



<b>Section 6.0</b>	<b>Consultation .....</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1	Overview of the Consultation Process.....	6-1
6.2	Stakeholders .....	6-1
6.3	Notice of Commencement.....	6-3
6.4	Website .....	6-3
6.5	Stakeholder Contact Database .....	6-4
6.6	Agency Consultation .....	6-4
6.6.1	GRT Meeting #1.....	6-4
6.6.2	GRT Meeting #2.....	6-5
6.6.3	Changes to the EA Due to Agency Input .....	6-6
6.7	Public Consultation .....	6-6
6.7.1	Public Open Houses.....	6-6
6.7.1.1	Public Open House #1 .....	6-6
6.7.1.2	Public Open House #2 .....	6-8
6.7.2	Changes to the EA Due to Public Input .....	6-8
6.8	Aboriginal Community Consultation.....	6-9
6.8.1	Notification.....	6-10
6.8.2	Meetings.....	6-10
6.8.3	Changes to the EA Due to Aboriginal Community Input.....	6-10
6.9	Public Liaison Committee .....	6-10
6.9.1	PLC EA Meeting #1 .....	6-11
6.9.2	PLC EA Meeting #2 .....	6-12
6.9.3	PLC EA Meeting #3 .....	6-12
6.10	Agency, Aboriginal Community, and Public Input .....	6-12
6.11	Review of the Draft Environmental Assessment Report .....	6-31
6.11.1	Notification and Availability of the Draft EA Report for Review .....	6-31
6.11.2	Delegation to Haldimand County Council in Committee .....	6-32
6.11.3	Consideration of Comments Received on the Draft EA Report .....	6-32
6.12	Formal EA Submission Consultation .....	6-130
6.12.1	Notification and Availability of the EA Report for Review .....	6-130
6.13	Commitments for On-Going Consultation.....	6-131



**List of Tables**

Table 6.1	Summary of EA Comments Received & Responses Provided (not including comments on the Draft EA Report).....	6-13
Table 6.2	Summary of Agency Comments Received During Review of the Draft EA Report and How They Were Considered in Finalizing the EA Report.....	6-34
Table 6.3	Summary of Public Comments Received During Review of the Draft EA Report and How They Were Considered in Finalizing the EA Report.....	6-103
Table 6.4	Summary of Aboriginal Community Comments Received During Review of the Draft EA Report and How They Were Considered in Finalizing the EA Report .....	6-129

## Section 6.0 Consultation

### 6.1 Overview of the Consultation Process

This section of the EA Report provides an overview of the consultation program undertaken as part of the Brooks Road Landfill Site Vertical Capacity Expansion EA. In accordance with the MOECC's *Code of Practice for Preparing and Reviewing Environmental Assessments in Ontario* (January 2014) and as required by Section 5.1 of the *EA Act*, a comprehensive stakeholder consultation program involving review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and the public was carried out throughout the EA process. The EA consultation program was designed and implemented based on the following principles, as described in the approved ToR:

- Accessible and inclusive, making all reasonable efforts to ensure that potentially-affected or interested parties have full information made available to them and have the opportunity to make their views known.
- Transparent by documenting the consultation process that is carried out for the development of the EA so that the process can be understood and traced.
- Responsive by providing opportunities for interested parties to comment on the EA at key stages and by ensuring that such comments are addressed in the EA.
- Meaningful by identifying how comments and concerns have been considered throughout the EA process.
- Flexible by allowing responses to new issues that emerge as the EA proceeds.

### 6.2 Stakeholders

A broad stakeholder group was consulted with throughout the Brooks Road EA process, including review agencies, Aboriginal communities, local residents, and the public. The list of stakeholders was updated throughout the EA process, as appropriate.

All relevant review agencies were contacted and invited to participate in the EA process upon commencement of the project, including federal ministries and departments, provincial ministries, the Haldimand County, conservation authorities, emergency services, school boards, and utilities. A complete list of the ministries and agencies comprising the Government Review Team (GRT) is provided below. Further information on the GRT is found in **Section 6.6**.

- Haldimand County
- Haldimand-Norfolk Health Unit
- Grand Erie District School Board
- Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA)
- Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority

- Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
- Ministry of Education
- Ontario Provincial Police
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs – Ontario Growth Secretariat (formerly under the Ministry of Infrastructure)
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
- Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
- Ministry of Transportation
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada
- Environment Canada
- Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- Transport Canada

The following ministries/agencies were contacted regarding the EA and requested removal from the GRT:

- Catholic Education Centre
- Niagara Escarpment Commission
- Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation (previously the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs)
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency
- Health Canada
- Hydro One Networks Inc.

Local residents within the vicinity of the existing Brooks Road Landfill Site were contacted upon project commencement via unaddressed mailings. Members of the Brooks Road Landfill Site Public Liaison Committee (PLC) and members of the public who had previously expressed an interest in the existing landfill and ToR for the EA were also notified at the start of the EA phase of the project. In addition, public stakeholder individuals and groups who became interested in the project were added to the list of stakeholders, including those who attended Public Open Houses, PLC meetings, or submitted comments. Further information regarding consultation with the public can be found in **Section 6.7**.

All Aboriginal communities potentially affected by or interested in the undertaking were contacted and invited to participate in the EA process upon commencement of the project. The Aboriginal communities contacted as part of the Brooks Road Landfill Site Vertical Capacity Expansion EA are listed below with further information provided in **Section 6.8**:

- Métis Nation of Ontario (MNO) (Head Office, Niagara Region Métis Council, and Hamilton-Wentworth Métis Council)
- Six Nations of the Grand River First Nation (Six Nations)
- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (MNCFN)
- Haudenosaunee Development Institute (HDI)
- Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council (HCCC)

The stakeholder contact list is included in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment A)**.

### **6.3 Notice of Commencement**

Following Minister-approval of the Brooks Road Landfill Site Vertical Capacity Expansion EA ToR on July 31, 2015, a Notice of Commencement announcing the start of the second step in the EA process was issued on August 27, 2015. The EA Notice of Commencement was distributed via the following means:

- Publication in the Sachem/Glanbrook Gazette on Thursday, August 27, 2015
- Posting on the project website
- Deposition of copies at locations accessible to the public, such as the Haldimand County office, the Cayuga public library, and the MOECC Regional and District Offices
- Direct mail and/or email to members of the GRT, Aboriginal communities, PLC members, and members of the public on the project mailing list
- Unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the NOA postal code, covering the town of Cayuga

The preceding notification materials are included in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment B)**.

### **6.4 Website**

A project specific website ([www.brenvironmental.com](http://www.brenvironmental.com)) was launched during the ToR stage and maintained throughout the EA process. The website was established to provide clear and accurate information to stakeholders as well as opportunities for participants to provide feedback.

The website includes up-to-date information about current study activities, notices of upcoming meetings, meeting materials, and a library of relevant background reports. In addition, stakeholders are able to submit comments to Brooks Road through the website.

## **6.5 Stakeholder Contact Database**

A comprehensive Stakeholder Contact Database was created during the ToR stage of the EA and was maintained and expanded throughout the study. This list was comprised of consenting public stakeholder individuals and groups who became interested in the project, including those who attended open houses, submitted comments, or requested to be added to the database. This database was used throughout the EA study to contact and inform stakeholders of study issues and events.

## **6.6 Agency Consultation**

Consultation was initiated with all relevant review agencies noted in **Section 6.2**, above, during the preparation of the ToR and continued through the duration of the EA process. Specific consultation activities included direct correspondence via letters and/or e-mails, meetings to which all GRT members were invited, as well as meetings held with individual agencies or groups of agencies, as appropriate. Review agencies were also invited to attend Public Open House events.

A summary of the meetings that took place between Brooks Road and GRT agencies is provided in the following sections.

