

Draft Minutes

November 23, 2022

Project name	Brooks Road Landfill	From	Blair Shoniker
Subject	2022 Brooks Road PLC #3	Tel	+1 905 429-5040
Date/Time	November 2, 2022/7:00pm-8:00pm	Project no.	018235
Attendees	Katrina McCullough (KM) – GHD Blair Shoniker (BS) – GHD Ryan Loveday (RL) – GHD Tim Danyliw (TD) – BRE Chris O’Connor (CO) – MECP Hamilton District Dave Bruce (DB) - PLC Member, Chai Dave Glenney (DG) – PLC Member Kim Seaben – PLC Member Rick Armstrong (RA) – Public Diane Manto (DM) – Public Laurie Woolner (LW) – Public	Copy to:	All Attendees

Minutes	Action
Objectives and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – KM provided an overview of the meeting – KM reviewed COVID-19 protocols – 2023 meetings will be confirmed at the end of this meeting – KM reviewed the ground rules as well as the purpose and objectives of the meeting
Review of Previous Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Pg 2 under approvals - Revise DG to DM and change next sentence to the following for clarity: "RL noted the options for where waste is going are currently being develop" – DB requested to add complaint phone number to minutes, KM agreed. – DB noted a change and clarification were required for the previous minutes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change DG to DM (in bold) with respect to the inquiry to where waste was going "DM inquired as to where..." • Add clarification (in bold) of what was being developed "RL noted that the options of where the waste footprint is as part of the expansion are currently being developed."
Site Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD provided the Site Update. – TD outlined odour mitigation measures at the Site including the mister system and odour control granules. – TD noted that raw leachate is hauled to Beamsville WWTP, treated effluent hauled to Dunnville WWTP – RA inquired about the amount of leachate being trucked to the County treatment facility, to which TD confirmed all the leachate. RA noted that he sits on the Agricultural advisory committee and have been told that treatment plants don't have capacity to expand. Didn't realize this was using capacity. TD informed that the County is being paid for treating the leachate and that BRE is flexible if the County requests leachate not be sent there. – New membranes installed at Leachate Treatment Plant (LTP).

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LW asked about the lifespan of the membranes. TD informed that they last for about 10-14 months. TD explained to move to a more reliable technology due to short lifespan of the membranes. - DB inquired if the pilot is at the site, TD agreed and mentioned a similar size of a softener tank to test results. DB asked to confirm that BRE is not putting anything in the ditch. TD agreed. - DG asked what a membrane is, to which TD explained that it's a 3' x 5' sheet of 36 cassettes for final filtration. TD mentioned having issues with scale which needs to pulse, back pulse, and scaling. - Erosion control issues raised by Rudi at the last meeting have been addressed and BRE continues to monitor it. - One complaint was received in October. Contact information as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate: 416-966-1100 • Site Specific: 888-402-7368 • On-Site office: 416-389-8876 • MECP Spills Action: 800-268-6060 - Leachate level continues to reduce, recently measured end of October 2022 at 192.26 m AMSL. - DM asked to clarify target leachate elevations, specifically the target of 191 m and the timing of achieving leachate elevations. Ryan reviewed the leachate elevations included in Schedule C. RL clarified that 191 m is the ultimate target as noted in ECA Schedules C and D. - TD noted that hauling volumes from September/October are raw leachate hauled from the cell to Beamsville WWTP, June/July/August is amount hauled to Dunnville WWTP. - RA noted that WWTPs are at capacity, but noted that BRE pays the County for WWTP. TD noted BRE remains flexible with Haldimand County and BRE can adjust, if needed for capacity (if County is constrained). TD noted the treated effluent is treated to a high degree and represents minimal treatment requirements for the County. - LTP is currently being reviewed for a more reliable treatment technology (other than membrane) – a current pilot project is in development by the LTP operator. The initial stage is complete and they are making adjustments to the testing procedure. Prior to implementation to discharge to the ditch, an ECA (Sewage) Amendment is required; the pilot data being collected will be used on technical basis to support the ECA (Sewage) Amendment. LW inquired how long the membranes last, TD noted they usually last between 10-14 months per set. DB inquired about the pilot plant; TD noted it is a small plant at the Site, and the LTP operator is running tests for optimization on flow rates, sand material, etc. - TD noted nothing is going to the ditch and that treated effluent goes to the Dunnville WWTP. TD outlined the overall membrane system operation. TD noted that a scale forms on the membranes currently, which induces additional cleaning requirements. - TD reviewed the Leachate Level Reduction strategy including raw and treated effluent haulage off-site, current pilot and future work on an ECA Amendment application for the LTP considering a pilot program, new membranes installed, and increasing interim cover installation to reduce infiltration into the cell.
Landfill Life Expectancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RL reviewed the landfill life expectancy based on survey (December 2021), tonnage received since December 2021 and projected tonnage and waste characteristics (type, compaction, density, consolidation). A survey is scheduled for mid-December 2022. - DG asked whether or not it includes new approval, to which RL informed that it does not.

