

Brooks Road PLC Meeting Minutes

November 03, 2022

Project name	Brooks Road Landfill	From	Blair Shoniker
Subject	2022 Brooks Road PLC #2	Tel	+1 905 429-5040
Date/Time	June 1, 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, Chair John Metcalfe (JM) – PLC Member, Councillor Diane Manto (DM) – Public (departed at 7:35) Laurie Woolner (LW) – Public Rudi Horvat (RH) – Public	Copy to:	All Attendees

Minutes	Action
Approvals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BS reviewed Site approvals. – BRE has considered the ability to accommodate additional waste capacity at the Site, BRE will embark on an Environmental Screening Process (ESP) for an additional 100,000 cubic metres (representing an additional estimated one year of life expectancy). DM inquired as to where the waste was going. RL noted the options for where waste is going are currently being developed. BS noted options evaluation for horizontal and vertical would be considered. BS noted that the same ESP will be followed as was completed for the Fill Rate Amendment. – LW inquired if that 100,000 m³ was in addition to the previous presented slide; BS confirmed that it is on top of the existing approved capacity. BS noted that the undertaking the ESP does not allow for a proponent to take a piecemeal approach (this approach can't be taken again). JM requested confirmation that BRE could not request an additional 100,000 m³ capacity following the next planned one – BS confirmed that BRE would not be permitted to subsequently apply for additional capacity through the Environmental Screening Process. – BS noted that the process will include public consultation and notification on the Screening process would be sent out to the mailing list as well as broader publications (i.e. newspaper, direct mailings) to the community in advance of a future public meeting.

Brooks Road PLC Meeting 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
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

Minutes	Action
	<p>detailed with respect to the Environmental Screening. BS noted that the consultation in the Screening is intended to review the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 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. - 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.

Brooks Road PLC Meeting Minutes

March 23, 2023

Project name	Brooks Road Landfill	From	Blair Shoniker
Subject	2023 Brooks Road PLC #1	Tel	+1 905 429-5040
Date/Time	March 22, 2023/ 7:00pm-8:00pm	Project no.	018235
Attendees	Katrina McCullough (KM) – GHD Blair Shoniker (BS) – GHD Ryan Loveday (RL) – GHD Tim Danyliw (TD) – BRE Michael Durst (MD) – MECP Hamilton District Dave Bruce (DB) - PLC Member, Chair Dave Glenney (DG) – PLC Member John Metcalfe (JM) – PLC Member Diane Manto (DM) – Public Laurie Woolner (LW) – Public Rod Leclair (RL) – OPP Liaison	Copy to:	All Attendees

Minutes	Action
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. Open House #1 was held in June 2022, it is anticipated that Open House #2 will be June 2023. BS noted that the Environmental Screening studies for each technical discipline continue to be developed. – Beyond Open House #2, everything is documented in the Environmental Screening Report, which is available for MECP and Public Review. The MECP will then need to make a decision on if the Screening moves forward. – DM inquired about the definition of net effects and that it notes negative effects. BS clarified that it can be net-negative effects or net-positive effects and they are the effects that are remaining after mitigation measures are applied. BS noted the previous EA utilized the same methodology, which is an accepted approach by the MECP. – DM noted that the public only has 60 days to review. BS noted that comments are received and considered at any time.



Brooks Road PLC Meeting Minutes

June 07, 2023

Project name	Brooks Road Landfill	From	Katrina McCullough
Subject	2023 Brooks Road PLC #2	Tel	+1 416-866-2365
Date/Time	June 7, 2023/ 7:00pm-8:00pm	Project no.	018235
Attendees	Katrina McCullough (KM) – GHD Ryan Loveday (RL) – GHD Tim Danyliw (TD) – BRE Michael Durst (MD) – MECP Hamilton District Charlene Anderson (CA) – MECP Hamilton District Dave Bruce (DB) - PLC Member, Chair Dave Glenney (DG) – PLC Member Diane Manto (DM) – Public Kim Seabon (KS) – PLC Member Rod Leclair (RL) – OPP Liaison	Copy to:	All Attendees

Minutes	Action
Approvals	– KM reviewed site approvals. Noted that we are currently looking at Summer 2023 for Open House 2 and the PLC will be updated once a date is set. No date is currently set.

Brooks Road PLC Meeting Minutes

November 21, 2023

Project name	Brooks Road Landfill	From	Katrina McCullough
Subject	2023 Brooks Road PLC #3	Tel	+1 416-866-2365
Date/Time	November 1, 2023/ 7:00pm-8:00pm	Project no.	018235
Attendees	Katrina McCullough (KM) – GHD Ryan Loveday (RL) – GHD Axita Patel (AP) – GHD Tim Danyliw (TD) – BRE Jeremy Gamble (JG) – MECP Hamilton District Charlene Anderson (CA) – MECP Hamilton District Dave Bruce (DB) - PLC Member, Chair Kim Seabon (KS) – PLC Member Richard Clark (RC) - Member of the Public Laurie Woolnor (LW) – PLC Member Tara Lindemann – Haldimand Press	Copy to:	All Attendees

Minutes	Action
Approvals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AP reviewed the current EA approval process, noting the change in Ontario regulation. AP noted we recently held Open House 2 and are currently in the public commenting phase. The Draft Environmental Screening Report will be completed in draft by the end of November. The final report will be submitted and available for 60 days and then GHD will issue a Notice of Completion. – DB was invited to a Council meeting in June 2014 (June 17, 2014) when BRE wanted to incorporate the north rail line into the zoning of the dump site and DB has a notice of Public Meeting for Zoning and Official Plan amendment. DB noted that the councillors were well informed about everything

going on. DB inquired as to what benefit there was to the public in incorporating the north rail line into the dump site.