### **6.6.1 GRT Meeting #1**

The first GRT meeting was held on May 30, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. An invitation was extended to all members of the GRT and the meeting was attended via teleconference by representatives from the following agencies:

- GRCA
- MOECC
- MTCS

The purpose of GRT Meeting #1 was to provide agencies with an overview of the project, existing environmental conditions, evaluation of the alternatives, identification of a Preferred Alternative, and the outcomes of Public Open House #1.

No comments were raised during GRT Meeting #1. A request was made by GRCA for hard copies of the Surface Water Assessment Report, Geology and Hydrogeology Assessment Report, and the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report Assessment Report.

A summary of GRT Meeting #1 is provided in the **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment C)**.

### **6.6.2 GRT Meeting #2**

A second GRT meeting was held on August 19, 2016 at 10 a.m., following issuance of the Draft EA Report. An invitation was extended to all members of the GRT and the meeting was attended via teleconference by representatives from the following agencies:

- MOECC
- MTO
- OPP
- OMAFRA
- MNRF

The purpose of GRT Meeting 2 was to provide agencies with an update on the project, including the submission of the Draft EA Report for public and agency comment, the contents of the Draft EA Report, the outcomes of Public Open House #2, and next steps in the EA.

MOECC noted that one resident had raised a concern that they received the Open House #2 notice (distributed via unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the NOA postal code) after the event had taken place. The Project Team explained that this means of notification had been used throughout the EA process and had been proven to be successful (e.g., attendees at Public Open House #1 noted on the sign-in sheet that they had been notified of the event via unaddressed flyer). Further, this method of notification was in addition to the distribution of the Public Open House #2 notice to all individuals on the project contact list via mail and/or email as well as advertisements in the two local papers (Sachem/Glanbrook Gazette and Haldimand Press). The Project Team committed to providing future notification material to Canada Post with additional lead time to ensure timely delivery to all recipients.

MOECC noted that it is stated in the appendix to the approved ToR that the Draft EA review period would be seven weeks long and asked whether an extension would be granted, given that the Draft EA Report review period was only proposed to be five weeks long (i.e., July 22, 2016 to August 26, 2016). During the meeting the Project Team stated that no formal extension to the Draft EA Report review period was being considered, but that comments received following the submission deadline would still be included in the formal

record of consultation and considered in the finalization of the EA Report. As a result of this discussion, Brooks Road Environmental subsequently extended the review period for a further two weeks (to September 9, 2016).

It was suggested by MOECC that the visual impact of the proposed vertical expansion had not been highlighted in the Public Open House material and the question of whether such an increase in height would contravene County by-laws was raised. The Project Team confirmed that there is no by-law restricting the height of a landfill in Haldimand County.

A summary of GRT Meeting #2 is provided in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment C)**.

### **6.6.3 Changes to the EA Due to Agency Input**

As noted in **Section 6.6.2**, above, as a result of discussions with MOECC during GRT Meeting #2, Brooks Road Environmental committed to providing future notification material to Canada Post with additional lead time to ensure timely delivery to all recipients and also extended the Draft EA Report review period from five weeks to seven weeks. Specific changes to the EA Report and individual technical aspects of the EA based upon input from review agencies on the Draft EA Report are described in **Table 6.2**.

## **6.7 Public Consultation**

Activities were undertaken throughout the duration of the EA in order to engage the public. These included notifications, Public Open Houses, and the maintenance of the project website. The following sections provide a summary of the EA Public Open Houses and changes to the EA resulting from public input. Further detail, including all materials disseminated to the public, comments received, and responses provided, can be found in **Supporting Document #1 - Record of Consultation**.

### **6.7.1 Public Open Houses**

The Brooks Road Landfill EA included two Public Open Houses aimed at providing an opportunity for the public to learn about, and offer comments on, the proposed vertical expansion. Project Team members were in attendance at all Open House sessions to facilitate discussions and answer questions.

#### **6.7.1.1 Public Open House #1**

Public Open House #1 was held on May 24, 2016 from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the Cayuga Kinsmen Community Centre (15 Thorburn Street South, Cayuga). Advance notification of the event was



provided to review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of public to ensure maximum attendance, and distributed via the following channels:

- Advertisement in the Sachem/Glanbrook Gazette newspaper publications (online and print) during the week of May 9, 2016
- Direct mailing/emailing to review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of public on the stakeholder contact database on May 12, 2016
- Unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the NOA postal code, covering the town of Cayuga, during the week of May 9, 2016
- Posting on the project website

Information presented at the Public Open House was in the form of display boards arranged around the room and organized to take the viewer through the process from project introduction to the history of the Site, EA process, need/rationale, Alternative Methods, Study Areas, assessment and evaluation methodology, comparative evaluation results, Preferred/Recommended Alternative, EA consultation, and next steps in the process.

A total of nine individuals attended the Public Open House, including local residents and landowners; members of the Public Liaison Committee for the existing landfill; and a member of the media from the Haldimand Press.

Verbal comments received during the meeting ranged from against the proposal to supportive of it, the majority of which were related to the existing landfill and the efforts made in recent years to clean it up. Landowners within the immediate vicinity of the site asked questions regarding the possible height of the vertical expansion, visual impact, odour, noise, wetland protection, potential for impacts to surface and groundwater, traffic, site life, and post-closure use. Verbal comments from Public Open House #1 are summarized in **Table 6.1**.

No comment sheets were received at the Public Open House and one comment was received from the MNCFN via e-mail following the event (see **Table 6.1**).

A summary of Public Open House #1 is provided in the **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment D)**.

### 6.7.1.2 Public Open House #2

Public Open House #2 was held on August 10, 2016 from 5 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the Cayuga Kinsmen Community Centre (15 Thorburn Street South, Cayuga). Advance notification of the event was provided to review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of public to ensure maximum attendance, and distributed via the following channels:

- Advertisement in the Sachem/Glanbrook Gazette newspaper publications (online and print) and Haldimand Press during the week of August 1, 2016
- Direct mailing/emailing to review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of public on the stakeholder contact database during the week of August 1, 2016
- Unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the NOA postal code, covering the town of Cayuga, during the week of August 1, 2016
- Posting on the project website

Information presented at the Public Open House was in the form of display boards arranged around the room and organized to take the viewer through the process from project introduction to the history of the Site, EA process, need/rationale, Alternative Methods, Study Areas, assessment and evaluation methodology, comparative evaluation results, Preferred/Recommended Alternative, impact assessment, EA consultation, and next steps in the process.

A total of five individuals attended the Public Open House, including local residents, landowners, and MOECC staff.

Verbal comments received during the meeting were related to the proposed height of the preferred vertical expansion alternative and odour. Verbal comments from Public Open House #2 are summarized in **Table 6.1**.

One comment sheet was submitted at the Public Open House (see **Table 6.1**).

A summary of Public Open House #2 is provided in the **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment D)**.

### 6.7.2 Changes to the EA Due to Public Input

Odour related to the Brooks Road Landfill Site was raised by members of the local community as a key concern. Brooks Road Environmental is committed to addressing these concerns and, as such, implements the following odour control measures at the Site:

1. Daily odour monitoring

2. Minimizing exposed waste through the application of cover material
3. Reducing the amount of leachate through off-Site disposal
4. Application of odour control granules and liquid spray
5. Upgrades to the on-Site leachate treatment facility
6. Community outreach to identify any impacts at neighbouring residences

A commitment to continue and modify, as necessary, these odour control measures is included in this EA. As an example, Brooks Road Environmental has made the commitment to implement continuous odour monitoring on-site in order to address comments and concerns from the public around odour.

As noted in the approved ToR, members of the local community have raised concerns verbally since before the start of the EA process regarding the "fundamental unsuitability of Site," particularly in regard to hydrogeological conditions, including the potential presence of karst topography and abandoned gypsum mines in the Site vicinity. In response to this, a commitment was made in the approved ToR to make available during the EA the existing available information on the geological and hydrogeological environment, including the potential for karst geology and abandoned gypsum mines within the area. As such, a Gypsum Mine Investigation Report was appended to the Geology and Hydrogeology Assessment Report, the purpose of which was to assess the potential influence of the former Cayuga Gypsum Mine on groundwater at the landfill site, in particular the bedrock aquifer. The results of the interpretations provided within the Gypsum Mine Investigation Report support the previous conclusion that the bedrock aquifer at the Landfill Site does not appear to be affected by the historic mine shafts located to the northwest of the Site.

