or surveys the site. CC confirmed that MECP conducts surveys occasionally as part of audits to ensure the site is in compliance and also reviews documentation provided by BRE. TD added that BRE conducts an annual site survey, which is included in the Annual Report.
- DB asked who reviews the Annual Report. MC confirmed that the review is conducted by either himself or CC and noted that they may also consult their technical support groups as needed.
- DB asked about bonding requirements for the operator. MC confirmed that the operator is required to post a financial assurance (bond) at the beginning of the project. The amount for this site is \$22 million, which is provided as a bond rather than cash. This financial assurance is continuously evaluated and formally reassessed every five years.
- JM asked whether the \$22 million is a one-time payment. TD confirmed that it must be maintained on an ongoing basis, with the operator making perpetual payments and continuing to contribute over time.
- DM asked whether the \$22 million would be used to remediate the site if operations cleared out. BK explained that the amount is based on the calculated contaminating lifespan of the site and is intended to fund proper landfill closure and ongoing monitoring for the entire period during which the site has the potential to impact the surrounding environment.
- DB expressed concern that the monitoring is conducted by the operator rather than MECP. CC confirmed that this approach is standard practice.
- DB raised concerns about the reliance on company-led monitoring, citing Enron as an example of inadequate external oversight and noting that businesses require independent review given the significant financial incentives involved. DB suggested that landfill operations warrant closer oversight. BK responded that testing is conducted by qualified professional geologists and engineers and emphasized that their professional licenses and livelihoods depend on maintaining accuracy and truthfulness.
- DG asked who pays for the consulting services. BK noted that he is paid by GHD, which is paid by Brooks Road. CC noted that the Ministry may take audit samples at any time and added that conducting all monitoring directly would

Minutes	Action
	<p>require hundreds of additional environmental officers. JM commented that private companies should be responsible for funding Ministry oversight rather than taxpayers.</p>
<p>Next Meeting and Other Business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DM asked about the thickness of the liner in the cell. TD explained that the landfill cell uses a composite liner system consisting of 750 mm of compacted clay, cushion layer, textile layer, HDPE liner, and drain stone (500 mm, or 300 mm on side slopes). The total liner thickness is approximately 1.25 m. BK added that the liner design follows the standard requirements under O.Reg 232. – LW asked whether the leachate treatment facility is currently treating leachate. TD confirmed that it is operating and meeting discharge criteria but the membranes in the treatment plant are not fully set up and are not yet back up and running. TD noted that the issue is subject to a power surge and a lawsuit with Hydro One and confirmed that leachate is not being discharged to the ditch. – DM asked about the beautification approaches along the site entrances, including trees and shrubs. TD confirmed that this is on the project docket and noted that, as the area is outside the property line and at the site entrance, any work will need to be approached carefully. – Meeting adjourned at 7:30