Minutes	Action
MECP Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – CO noted that there have been regular Site surveys and odour tours. CO noted that he passes the Site on a regular basis (2-3 times per month). The MECP was on-Site July, August, and October 2022. One odour complaint was received and on further review was attributed to biosolids application (on Concession 1). DM noted she has lived here for 47 years and knows the difference between manure and fertilizer. Most of the time the odour is present when there is no wind, it is foggy, and all the smell is held in the gully where she lives. She noted there was no wind whatsoever at the time of the October complaint. DM noted that the BRE representative (Aaron) could only smell wet leaves and that he is acclimatized to the odour. DM noted she wouldn't be calling if it wasn't there. DM noted that they know what they're talking about and that overall, it has gotten better. DM noted that she was able to detect the odour system spray Tuesday afternoon. – DB asked when the MECP was last on-Site. CO noted that the on-Site inspection was on August 30, 2022. DM inquired about early morning drive-bys by the MECP. CO noted that past visits were not that early. DM would like a visit on a foggy morning. – CO noted that 1 odour complaint was filed and was determined not to be from landfill. – DM - Submitted the complaints. Contends the odour complaint is from the landfill; requested a site visit early in the morning (e.g. 5-7am) when there is very still air (e.g. foggy). CO indicated that they will try to accommodate the request. – DM inquired if Brooks Road is under a Notice of Violation (NOV), CO replied "Does not think Brooks is under an NOV" – DB inquired about the previous Notice of Violation; CO noted that was in relation to the leachate level and that he thinks BRE is no longer under an NOV.
Approvals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BS reviewed Site approvals. – BS outlined the Streamlined Environmental Screening Process currently being undertaken for a 100,000 m3 expansion. BS noted this is a similar undertaking that was completed for the previous fill rate amendment. – BS noted that the Environmental Screening studies for each technical discipline continue to be developed. That work includes the development of impact management and mitigation measures. – Currently targeting late 2022 or early 2023 for the next Public Open House (Open House 2). The Public will be notified throughout newspaper ads, email, Canada Post mailouts and email to the PLC. – LW noted that Notice of Commencement was not clear because it did not say that the increase the capacity would be accomplished by expanding the footprint. BS informed that at the time of publishing the Notice it was not confirmed that expansion would be done by expanding the footprint horizontally. BS noted that it will be considered for future notice. – LW noted that the newspaper ad doesn't address expanding the footprint. LW noted that it should note a footprint expansion. BS noted the second sentence in the slide deck summary references the approved footprint. DB noted that the reference going forward should note that it is 100,000 m3 and that the footprint is likely to change. BS noted he doesn't agree with the statement that DB stated, and that timing of the article relative to Open House 1 is the reason why. BS noted the intent here at this PLC was to provide a summary only, rather than get into the details – LW noted that the expansion couldn't be piecemealed, and inquired why this work can. BS noted that the Environmental Screening process can't be piecemealed. BS noted the first process was an Individual EA, and this process is an Environmental Screening. LW noted that people reading the newspaper wouldn't know the details of the expansion. KM noted that Open House 2 will provide more detail with respect to the work. BS noted that this is a summary only, and not detailed with respect to the Environmental Screening. BS noted that the consultation in the Screening is intended to review the proposal. – DM and LW inquired about the Environmental Screening being different than the Environmental Assessment, the previous approvals (vertical expansion, change to annual amount and this latest expansion of the footprint); and why can Brooks expand vertically and horizontally with both expansions. BS noted they are both