Changes to the EA based upon input from the members of the public on the Draft EA Report are described in **Table 6.3**.

## **6.8 Aboriginal Community Consultation**

As noted above, all Aboriginal communities potentially affected by or interested in the undertaking were contacted and invited to participate in the EA process upon commencement of the project. The Aboriginal communities contacted as part of the Brooks Road Landfill Site Vertical Capacity Expansion EA include:

- MNO (Head Office, Niagara Region Métis Council, and Hamilton-Wentworth Métis Council)
- Six Nations
- MNCFN
- HDI
- HCCC

The Aboriginal communities potentially affected by or interested in the undertaking were originally identified based on the contact lists from previous projects conducted within Haldimand County. A November 25, 2013 letter from the Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation (previously the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs) verified that Six Nations, HCCC, and MNCFN should be contacted regarding this project (see ToR Record of Consultation). The following sections provide a summary of Aboriginal community consultation activities carried out during the EA and changes to the EA resulting from Aboriginal community input. Further detail, including all materials disseminated to Aboriginal communities, comments received, and responses provided, can be found in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation**.

### **6.8.1 Notification**

The Notice of Commencement, notice of Public Open House #1, notice of Public Open House #2, and notice of the availability of the Draft EA Report for review and comment were provided to the above-listed Aboriginal communities via both letter and email and followed-up by telephone calls from members of the Project Team to confirm their receipt.

### **6.8.2 Meetings**

A project update meeting with Lands and Resource staff from Six Nations was held on July 21, 2016 to present information on the existing environmental conditions within the Study Areas; provide an overview of the evaluation of the alternatives, identification of a Preferred Alternative, and results of the detailed impact assessment; and outline next steps in the EA, including review of the Draft EA Report. During this meeting Six Nations Lands and Resources staff raised general questions with respect to service area, monitoring, and odour. Verbal comments from the July 21, 2016 meeting are summarized in **Table 6.1**. A summary of the July 21, 2016 meeting is provided in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment E)**.

### **6.8.3 Changes to the EA Due to Aboriginal Community Input**

Changes to the EA based upon input from Aboriginal communities on the Draft EA Report are described in **Table 6.4**.

## **6.9 Public Liaison Committee**

Conditions 86 and 87 of ECA No. A110302 for the existing Brooks Road Landfill Site require the maintenance of a PLC to serve as a focal point for dissemination, review and exchange of information regarding the operation of the Site, including environmental monitoring, maintenance, complaint resolution, and new approvals or amendments to existing approvals

related to the operation of the Site. Under the Terms of Reference established for the PLC, it meets a minimum of three times per year and membership is comprised as follows:

- 3 residents who live in the community
- 1 senior staff member from the County of Haldimand
- 1 representative appointed by the Six Nations Council of the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory
- 1 representative appointed by the Owner
- The District Manager<sup>1</sup> or his/her representative or delegate shall be an ex-officio member and entitled to attend and participate in all meetings of the PLC

Currently, there are vacancies for two additional residents who live in the community, one senior staff member from the County of Haldimand, and one representative appointed by the Six Nations Council of the Six Nations of the Grand River Territory. The vacancies for residents have been advertised by Brooks Road through newspaper notices on two separate occasions in 2015 and 2016.

In addition to regular business related to the existing Brooks Road Landfill, the PLC was also involved in the EA process. The following subsections summarize the EA-related discussions that took place at PLC meetings throughout the EA process.

#### **6.9.1 PLC EA Meeting #1**

The first PLC meeting to take place during the Brooks Road Landfill EA following Minister-approval of the ToR was held on March 9, 2016. In addition to other PLC agenda items, the following was discussed with respect to the EA:

- An update on the status of the EA was provided
- Members were made aware of Brooks Road's intention to schedule Public Open House in the coming weeks
- A PLC member noted that valid concerns relating to the EA should be put forward to the MOECC to be considered as part of the approvals process

A summary of PLC Meeting #1 is provided in the **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment F)**.

---

<sup>1</sup> "District Manager" means the District Manager of the Hamilton District Office, West-Central Region, MOECC

### 6.9.2 PLC EA Meeting #2

The second PLC meeting to take place during the Brooks Road Landfill EA following Minister-approval of the ToR was held on June 1, 2016. In addition to other PLC agenda items, the following was discussed with respect to the EA:

- An update on the status of the EA was provided
- Odour was raised a key issue for the surrounding community – odour monitoring program was established to address these concerns
- The protocol for making odour complaints and commenting on the proposal to the MOECC was raised and reviewed
- An update on leachate treatment facility construction at the Site was provided

A summary of PLC Meeting #2 is provided in the **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment F)**.

### 6.9.3 PLC EA Meeting #3

The third PLC meeting to take place during the Brooks Road Landfill EA following Minister-approval of the ToR was held on November 2, 2016. In addition to other PLC agenda items, the following was discussed with respect to the EA

- An update on the status of the EA was provided, including issuance of the Draft EA Report for public review and the upcoming submission of the Final EA Report
- An update on leachate treatment facility and stormwater management system construction at the Site was provided
- An overview of odour monitoring in and around the Site and odour mitigation on-Site was provided by a GHD Odour specialist
- The protocol for making odour complaints and commenting on the proposal to the MOECC was reviewed

A draft summary of PLC Meeting #3 is provided in the **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment F)** (minutes are finalized at the subsequent PLC meeting).

## 6.10 Agency, Aboriginal Community, and Public Input

A comprehensive list of the comments received from agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of the public throughout the EA process (not including comments submitted on the Draft EA Report) and their associated responses is located in **Table 6.1**, below. Comments received on the Draft EA Report are captured in **Section 6.11**.

**Table 6.1 Summary of EA Comments Received & Responses Provided (not including comments on the Draft EA Report)**

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
<b>Review Agencies</b>					
1	GRCA	Aug. 28, 2015	Email	Expression of interest in participating in the EA due to the natural heritage features that are on and adjacent to the site.	<i>GRCA continues to be notified throughout the EA process.</i>
2	Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	Sept. 1, 2015	Email	Notification that, based on the information provided, the project does not appear to be described in the Regulations. Request for Brooks Road to review the Regulations to confirm applicability to the proposed project and, if the project is not subject to a federal EA, remove the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency from the distribution list.	<i>Upon review, the proposed project does not appear in the Regulations; therefore, CEAA is not applicable.</i>
3	MTCS	Sept. 24, 2015	Email	Request for Brooks Road to complete the MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Archaeological Potential to determine if an archaeological assessment is needed as well as the MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes to determine whether the project may impact cultural heritage resources.	<i>MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Archaeological Potential and MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes were completed and included in the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report.</i>  <i>(see Section 5.3.2 and Appendix E-6 for the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment)</i>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
4	MTCS	Jun. 9, 2016	Email	Completion of the MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Archaeological Potential as well as the MTCS Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes should consider any temporarily staging, stockpiling or access routes or servicing upgrades, and potential haul-route impacts on adjacent heritage resources, if any.	<p>The proposed project has been screened using the referenced MTCS checklists to determine if an archaeological assessment is needed as well as to determine whether the project may impact cultural heritage resources. Given that the entire Site has been in existence for over 30 years and has been subjected to historical and recent, extensive and intensive disturbance, and due to the proposed expansion amounting to waste being placed on top of existing waste, the results of both evaluations indicate that there is no potential for cultural heritage resources nor any archaeological potential. The completed checklists are found in the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report for the Brooks Road Landfill Site Vertical Capacity Expansion EA, which is appended to the EA Report.</p> <p>(see Section 5.3.2 and Appendix E-6 for the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment)</p>