- DB noted the details of the application for public meeting; “the purpose of this application is to amend the Designation of the official plan and zoning of the town of Haldimand zoning by-law 1H86 of the subject property to facilitate the extension of the northern rail line to act as an additional buffer zone and temporary storage of clean clay and relocation of groundwater monitoring wells. It has been assured by the proponent that there will be no landfilling on added lands and no change to the existing waste footprint of the land site will take place”. DB says that BRE says something, and you can’t believe them, they will say what they want and get what they want. KM noted she would put that into the meeting and asked if he could share the document. DB agreed to let KM take a photo of the document. MECP inquired about the date of the document and DB replied it was June 17, 2014. DB said he wished John Metcalfe was here to hear it and DB will make sure he gets a copy of it.
- DB asked if the approval for the expansion goes through, is it correct that you have to dig down to the bottom of the current cell where a liner and another liner would be fused? RL said that the northern expansion cell adjacent to the current landfill doesn’t go as deep. The base is projected to be about 4-5 m higher than the existing low point in the current cell.
- DB asked how the leachate would be handled in the new cell. RL responded that there would be a new pipe on the side slope that would pump into the same leachate treatment system.
- DB noted that Stoney Creek is expanding horizontally, and they have nothing but problems, they have dug down to the bottom level which is causing odour issues. He thinks that if the same will happen here and they dig down the leachate, you can expect the same thing with odour problems. KM disclosed that GFL is a client and can speak to what has been released from GFL. KM explained that odour issues were caused by leachate and not cell construction. KM noted there was cell construction prior to the leachate odour issue and that was causing odours, but the odour issues since the summer have been caused by leachate. KM noted that the leachate is treated at BRE in a closed system and that GFL treats leachate in an open pond. DB asked CA if she is involved. CA noted she has previously responded to after-hours complaints and that others are on that file. CA noted that yes there are odour issues, and it is being dealt with by the area officer. There have been many meetings with GFL, MECP, and GHD. CA confirms that both the landfills are not designed the same way.

- DB inquired if odour complaints have been since the start or recent; CA said she isn't aware. DB asked is an open pond to manage leachate is permitted, CA responded yes.
- KS asked if you can guarantee there won't be odors. TD responded that the design is intended to minimize odour and that the expansion drainage layer will not be hydraulically connected to the existing landfill drainage layer. This manner of construction will drastically reduce the need for waste excavation and thus avoid odours as best as possible.
- KM noted that GFL had construction into an existing cell, and they anticipated odour (with advanced notification) – there were some odour complaints and then the leachate issue occurred later. LW inquired if GFL offered air conditioners like Glanbrook did so that owners could keep windows shut. KM noted that she is not aware.
- RC noted that multiple expansions have occurred and inquiring if there are plans for more. He noted that it's a dog and pony show and that they never got the truth. He asked what the reality of this in the long term is and what is to say that we are not going to purchase more land. He mentioned that the reason there are no complaints is because the people have given up and it's a horrendous situation. RL noted it is a business and supply/demand decision. RC asked where those people are who makes these decisions. RC noted that he saw a dental hygienist and she apologized for odour and he noted it was the dump. The hygienist didn't know that there is a landfill nearby. He noted that it would be better if there was truth behind it. He has written many emails and phone calls and hasn't heard back.
- KM noted that there is a business decision once capacity is reached so that it is impossible to say exactly when a business case would continue. RC said that they made statements. RC called them a used car salesman.
- KS asked why was this land chosen to be a landfill? DB noted that it was a garbage dump and nothing was regulated and later the government gave that piece of property its designation. DB noted that the property was purchased by a couple of guys (who borrowed money from Romspen). Over 2-3 years the site went into receivership and Romspen took it over and still owns it. RC noted that a dump was also permitted as a wrecking yard; KS noted that is the case as long as it is open.
- DB inquired about silt fence/chain-link around the Site. TD noted that there is a silt fence and an exclusion fence. DB mentioned that Amy from GHD at the Open House said that in case of heavy rainfall, the water would come off the dump site if it ever got out of the leachate collection ditches it would flow across and the silt fence would stop the debris and any water

Minutes	Action
	<p>that got off the site would be tested. KM noted that she was present during this conversation and that Amy didn't realise that you were talking about the active landfill. She was talking about the outside of the landfill area. RL noted yes, she was talking about the perimeter fence not the landfill site. DB inquired if you also test the water outside the boundaries. RL noted that surface water is tested as part of the quarterly system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- RC inquired about studies to Grand River – RL noted he doesn't have all the details, but that discharge to the roadside ditch and to the south was part of the discharge approval.

DRAFT