Minutes	Action
	<p>instruments under the EA Act, and they both consider consultation and environmental (natural, social, technical) aspects. LW inquired about asking for more volume (horizontal, vertical) in different ways. BS noted that it all has to do with volume – the individual EA was for more than 400,000 m3. BS outlined the steps required for the Individual EA, including Minister Approval of the Terms of Reference as well as the EA. BS noted the previous IEA took seven years. BS outlined the triggers for the Streamlined Environmental Screening including an expansion volume greater than 40,000 m3 but less than 100,000 m3. The current proposal will extend Site life by approximately one year. LW noted she was confusing the vertical expansion with the fill rate amendment relative to the process used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DG inquired if BRE is trying to expand by digging down into existing landfill, RL replied with a yes. – DG wanted to know the slide slopes, to which RL replied 3:1 to 4:1.
Next Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – KM noted that the proposed 2023 dates are consistent with the previous approach, meeting the first Wednesday of each month in March (1), June (7) and November (1) of 2023. DB noted he is good with the dates proposed, there was no opposition to the dates. – BS noted this presentation will be posted November 3, 2022 and the draft minutes will be sent out no later than three weeks following the meeting (in accordance with PLC requirements).
Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – DB inquired about the next open house. BS noted the date for Open House 2 as late 2022 or early 2023. BS noted the date will be confirmed once studies are advanced. – DM inquired about comment submission during the process. BS noted that comments come to BRE/GHD first, similar to previous Vertical (Individual EA) Open House. BS outlined Open House 2 will cover technical studies and impacts (Air, Noise, Hydrogeological, etc.) and there is an additional two-week period following Open House 2 for review and comment. All documents then get compiled into a summary report (Environmental Screening Report [ESR]) and the ESR is then posted for a 60-day review period. DB inquired about MECP review - BS noted that the MECP is part of the Governmental Review. – DB asked if the ECA has been amended for the changes to filtration, TD replied with a No – LW inquired if it would be online. BS noted that previously an online Open House was utilized (in COVID). BS did confirm that documents, including the ESR, will be posted online. KM confirmed that there is no public engagement as part of the ESR review, and that it is in the form of document review and comment only. – DB inquired about the relationship between Romspen and BRE. Tim noted that Romspen owns the Site. DB inquired if they would reap financial benefits from the Site. Tim noted that he assumed that yes, that would be the case. – DB is going to generate a letter to the Minister of the Environment. DB inquired about information from BS at the Open House related to landfill capacity. BS noted the Ontario Waste Management Association (OWMA) website has a countdown clock as to when Ontario runs out of landfill capacity. BS noted Ontario sends three million tonnes of waste to Michigan each year. Michigan landfills it there, BS noted it is much cheaper to go there. Ontario municipalities agreed they wouldn't send their waste to Michigan, the only waste that goes there is Institutional, Commercial and Industrial (IC&I) waste. BS noted that there is an issue if the border closes, provincial landfill capacity would be reduced by 30 percent. BS noted that there is not a lot of replacement capacity available as well (relative to per person waste generation, lack of diversion). BS also referenced more homes, built faster (1.5 million people, 2.5 people per home), which will increase total waste generation tonnages. DM noted that the government needs solutions (burning waste, remove plastic). BS noted that waste diversion takes a lot of effort. DG noted it is cheaper to dig a hole and bury it. BS noted it wouldn't change until there is a pricing floor, which could be in the form of a levy. DG noted that recycling is not viable; BS noted a change in the legislation (Extended Producer Responsibility) is coming into effect in 2023. BS also noted that 30 percent of waste is organics, there are municipalities that don't have collection systems in place to divert from landfill.