No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
<b>Public</b>					
1	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	Resident remembered the old Site and remarked on how pleased they were with how Brooks Road Environmental has improved the Site since taking ownership. Questions were asked about the decommissioning that took place and future plans for the site.	<p>Since its purchase in May 2012, Brooks Road Environmental has fully decommissioned the Site and, as of June 2013, all hazardous waste associated with historic landfilling operations has been removed (all decommissioning activities are documented in the Site Decommissioning Report submitted to the MOECC on January 30, 2014). Brooks Road Environmental has also provided an irrevocable letter of credit to the Ontario Government to satisfy the Financial Assurance requirements stipulated by the ECA. Further, a renewed Aboriginal community, Agency and public consultation/outreach program has been put in place to provide immediate data and to consult on future plans for the Site. This communication is primarily through the PLC.</p> <p>Going forward, the Site will continue to operate as a modern, state of the art non-hazardous solid waste landfill for the disposal of IC&amp;I wastes. Brooks Road</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<p>Environmental is committed to environmental stewardship and community involvement/outreach, and will fully comply with all permits and approvals.</p> <p>(see Section 1.3 and Appendix A for Site History)</p>
2	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	How high will the vertical expansion be?	<p>The vertical expansion alternatives range in elevation from 219.7 mAMSL to 222.1 mAMSL (approximately 21 m to 23 m above Existing Grade of 198.96 mAMSL).</p> <p>(see Section 5.1 and Appendix D for a description of the vertical expansion alternatives)</p>
3	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	Will it be visible from the surrounding area?	<p>Views of the Site from surrounding areas to the west and southwest would be minimized by vegetating the screening berm along the western boundary of the Site and/or additional plantings on-Site. The Site is surrounded by forested areas to the north, east and southeast which obscure views of the existing Site from these directions, as will be the case for the vertical expansion.</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					(see Section 5.3.4 for a description of the visual impacts of the Preferred Undertaking)
4	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	Resident noted that they can sometimes smell the existing landfill from their backyard, early in the morning.	<p>Odour sources at the Brooks Road Landfill may include the active working face or leachate.</p> <p>Odours are mitigated on-Site through the implementation of operational BMPs as well as the application of odour control substances. Operational BMPs to minimize odour include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily odour monitoring carried out by the Site Operator</li> <li>• Limiting the size of the active landfill working face</li> <li>• Applying daily cover to the active landfill working face</li> <li>• Applying interim cover at a minimum thickness of 300 mm on areas of the landfill where landfilling has ceased for 6 months or more</li> <li>• Limiting exposed areas of the leachate</li> </ul> <p>Brooks Road Environmental continues to invest in the Odour Monitoring</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<p>Program and will continue to review each complaint with a mandate to identify the source and mitigate or reduce odours that are impacting our community.</p> <p>It is important to document a description of the odour and the conditions in which it was experienced. The community itself can become a valuable source of qualitative data, providing information to be used when assessing other prevention and mitigation tools. Please report all odour occurrences to Brooks Road Environmental to ensure that all that can be done to mitigate the odours is being implemented.</p> <p>(see Section 5.3.1.1.1 and Appendix E-1 for a description of the odour monitoring program )</p>
5	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	What will be the impact from a noise perspective?	The increased height will result in a potential change to the line-of-sight noise impact exposure for the fourteen off-site residential dwellings; however, all residential dwellings will be below the 55 dBA noise limit. As such, no

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<p>specific mitigation measures are required. The implementation of best management practices (BMPs), such as barriers and/or berms at Landfill perimeter and administrative controls that limit on-site landfilling activities will serve to minimize noise impacts from the Site.</p> <p>(see Section 5.3.1.1.2 and Appendix E-2 for a description of the worst-case noise impacts anticipated for the vertical expansion alternatives)</p>
6	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	How will Brooks Road ensure that the nearby wetland is protected?	<p>Many aspects of landfill activities will not change as a result of the vertical expansion. Buffer areas surrounding the limit of waste, stormwater management, and traffic conditions are expected to remain unchanged from existing to proposed conditions. As a result, no adverse environmental effects to the terrestrial and aquatic environment are expected as a result of the proposed vertical expansion.</p> <p>General BMPs for continued operation of the landfill should include:</p>



No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Notify Site operators and delivery contractors of the presence of reptiles and amphibians in the surrounding areas. This includes visual identification tools for species at risk (SAR) common to the area.</li><li>• Any wildlife incidentally encountered during Site operation activities will not be knowingly harmed and will be allowed to move away from the area on its own if at all possible.</li><li>• In the event that an animal encountered during Site operation activities does not move from the area, or is injured, the Site Supervisor will be notified. In the event that the animal is a known or suspected SAR, the Site Supervisor will contact MNRF SAR biologists for advice.</li></ul> <p>(see Section 5.3.1.4 and Appendix E-3 for mitigation measures proposed for Preferred Undertaking; see Section 7.0 for commitments and monitoring proposed for the Preferred Undertaking)</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
7	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	What is the potential for impacts to surface water?	<p>For the Surface Water Resources net effects analysis, the following assumptions were made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The landfill cap will be vegetated and no pollutants of any kind (i.e., pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers) will be applied to the cap once it has been fully vegetated.</li> <li>• Only areas on the landfill cap are changing, no other area of the Site will change slopes or have its drainage significantly re configured in any way.</li> <li>• No surface water will ever come in contact with waste. Any surface water that infiltrates through the cap will be captured by the leachate collection system and treated.</li> <li>• There will be no leachate seeps or exchange of surface water and leachate.</li> </ul> <p>An increased slope would lead to increased soil loss due to erosion for all three vertical expansion alternatives. The increase in soil loss would be minor as slope is only one of numerous factors</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<p>that affect soil loss. The erosion would show up in stormwater runoff as slightly increased concentrations of TSS and TSS related pollutants. Hydrologic modelling shows no significant increases in runoff peak flow rates for the vertical expansion alternatives compared to currently approved final closure conditions.</p> <p>(see Section 5.3.1.3 and Appendix E-5 for a description of the surface water potential effects, mitigation measures and net effects associated with the vertical expansion alternatives)</p>
8	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	What is the potential for impacts to groundwater?	<p>As Alternative Methods 1, 2 and 3 are vertical expansions of the existing Brooks Road Landfill there would be no change to the landfill footprint. Leachate generation would not change from existing conditions and the leachate collection system would continue to maintain leachate levels as per the current design criteria. Consequently, there is no potential for effects on groundwater quality or flow characteristics for all three Alternative Methods.</p>



