

# Minutes

05 June 2024

<b>Project name</b>	Brooks Road Landfill	<b>From</b>	Shelly Reed
<b>Subject</b>	2024 Brooks Road PLC #2	<b>Tel</b>	+1 519 340-3983
<b>Date/Time</b>	June 5, 2024/ 7:00pm-8:00pm	<b>Project no.</b>	018235
<b>Attendees</b>	Shelly Reed (SR) – GHD Ben Kempel (BK) – GHD Tim Danyliw (TD) – BRE Dave Bruce (DB) – PLC Member, Chair Kim Seaben (KS) – PLC Member Laurie Woolner (LW) – PLC Member Diane Manto (DM) – Member of the Public	<b>Absent</b>	Jordan Balch (MECP)
		<b>Copy to</b>	All

Minutes	Action
<b>Objectives and Introductions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Introductions were completed for all in attendance.</li> <li>– SR provided an overview of the meeting agenda.</li> <li>– SR reviewed the ground rules as well as the purpose and objectives of the meeting.</li> </ul>
<b>Review of Previous Minutes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– SR referenced an action item regarding a question the group had at the March 7 meeting. The action item was: KM will confirm if there is a limitation to the number of individual EAs that can be used.</li> <li>– BK said there is no limitation to the number of individual EAs that can be used, but there is a limit to the number of screenings that can be completed. This rule is in place so people don't avoid the larger formal EA process.</li> <li>– LW asked if this project was piece-meal and BK clarified that the intention of the legislation is to avoid projects piece-mealing small expansions to avoid a full EA.</li> </ul>
<b>Site Updates</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– TD provided the Site Update.</li> <li>– TD gave an update regarding paving the site entrance, saying the design work is complete, and a contractor is being sought to perform the work which is expected to be completed by Fall.</li> </ul>

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– TD gave an update about a power surge in March that caused damage to the electronic controls and hardware. He said Hydro One and Insurance are investigating the cause and financial compensation for repairs.</li> <li>– TD said the raw leachate has been and will continue to be hauled to a wastewater treatment plant to maintain leachate level and that discharge to the roadside ditch will not resume until the treatment plant is repaired and permission from the MECP to resume discharge to the roadside ditch has been obtained. TD also said that hauling to the Haldimand treatment plant will resume once the treatment plant is able to meet the acceptance criteria.</li> <li>– DM asked why the paving was taking so long.</li> <li>– TD said the design was done earlier this year and now they're getting to it.</li> <li>– TD said many things were happening at the site at once and the timing is best now.</li> <li>– TD provided a summary of complaints received between March and June. He indicated there was one complaint logged by Jordan Balch from MECP on May 3 about a smell of pig manure for about 3hrs, a 4 out of 5 rating. TD read out Jordan's investigation notes: followed up and conducted a survey on May 6, cloudy conditions, little to no wind, arrived at 2:41 p.m. and parked near the front of the site for about 20 minutes and did not detect any odour at the time.</li> <li>– DM asked if he was on the east or west side.</li> <li>– TD said he didn't know, that information was not included in Jordan's notes.</li> <li>– LW said sometimes she smells raw leachate around 6:15/6:30 p.m.</li> <li>– TD said there can be odour upon departure as they load and unload but they do their best to keep the hatches closed.</li> <li>– TD provided a community update, indicating that Brooks Road has started an annual community donation program. The objective of the program is to provide support to the local community and has been initiated with a donation to the Cayuga Foodbank.</li> <li>– TD said that in the past Brooks Road has donated to local sport clubs, but would be interested in suggestions from the members of the PLC. Suggestions for 2024 can be sent to <a href="mailto:admin@BRenvironmental.com">admin@BRenvironmental.com</a> by June 30th at the latest.</li> <li>– TD gave an update on hauling and leachate levels, saying with all the rain there was a slight uptick in May and they'll be tracking leachate levels every two weeks.</li> <li>– DB commented that the level we had to reach was in March 2024.</li> <li>– BK confirmed that the target leachate elevation was reached in March 2024. Leachate levels have risen slightly since that time, and this is likely attributable to lower rates of leachate hauling. An important observation from the data is that leachate levels go up with less</li> </ul>