No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					(see Section 5.3.1.2 and Appendix E-4 for a description of the geology and hydrogeology potential effects, mitigation measures and net effects associated with the vertical expansion alternatives)
9	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	How many more trucks will the vertical expansion mean for our roads?	<p>The maximum daily truck traffic at the existing landfill, assuming delivery of 500 tonnes of material per day, is 8 to 12 walking floor trucks, 1 to 2 front end trucks and 1 to 3 roll-offs for a total of 17 inbound and 17 outbound trucks plus another one or two trips for staff. This number can increase slightly if there are certain soil jobs on the site as the walking floor trucks are replaced with dump trailers and tri-axle trucks. The average number of vehicles per day associated with waste and construction materials for all three vertical expansion alternatives is expected to be approximately 16.</p> <p>(see Section 4.5.1 for existing traffic conditions at the Site; see Sections 5.1.1.7 and 5.3.3.1, Appendix D, and Appendix E-7 for a</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					description of the traffic associated with the vertical expansion alternatives)
10	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	How much longer will the Site be operational for if the expansion goes ahead?	<p>The vertical capacity expansion proposed under this EA is for 421,000 m<sup>3</sup> (including waste, daily cover, and interim cover), over a five to seven year planning period. The five to seven year planning period is expected to start in Fall 2017, following EA and ECA approvals.</p> <p>(see Section 3.1 for a description of the undertaking and Section 5.1.1 and Appendix D for information regarding site life)</p>
11	Resident	Public Open House #1 – May 24, 2016	Verbal	Once the landfill is closed, what will it be used for?	<p>The post-closure use for the Brooks Road Landfill Site has not yet been determined. Post-closure will be addressed as part of the amended site Design and Operations Report (Post Closure Plan), which is mandated by the Province. Input from the public on future recreational uses for the closed site may be sought during preparation of the Post Closure Plan.</p> <p>(see Section 5.7.14 for a discussion of site closure and end use)</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
12	Resident	Public Open House #2 – Aug. 10, 2016	Verbal	What is the source of odour at the existing landfill? Will it be worse if the vertical expansion is approved?	<p>Odour sources at the Brooks Road Landfill may include the active working face or leachate.</p> <p>Odour impacts from the vertical expansion of the Site are expected to remain the same or lower than the existing conditions. This is due to the fact that the Site will still be receiving a maximum of 151, 000 tonnes per year and will continue to accept the same type of waste resulting in an unchanged odour profile. Additionally, the area of the active face will remain relatively unchanged and will occur further from the property boundary to allow for proper landfilling slopes to occur. This will reduce and/or maintain any odours present along the property boundary of the Site. Furthermore, operations will occur within the Site's existing waste footprint and Site boundaries.</p> <p>Odours are mitigated on-Site through the implementation of operational BMPs as well as the application of odour control substances. Operational BMPs to minimize odour include:</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daily odour monitoring carried out by the Site Operator</li> <li>• Limiting the size of the active landfill working face</li> <li>• Applying daily cover to the active landfill working face</li> <li>• Applying interim cover at a minimum thickness of 300 mm on areas of the landfill where landfilling has ceased for 6 months or more</li> <li>• Limiting exposed areas of the leachate</li> </ul> <p>Brooks Road Environmental continues to invest in the Odour Monitoring Program and will continue to review each complaint with a mandate to identify the source and mitigate or reduce odours that are impacting our community.</p> <p>(see Section 5.3.1.1.1 and Appendix E-1 for a description of the odour monitoring program )</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
13	Resident	Public Open House #2 – Aug. 10, 2016	Comment Sheet	Scenes of the proposed finished site do not match existing site at present in length and width.	The dimensions (i.e., length, width) of the site boundary and the limit of landfill will not change as a result of the proposed vertical capacity expansion.  (see Section 5.1 and Appendix D for the design basis for the vertical capacity expansion)
<b>Aboriginal Communities</b>					
1	MNCFN	Jun. 1, 2016	Email	At this time, MNCFN has a low level of concern about the project. Request copies of all associated Environmental and/or archaeological reports.	<i>MNCFN was provided with a copy of the Draft EA Report, which includes the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report as well as the Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report.</i>  (see Section 4.3.4, Section 5.3.1.4 and Appendix E-3 for Terrestrial and Aquatic information; see Section 4.4, Section 5.3.2 and Appendix E-6 for Archaeology and Cultural Heritage information)
2	Six Nations	Meeting – Jul. 21, 2016	Verbal	What is the proposed service area for the vertical expansion?	Both the current and proposed service area for the Brooks Road Landfill is Ontario-wide, but it is expected that waste will primarily be received from Haldimand County and the surrounding areas. Brooks Road would be able to

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<p>accept materials (as approved in the ECA) from Six Nations as well.</p> <p>(see Section 3.2 and Section 5.7.4 for information regarding the proposed service area)</p>
3	Six Nations	Meeting – Jul. 21, 2016	Verbal	What sort of odour monitoring is carried out at the landfill?	<p>From an odour perspective, Brooks Road Environmental has taken a number of steps to ensure that 1) the odour is reduced/mitigated and 2) that a continuous monitoring program be put in place at the site to detect odour in real-time in order to proactively address any potential issues. That said, as a matter of protocol and standard operating procedure, every complaint that Brooks Road Environmental receive is thoroughly reviewed and our onsite manager personally investigates to conduct testing and prepare a report on the issue.</p> <p>The following operational measures are currently implemented in order to reduce and/or mitigate odour impacts from the Site and will continue throughout the vertical expansion:</p>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuing with the daily odour monitoring program carried out by the Site Operator</li> <li>• If odours are evident on the property boundary, increase the amount of daily cover applied on the waste</li> <li>• Minimize the active working face. Apply interim cover at a minimum thickness of 300 mm on areas of the landfill where landfilling has ceased for 6 months or more</li> <li>• Limit exposed areas of the leachate collection system</li> <li>• When not in use, ensure blind flanges are placed on leachate collection system cleanouts and sump risers</li> <li>• Make every effort to limit spilled leachate within the leachate storage tank (Baker Area) containment area and immediately clean up any spills when they occur</li> <li>• Continue with the use of odour control granules for odour mitigation. Assess areas of placement and their effect on odour</li> </ul>

No.	Agency/ Affiliation	Date	Method	Comment Summary	Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered
					<p>mitigation.</p> <p>A commitment to continue and modify, as necessary, these odour control measures is included in this EA. As an example, Brooks Road Environmental has made the commitment to implement continuous odour monitoring on-Site in order to address comments and concerns from the public around odour.</p> <p>(see Section 5.3.1.1.1 and Appendix E-1 for a description of the odour monitoring program )</p>



## **6.11 Review of the Draft Environmental Assessment Report**

In accordance with the approved ToR, the Draft EA Report was made available to agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of the public for review and comment prior to formal submission of the EA to the MOECC. The pre-submission review period was originally scheduled for five weeks, beginning July 22, 2016 and ending on August 26, 2016, but was modified to run for 7 total weeks to September 9, 2016. In support of the pre-submission review of the Draft EA Report, various consultation activities took place, including notification of the review process, provision of the Draft EA Report, Public Open House #2 (described in **Section 6.7.1.2**, above), GRT Meeting #2 (described in **Section 6.6.2**, above), and a delegation to Haldimand County Council in Committee (see **Section 6.11.2**, below).

### **6.11.1 Notification and Availability of the Draft EA Report for Review**

The Draft EA Report was available for review on the project specific website ([www.brenvironmental.com](http://www.brenvironmental.com)) and at the following locations:

- Haldimand County Office (45 Munsee Street North, Cayuga, ON N0A 1E0)
- Cayuga Public Library (28 Cayuga Street North, Cayuga, ON N0A 1E0)
- MOECC, Hamilton District Office (Ellen Fairclough Building, 9th Floor, 119 King Street West, Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y7)

Notification of the availability of the Draft EA Report for a five week review period was provided through the following means:

- Advertisement in the Sachem/Glanbrook Gazette newspaper publications (online and print) and the Haldimand Press during the week of July 18, 2016
- Direct mailing/emailing to review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of public on the stakeholder contact database on July 22, 2016
- Unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the N0A postal code, covering the town of Cayuga, during the week of July 18, 2016
- Posting on the project website

The availability of the Draft EA Report for review, including review locations and the timelines for submitting comments, was also included in the notification for Public Open House #2 (see **Section 6.7.1.2** for notification details).

Notification providing the modified Draft EA Report review period end date of September 9, 2016 was provided through the following means:

- Advertisement in the Sachem/Glanbrook Gazette newspaper publications (online and print) and the Haldimand Press during the weeks of August 22 and August 29, 2016
- Direct mailing/emailing to review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of public on the stakeholder contact database on August 22, 2016
- Posting on the project website

The preceding notification materials are included in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment G)**.

#### **6.11.2 Delegation to Haldimand County Council in Committee**

To ensure Haldimand County Council was aware of and sufficiently briefed on Brooks Road Vertical Capacity Expansion EA and the Draft EA Report review period, the Project Team presented the findings of the Draft EA Report to Haldimand County Council in Committee on August 23, 2016. The presentation delivered and formal acknowledgement letter from the Haldimand County Clerk are provided in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment H)**.

#### **6.11.3 Consideration of Comments Received on the Draft EA Report**

A total of 23 written comment submissions on the Draft EA Report were received from agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of the public. The comments received through the 23 submissions and how they have been considered by Brooks Road in finalizing the EA Report are summarized in a series of tables by participant group, in accordance with Section 4.3.7 of MOECC's Code of Practice for Preparing and Reviewing Environmental Assessments in Ontario (January 2014):

- **Table 6.2** summarizes the written comments received from agencies and how they were considered by Brooks Road (organized by agency)
- **Table 6.3** summarizes of the written comments received from members of the public and how they were considered by Brooks Road (organized by issue)
- **Table 6.4** summarizes the comments received from Aboriginal communities and how they were considered by Brooks Road (organized by First Nation and Métis organization)

As part of considering comments received, Brooks Road issued individual responses to those who provided comments on the Draft EA Report except for MOECC because of their unique EA review and approval function. The issued responses were either in the form of a formal letter or



email, corresponding to how the comments were received. Written correspondence received on the Draft EA Report and response letters provided, as well as a table including a complete listing of all comments received and the responses provided are included in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachments I, J and K)**.

**Table 6.2 Summary of Agency Comments Received During Review of the Draft EA Report and How They Were Considered in Finalizing the EA Report**

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
1.	Haldimand County	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
2.	Grand River Conservation Authority	The GRCA's online mapping tool provides updated (2015) ortho-rectified imagery and identifies natural hazard and natural heritage features within the Grand River watershed. We request that the GRCA's wetland and watercourse layers be mapped and interpreted in conjunction with mapping information obtained from the MNRF and others.	<p>These layers have been added to the applicable figures in the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report.</p> <p>(These layers have been added to Figures 4.19 and 4.20 in the final EA Report.)</p>
3.	Grand River Conservation Authority	It is not clear if and when wetland boundaries were verified by the GRCA. This should be noted in the report.	<p>The North Lands wetland boundaries were verified by GRCA ecologists on July 5, 2013, while the East Lands wetlands were verified on June 12, 2014. This information is detailed in Section 3.3.3 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report.</p> <p>(This information is included in Section 4.3.4.3 of the final EA Report.)</p>
4.	Grand River Conservation Authority	A single breeding bird survey is generally not sufficient for the purpose of confirming breeding status of all birds expected to be breeding within this area.	A single breeding bird survey was considered appropriate for the scale and nature of the EA. It was intended to be reflective of the bird community using the available natural features, but not exhaustive of the bird community present. Incidental observations were also collected at each Site visit and are documented in Table 3.3 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report. The breeding

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			<p>bird survey was not intended to be representative of impacts to habitat, as there will be no change to available habitat under proposed conditions.</p> <p>(Breeding bird survey results and incidental observations are included in Section 4.3.4.6 of the final EA Report.)</p>
5.	Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>It is our understanding that detailed plans were prepared to support a GRCA permit for a leachate treatment system located at the south end of the property adjacent to the wetland feature. The plans approved by the GRCA did not address the vertical expansion, which is the subject of the current EA. However, this and any additional information collected to support the GRCA permit would be helpful to know and should be added to this section for clarification.</p>	<p>The leachate treatment facility and process has been modified as a part of the current EA process. A leachate treatment alternatives evaluation was completed during the EA and is provided in Section 5.6 of the EA Report.</p> <p>(An evaluation of leachate treatment alternatives is provided in Section 5.6 of the final EA Report.)</p>
6.	Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>Please confirm that the most current OWES manual (OMNRF 2013) was used when evaluating and delineating wetlands within the study area.</p>	<p>Wetlands within the Local Study Area were not evaluated, but were delineated as per available OWES and Ecological Land Classification (ELC) protocols at the time of survey. The Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report has been updated to clarify this.</p> <p>(Section 4.3.4.3 includes clarification regarding Local Study Area wetland delineation.)</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
7.	Grand River Conservation Authority	Although no field surveys were completed, a review of existing mapping information suggests that there is warm water fish habitat on the East Lands and unclassified fish habitat (direct or indirect) on the West Lands. This section should be revised accordingly.	<p>An aquatic habitat survey was conducted on October 28, 2016. Section 3.2.2.5 Methodology and Section 3.3.5 Aquatic Habitat and Species (existing conditions) of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report have been updated accordingly. In summary, the drainage system within the Local Study Area provides contributing fish habitat with no direct fish use. The Norton Creek system is believed to provide direct fish habitat south of Highway 3.</p> <p>(Section 4.3.4.5 of the final EA Report has been updated to include the results of the aquatic habitat survey)</p>
8.	Grand River Conservation Authority	We request that the GRCA's drainage layers be mapped and clearly labelled in the report to support the discussion on drainage patterns within the study area.	<p>All applicable figures in the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report have been updated accordingly.</p> <p>(GRCA drainage layers have been added to Figures 4.19 and 4.20 in the final EA Report.)</p>
9.	Grand River Conservation Authority	It is requested that unevaluated wetlands mapped by the GRCA be added to Figure 3.4 (Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report).	<p>Figure 3.4 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>(Unevaluated wetlands mapped by GRCA have been added to Figure 4.19 in the final EA Report.)</p>
10.	Grand River Conservation Authority	It would be helpful to note which boundaries specifically were delineated and verified in the field with the GRCA (Figure 3.5 – Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report).	<p>This information is shown on Figure 3.5 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report with red hatching (Figure 4.20 in the final EA Report). All boundaries shown with this layer were field verified with GRCA. The verification dates for these boundaries are detailed in</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			<p>Section 3.3.3 (north lands – July 5, 2013; south and east lands – June 12, 2014) of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report.</p> <p>(GRCA delineated wetland boundaries are shown in Figure 4.20 in the final EA Report.)</p>
11.	Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>We request that the wetland complexing rules outlined in the current OWES manual (OMNRF 2013) be applied to unevaluated wetlands where practicable. The GRCA may also consult with the MNRF from time to time to confirm the status of the unevaluated wetlands within the current study area. (Figure 3.5 – Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report)</p>	<p>The evaluation of wetlands is not part of the scope of this EA. Potential impacts to wetlands have been considered in the report regardless of wetland status (i.e., PSW or unevaluated), as there are no unevaluated wetlands.</p> <p>(Potential impacts to wetlands have been considered in Section 5.3.1.4 of the final EA Report.)</p>
12.	Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>The Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report notes that the Blanding's turtle was recorded prior to 1990 and is therefore a historical record. The report also notes that a single Blanding's turtle was observed during field investigations. Was the MNRF consulted regarding the recent sighting?</p> <p>The fact that there are several additional historical records of rare species (i.e., Jefferson salamander and eastern ribbonsnake) suggests a need for</p>	<p>No, the MNRF was not consulted regarding the sighting as the identification was made by GRCA in the field during a joint Site visit. Despite the age of any Blanding's turtle observations within the local study area, the identification of impacts and assessment of mitigation consider the possible presence of turtles including Blanding's turtle.</p> <p>The footprint of disturbance of the approved operational landfill area will not change from existing limits as a result of the proposed vertical expansion. The already developed nature of the Site results in a lack of available habitat for these species. Therefore, the surveys completed are considered appropriate for the scale and nature of the EA.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>additional survey work.</p> <p>It is recommended that the MNRF be consulted to determine the need for targeted surveys of turtles and snakes.</p>	<p>As per our previous response, the surveys completed are considered appropriate for the scale and nature of the EA, due to the lack of available habitat on Site and no change in the footprint of disturbance, location of or quality of discharge from the Site.</p> <p>(The identification of impacts and assessment of mitigation measures in Section 5.3.1.4 of the final EA Report consider the possible presence of turtles including Blanding's turtle)</p>
13.	Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>As per a letter from the MNRF dated April 29, 2014, "The District is of the opinion that each species at risk identified under Step II should be surveyed for, regardless of whether or not the species has been previously recorded in the area, or whether previous records are historical in nature. The survey report should describe how each species at risk was surveyed for, and provide a rationale for why, if any, certain species appearing on the county/regional municipal list were not the subject of the survey. These rationales must be based on evidence demonstrating either that: suitable habitat for the species is not present on the property or, the project will not have any impacts - <b>including indirect impacts</b> - on</p>	<p>Species-specific Species at Risk surveys were not completed; however, incidental observations of all species, including any Species at Risk encountered, were collected during field investigations and are detailed in Table 3.3 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report. Mitigation measures are currently in place to dissuade wildlife access/use of the landfill property. Chain link fence is present around the perimeter of the property, which dissuades larger reptile and mammal access to the site. The silt fence along the north perimeter of the property, a higher risk area for wildlife access to the Site based on proximity to the Provincially Significant Wetland to the north, is an effective deterrent for small reptiles, mammals, and amphibian access to the Site. There are also very limited natural areas on the landfill Site itself and daily landfilling activities (e.g., noise, human presence, heavy machinery) also provide deterrents for use of the Site by wildlife. Other operational practices (i.e., daily cover)</p>