Minutes	Action
	<p>pumping and down with more pumping. This means that pumping leachate works to bring the levels down, which is a good thing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– TD said the leachate target level was 191.3 in March and the next target is 191 which is considered essentially empty because it leaves 0.3 m of leachate above the collection system.</li> <li>– BK said a year from March 2024, in March 2025 the target is 191. If we increase the pumping and hit 191 by March 2025, that target is totally possible. A really wet year can make it harder but this target will be more feasible once the treatment facility is back up and running.</li> <li>– BK explained target leachate elevation by capacity and noted we're approaching the new target.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Landfill Life Expectancy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– BK talked about landfill expectancy and said it's based on remaining capacity and fill rate, and it depends on how much waste is coming in, which is dependent on various factors including market conditions.</li> <li>– BK said a survey was conducted on January 8, 2024 for capacity (end of 2023), and another survey was conducted May 30, 2024 to closely track remaining air space.</li> <li>– BK said there is about 17,500 m<sup>3</sup> estimated capacity remaining based on the May 2024 survey, and that remaining capacity can be affected by waste type, compaction, tonnage received, and consolidation of existing waste within the landfill over time.</li> <li>– BK said that based on these factors, and tonnage received, the estimated average remaining landfill life expectancy is about 4 months.</li> <li>– LW asked how often we're tracking.</li> <li>– BK said January and May were the most recent surveys.</li> <li>– TD said or sometimes more often so we're always watching.</li> <li>– BK wanted to be as accurate as possible for today's meeting but it does depend on fill rate and number of loads and type of waste coming in.</li> <li>– TD said pulling out leachate which occupies a certain amount of space, will increase compaction over time resulting in some settling.</li> <li>– BK said we're looking at an expectancy of four months based on the current fill rate.</li> <li>– TD mentioned the tonnage has been less than what is allowed.</li> <li>– KS asked if the site is monitored after it's closed.</li> <li>– TD confirmed that yes, the site is monitored.</li> <li>– BK said the site will continue to be monitored as long as it has potential to impact the environment.</li> <li>– TD said they monitor wells too, and they ensure bonding exists throughout the duration of time that the site is continued to be monitored.</li> </ul>

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– BK explained that there is a calculation used to determine the contaminating life span for a landfill which takes into account leachate quality, amount of waste landfilled, and leachate collection rates to estimate the number of years that the landfill could potentially impact the environment. This estimated number of years is used to determine the amount of money that is set aside to monitor the landfill after closure.</li> <li>– DB asked if the four-month expectancy includes the expansion.</li> <li>– BK said it doesn't include the expansion.</li> <li>– DM wanted to know how we got to expanding the landfill beyond the rail tracks.</li> <li>– BK said the expansion of the landfill doesn't go beyond the rail property. The waste footprint will stay on the existing property and the rail property will remain as buffer.</li> <li>– DB said that the buffer is not being used for waste disposal.</li> <li>– TD and BK said the buffer is being maintained and the landfill is staying on existing property. BK said this is a design principle.</li> <li>– BK assured the group that this is a design principle and that the landfill is staying on existing property.</li> <li>– KS asked how long the expansion will last.</li> <li>– TD and BK did a calculation using current numbers and said at 219,400m<sup>3</sup> the landfill expansion would last approximately four more years at the current fill rate.</li> </ul>
<b>MECP Update</b>	<p>– SR read Jordan Balch's email to the group because he was unable to attend the meeting. SR read: I wanted to provide everyone an update and let you know that I have been following the details and information provided by GHD to the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP). Yesterday, I conducted a follow up inspection of the site to review the status of the leachate treatment system, the management of waste on the property and to evaluate any odours. At this time, the site is continuing to haul the raw leachate offsite and I did not detect any odours emanating from the property. I do not have any other further comments to provide at this time. However, if you have any other questions, comments, or concerns please feel free to reach out to me using the contact information below.</p>
<b>Approvals</b>	<p>– BK gave an update on site approvals. BRE are in the middle of an Environmental Screening process to add additional capacity of 219,400 m<sup>3</sup>. The approved footprint is expected to change as a result of the increased capacity. He said the Environmental Screening is being conducted in accordance with the planning and design process outlined in Ontario's "Guide to Environmental Assessment Requirements for Waste Management Projects", and the results of</p>