No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>the species." (Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report).</p> <p>It is recommended that MNRF be further consulted to determine the need for surveys of turtles and snakes.</p>	<p>further act to deter wildlife use of the Site. <i>The text of Section 3.3.6.4 Species at Risk has been updated as follows to reflect this: Correspondence with MNRF provided numerous SAR with a documented presence within the Cayuga area (Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report – Appendix A). Provincially tracked species records for the Study Area are shown on Figure 3.8 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report. Incidental observations of all species, including any SAR encountered, were collected during field investigations and are detailed in Table 3.3 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report. SAR sspecies-specific surveys were not completed for a number of reasons including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Natural areas on Site are very small and limited to a small section of the south boundary of the Site. This area provides little available habitat for any of the listed SAR based on its proximity to the Site operations, small size, and presence of a chain link fence at the Site boundary.</i></li> <li>• <i>Mitigation measures are currently in place to dissuade wildlife access/use of the landfill property include: chain link fence is present around the perimeter of the property which dissuades larger reptile and mammal access to the Site;</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>Silt fence along the north perimeter of the property, a higher risk area for wildlife access to the Site based on the close proximity to the Provincially Significant</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			<p><i>Wetland to the north, is an effective deterrent for small reptiles, mammals, and amphibian access to the Site;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Daily landfilling activities (e.g., noise, human presence, heavy machinery) also provide deterrents for use of the Site by wildlife; and</i></li> <li>- <i>Operational practices (i.e., daily cover) further act to deter wildlife use of the Site.</i></li> </ul> <p>Additionally, as part of proposed mitigation measures, on-site landfill staff will be instructed regarding best management practices for dealing with any wildlife encountered on Site. This includes information sheets to aid in the recognition of SAR known to the surrounding areas, along with instructions about procedures to follow should they be encountered.</p> <p>The surveys completed are considered appropriate for the scale and nature of the EA, due to the lack of available habitat on Site and no change in the footprint of disturbance.</p> <p>(Incidental observations of all species are detailed in Table 4.5 of the final EA Report. Mitigation measures currently in place to dissuade wildlife access/use of the landfill property are described in Section 4.3.4.6 of the final EA Report.)</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
14.	Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>Mitigation measures outlined in the Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix A, Surface Water Resources Assessment Report) are considered relevant in terms of assessing potential indirect impacts on the surrounding aquatic and terrestrial environment. As noted on page 16 of the SWM Plan, "Erosion and sediment controls shall be maintained until all disturbed areas of the Site, including the pond and swales, have fully stabilized and vegetated areas have achieved 70 percent of the native background density of growth. The condition of all swales, culverts, vegetation, infiltration basin outlet, and outflow channels leading to the Brooks Road drainage ditch and off Site will be noted at regular intervals."</p>	<p>Long-term monitoring associated with erosion and sediment controls has been added to the text of Section 5.5.4 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report, as follows:</p> <p>Erosion and sediment controls shall be maintained until all disturbed areas of the Site, including the pond and swales, have fully stabilized and vegetated areas have achieved 70 percent of the native background density of growth. The condition of all swales, culverts, vegetation, infiltration basin outlet, and outflow channels leading to the Brooks Road drainage ditch and off Site will be noted at regular intervals.</p> <p>Additionally, silt fence is recommended to be maintained on perimeter chain link fencing, providing the dual benefit of mitigation of any erosion from the Site as well as minimizing human-wildlife interactions.</p> <p>(Long-term monitoring associated with erosion and sediment controls has been added to Section 5.3.1.4 of the final EA Report.)</p>
15.	Grand River Conservation Authority	<p>It is recommended that the MNRF be consulted to determine the need for mitigation measures for species at risk. For example, it would be reasonable to educate the landfill operator about species at risk that could potentially be</p>	<p>Section 5.5.4 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report details recommended best management practices for dealing with any wildlife/SAR encountered on Site. As part of proposed mitigation measures, on-site landfill staff will be provided with information sheets to aid in the recognition of SAR known</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		encountered on or near the site.	<p>to the surrounding areas, along with instructions about procedures to follow should they be encountered. MNRF will be consulted as appropriate to ensure the most current list of SAR is being considered and are advised of any SAR sightings.</p> <p>(Wildlife/SAR BMPs for the Site are included in Section 5.3.1.4 of the final EA Report.)</p>
16.	Grand River Conservation Authority	The installation of exclusion fencing is recommended to prevent or minimize human wildlife interactions on the site.	<p>As per our previous comment, chain link exclusion fencing is already in place around the landfill Site, while chain link with silt fence is in place along the north boundary of the Site. The report has been updated in Section 5.5.4 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report to clarify this and recommend that silt fence be added to all perimeter Site fencing as an enhanced effort to minimize human-wildlife interactions on Site.</p> <p>(Section 5.3.1.4 of the final EA Report has been updated to clarify that chain link exclusion fencing is already in place around the site and to recommend that silt fencing be added to all perimeters to minimize human-wildlife interactions on Site.)</p>
17.	Grand River Conservation Authority	Long-term monitoring of the wetland areas adjacent to the site is recommended in order to assess the indirect impact of the proposed vertical expansion and increased activity on the site. This monitoring should include, but is not	<p>As this project suggests a continuation of the current land use and activity with no increase in footprint, and existing storm water management infrastructure is to be maintained with no changes to quantity or quality of discharge, monitoring is not recommended at this stage. Should changes to these elements be proposed, the need</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		necessarily limited to, water quality monitoring, vegetation community monitoring, bird monitoring, amphibian monitoring, and targeted surveys of species at risk.	<p>for long-term monitoring may be re-evaluated. Additional monitoring associated with erosion and sediment control monitoring has been outlined in the earlier response to Section 4.0 comment.</p> <p>Any additional monitoring will be determined during the ECA process in conjunction with the MOECC, MNRF and GRCA.</p> <p>(Long-term monitoring associated with erosion and sediment controls has been added to Section 5.3.1.4 of the final EA Report.)</p>
18.	Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
19.	Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)	A short explanation as to why Alternative Method 2 ranked higher than the other two alternatives would provide greater clarity on the decision to select it as the preferred undertaking.	An explanation as to why Alternative Method 2 ranked higher than the other two alternatives has been added to the Executive Summary.
20.	MOECC	Adding illustrations of the three alternatives methods would assist readers in the comparison of vertical expansion options.	Illustrations of the three alternative methods have been added to the Executive Summary to assist readers in the comparison of vertical expansion options.
21.	MOECC	Providing the equivalent volume in cubic metres for the annual fill rate of 151,000 tonnes per year and daily maximum fill rate of 500 tonnes per day	As per the existing Site ECA, annual and daily maximum fill rates are based on tonnages rather than volume, as measured by the on-site scales. As noted in Section 3.1, an assumed compacted waste density of 1 tonne per cubic