Minutes	Action
	<p>the Study may be found in the Environmental Screening Report (ESR).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– BK stated that consultation activities were carried out for the Screening Process including Open House #1 (late June 2022) and Open House #2 (October 2023). He stated that the final ESR was posted for the mandatory 60-day review period in April 2024, with review completed by June 24, 2024. The ESR will be available for review to the public, Indigenous communities, and government agencies.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Suggestions and Concerns</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Before the meeting started, DM shared concerns about new representatives from GHD, how representatives from GHD are always changing and because the new representatives don't know what's going on, the committee is forced to be the watchdog to make sure we're doing what we're supposed to do.</li> <li>– BK confirmed that Blair Shoniker (BS), Ryan Loveday (RL) and Katrina McCullough (KM) are still involved in the project. He confirmed that SR and BK were both at the March meeting, we are aware of the project and are happy to share information and answer questions from committee members.</li> <li>– SR said we'll do our best to answer on the spot and if there's anything we don't know at the moment, we'll get the answers and follow up with the group.</li> <li>– DM complained about the fact that SR and BK are new to the PLC meetings and that we couldn't answer their questions about the EA process.</li> <li>– SR and BK committed to following up with additional, clearer details.</li> <li>– KS asked who should be attending the PLC meetings. She wanted to know why Six Nations and the Mayor were not present. She said she talked to a few people about the meetings and they had no idea about the meetings or the project. She said the mayor was unable to attend today's meeting but was able to attend a previous meeting that was cancelled. She doesn't think the proper people are informed. She asked where all the mandatory people are, that are supposed to attend these meetings.</li> <li>– LW said it's up to the committee members to get other people involved and asked who is supposed to sit on the committee.</li> <li>– DB said he was reading the Terms of Reference and there needs to be representation from people who live close to the landfill, a member of council, someone from Six Nations, and they vote for the chair on a term for two years.</li> <li>– TD said we talked about this a year ago, and that BS had a list of people that were invited to attend.</li> <li>– BK said BS is still involved with this project and he and SR will check with him about the list. BK and SR agreed that people should attend these meetings to learn more about the project.</li> </ul>

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– DM asked how much Brooks Road is donating.</li> <li>– TD said it's a substantial amount.</li> <li>– KS said we need a pool because we are a water community and we don't have a place to teach people how to swim.</li> <li>– TD confirmed the donation to the Food Bank was \$5,000 and Brooks Road is looking to donate another \$5,000 to \$10,000 annually. He's looking for ideas, perhaps a donation to the Kinsmen Community Centre. He's open to suggestions for something local. He mentioned he'd like to get ideas soon so we can move this forward quickly for this year. If we don't get any suggestions or can't do anything this year, then maybe next year.</li> <li>– DM said the donation was a small amount. And Brooks Road Environmental is a million dollar operation.</li> <li>– TD said that's why he pushed for something annual, and it will stay annual so we'll see where it goes. The deadline of June 30 is to receive ideas so we can get started and talk to the people that will need to be involved.</li> <li>– SR suggested that it might not be a pool but maybe it is a community picnic or festival with some local music, something like that.</li> <li>– DM wanted to discuss the beautification of the site so it doesn't look bad.</li> <li>– TD said Brooks Road doesn't have the money they think it has.</li> <li>– DM said we don't want the site to look bad, there is garbage everywhere along the road and dead animals.</li> <li>– TD confirmed he picks up garbage but he doesn't pick up dead animals.</li> <li>– DM said it's TD's responsibility to call the City to pick up the dead animals.</li> <li>– TD said the landfill will be capped first along the west side and then to the south side. That's the first section that will be done and they are adding a prescribed seed mix. He said they're unable to plant trees on a landfill cap. When the paving is done they can look at sprucing up the area, although it's hard to plant anything in clay.</li> <li>– DM said you can plant anything in clay, hostas, trees, bushes.</li> <li>– TD said he'll see what they can do. The seed for landfill cover is prescribed and he confirmed that the proposed expansion goes to the other side.</li> <li>– DM said she emailed Kelechi Agu (KA) of GHD to get the comments and responses but didn't get anything.</li> <li>– BK said the ESR is a long document because it is technical in nature and it includes the same information that was presented at the open house.</li> <li>– LW asked why there was an amendment.</li> </ul>

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="418 180 1328 247">– BK said it included changes to the report based on comments received.</li><li data-bbox="418 258 1393 325">– LW asked why the submission used the term Township of Cayuga when there is no township.</li><li data-bbox="418 336 883 369">– BK said that must be an error.</li><li data-bbox="418 380 1024 413">– LW said it should be Haldimand County.</li><li data-bbox="418 424 1422 533">– DB said on page 21 of Appendix C of the ESR there is a picture of what is proposed to be expanded but he can't decipher exactly what the boundary is on the picture. He said it's difficult to read.</li><li data-bbox="418 543 1419 722">– DM read a letter she wrote she wrote. SR did not record the letter verbatim, but it was about the beautification of the site, saying BRE was supposed to plant trees and keep the property looking nice and that they are concerned citizens who are not getting paid to be the watchdog.</li></ul>

Minutes	Action
<b>Next Meeting and Other Business</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– SR mentioned the next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 6, however we know how much this group likes to meet on Wednesdays, as per the original schedule, so we’re going to do our best to book the Wednesday, November 5 instead.</li> <li>– DM said we need to book in advance and SR confirmed that we’ll do our best.</li> </ul>
<b>Post-PLC Follow-up</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Environmental assessment (EA) process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Now that we have gone through a screening, the site is not eligible for another screening to expand for 10 years. There could be an individual EA because that is a larger undertaking and requires a more rigorous assessment and consultation process.</li> <li>• There is no limit to the number of individual EAs and there are several landfill expansion EA’s occurring in the province now that are expansions that would have previously completed an EA.</li> </ul> </li> <li>– Distribution of PLC meeting notices, agendas and minutes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notices of meetings are published in the local newspaper and sent by email to the PLC members and an email distribution list</li> <li>• Meeting agendas and minutes are sent by email to the PLC members and an email distribution list, and posted on the BRE <a href="https://www.brenvironmental.com/public-liaison-committee">project website</a> (https://www.brenvironmental.com/public-liaison-committee)</li> </ul> </li> <li>– GHD corporate confidentiality statement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per the minutes from and follow-up to the March 2022 meeting, DB inquired about the confidentiality clause on each email from GHD. DB noted that e-updates, minutes should not include confidentiality clauses. DB requested that it be noted that as PLC chair he is able to distribute. BS noted that it is a corporate requirement, added on automatically and that the statement could not be modified. BS noted that the content does go out to the distribution list and is posted to the BRE website. BRE could distribute the email or members of the public could be directed to the BRE <a href="https://www.brenvironmental.com/public-liaison-committee">project website</a> (https://www.brenvironmental.com/public-liaison-committee) for additional information.</li> </ul> </li> <li>– Summary of MECP’s responses to comments regarding the Environmental Screening Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelechi Agu (KA) confirmed she sent Appendix 7 - Comment &amp; Responses on Draft ESR, to DM on June 5, 2024.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>