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		would give readers a better sense of annual waste disposal volumes relative to the additional capacity requested.	metre was used to approximate the overall tonnage equivalent of the 421,000 m <sup>3</sup> of additional airspace proposed as part of this EA.
22.	MOECC	This section implies that a review of leachate treatment alternatives is not formally required under the EA Act. The ToR Errata Letter indicated that leachate treatment alternatives would be assessed in the EA along with alternative methods of vertical expansion.	Bullet point "Review of leachate treatment alternatives" has been removed from Section 2.2.
23.	MOECC	The planning period of the proposed undertaking spans five to seven years. The starting year for the planning period was not specified.	A sentence has been added to Section 3.1 to note that the five to seven year planning period is expected to start in Fall 2017, following EA and ECA approvals.
24.	MOECC	The Report of Solid Waste landfilled in Michigan referenced in the second paragraph is dated 2013. Information from the 2015 report would be more relevant.	The volume of IC&I waste exported to Michigan has been revised in Section 3.2 to reflect what was reported in the 2015 Annual Report of Solid Waste Landfilled in Michigan. The volume has increased from approximately 5.5 million m <sup>3</sup> in 2012 to 6.2 million m <sup>3</sup> in 2015.
25.	MOECC	Support and cooperation of all partners are required to achieve the vision and goals outlined in the draft Strategy for a Waste Free Ontario: Building the Circular Economy. A description of how BRE plans to support Ontario's goals of achieving a circular economy would be beneficial in this section, in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimizing the need for landfills</li> </ul>	A discussion has been added to Section 3.2 describing how the proposal supports the waste diversion and climate change mitigation goals in the Waste Free Ontario Strategy and <i>Waste-Free Ontario Act, 2016</i> . Specifically, we have included discussion on the recognition that landfills are still required in Ontario while the Province transitions to a "waste free and circular economy". Further, there is more of a focus on existing landfills that are managed appropriately and environmentally secure to expand, rather

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensuring existing landfills are well managed</li> <li>• Reducing greenhouse gas emissions</li> <li>• Improving awareness of diversion opportunities to help drive larger volumes of IC&amp;I waste diversion</li> </ul>	<p>than developing a new site.</p>
26.	MOECC	<p>Existing odour conditions within the Local Study Area would be better characterized with reports of odour levels (i.e., odour units) at the landfill site and at receptors where odour is monitored. It is also unclear whether existing odour conditions were confirmed (e.g., odour survey with nasal ranger) during GHD's site visit on Friday, September 11, 2015. Also it would be useful to identify the meteorological and operational conditions when odour complaints are most prevalent.</p> <p><i>(Subsequent comment)</i> Added discussion of existing odour conditions in Section 4.3.1.1 will be reviewed upon the submission of the revised EA report.</p>	<p>A discussion of existing odour conditions within the Local Study Area has been added to Section 4.3.1.1.</p> <p>Odour unit measurement data for 2014 is included in Appendix A of the Air Quality and Odour Assessment Report (Appendix E-1 to the EA Report).</p> <p>Odour is typically worst case in early morning when there are inversions.</p> <p>GHD has never detected any measurable odour off site, including the post 2014 measurements.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
27.	MOECC	<p>GHD proposes to focus on PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the main contaminant that will be released at the Brooks Road Landfill Site; however, the rationale for this focus and the sources of PM<sub>2.5</sub> and other air contaminants from site have not been specified.</p>	<p>Particulate is the air contaminant of most concern emitted from the landfill site, primarily from vehicle traffic on paved and unpaved roads. It was proposed to focus on PM<sub>2.5</sub> because this is a fine particulate size that would be most likely to travel off-Site. The larger particle sizes are more likely to settle within the landfill property boundary. A statement to this effect has been added to Section 4.3.1.1.</p> <p>An assessment of all particulate sizes was; however, completed in the assessment of the alternatives. Total particulate, including all particulate fractions, such as PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and larger, were considered.</p> <p>The landfill does not accept wastes that produce significant quantities of landfill gas, such as you might find at a municipal landfill; therefore, gaseous air emissions are not a concern at this landfill.</p>
		<p><i>(Subsequent comment)</i> The EA should identify all potential sources of air contaminants from landfill operations, and discuss why particulate matter from vehicle exhaust and fugitive road dust was selected as the only contaminant of concern. The air quality assessment should summarize emission sources and provide rationales of why they were or were not assessed, as well as</p>	<p><i>(As discussed during Nov. 8, 2016 meeting)</i> GHD has added PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> model results to the Air Quality and Odour Assessment report.</p> <p>GHD has calculated the particulate emissions from truck brake and tire wear and the tailpipe emissions. These emission estimates will be added to the Assessment report with some discussion on the significance of these sources.</p>



No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>outline data sources and assumptions.</p> <p>Brooks Road Environmental (BRE) indicated that it would like to maintain the landfill's ability to accept organics in an amended ECA, should the EA be approved. The waste currently being accepted at the landfill may not be reflective of future waste that will be disposed.</p> <p>In addition, the landfill has a history of hazardous and municipal solid waste disposal. Landfill gas and leachate is being generated from the decomposition of these materials. The EA should identify existing air quality impacts from historical waste disposal and predict future air quality impacts from vertical landfill expansion.</p>	<p>The particulate emissions are a very small fraction of the particulate generated from road dust re-suspension, and will not have a material additional impact on the predicted particulate levels from the road dust models.</p> <p>The tailpipe emissions from the vehicles at the landfill are very insignificant relative to vehicle exhaust emissions that anyone would be exposed to from municipal road.</p> <p>GHD has added the background monitoring data for PM2.5 that is available from the closest monitoring station, the MOECC Station #60513 Hamilton Mountain which is about 11 kilometres from the site.</p> <p>Existing background levels of PM2.5 at that MOECC monitoring station are fairly high relative to the Canada-wide standard, however the worst-case impact of PM2.5 from the landfill at the nearest residential receptors is very small in comparison.</p>
		<p><i>(Subsequent comment)</i> Please provide additional rationale/support for the conclusion that particulate matter is the main type of contaminant that will be released from the site. Indicator compounds that will be discharged from the landfill in negligible amounts and were thus excluded from</p>	<p><i>(Subsequent response)</i> A brief section on "Indicator Compounds" has been added to Appendix E-1 (Air Quality and Odour Assessment Report) and the corresponding section of the EA Report, to list the following indicator compounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Combustion gases: Nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and carbon monoxide (CO)</li> </ul>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>further analysis should be documented in Appendix E-1 (Air Quality and Odour Assessment). The rationale for these exclusions should also be provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landfill gases: Hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S), and vinyl chloride (C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>3</sub>Cl)</li> <li>• Particulate (TSP, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>)</li> </ul> <p>A rationale for excluding combustion gases and landfill gases, and including particulate has also been added to Appendix E-1 (Air Quality and Odour Assessment Report) and the corresponding section of the EA Report.</p>
28.	MOECC	<p>The addition of a geological cross-section figure to accompany the description of site geology and hydrogeology would aid readers in understanding the existing geological and groundwater conditions within the Local Study Area.</p>	<p>Geologic cross-sections have been prepared and incorporated into the report as Figures 4.10 through 4.12.</p>
		<p><i>(Subsequent comment)</i> A description of any active groundwater wells and well head/ source water protection areas within the local study area should also be included in this section. Please refer to the Grand River Source Water Protection Plan. A figure showing groundwater well locations (similar to Figure 4.12 Oil and Gas Well Locations) would also be helpful.</p>	<p><i>(Subsequent response)</i> GHD has reviewed the available source water protection areas, as defined in the Grand River Source Water Protection Plan. Based on this review, there are no source water protection areas located in the immediate vicinity of the Site. The closest source water protection area is located near the town of Dunnville, approximately 17 km to the southeast of the Site.</p> <p>A map showing water supply wells, based on the information available in the MOECC's water well database, has been prepared and incorporated into the report, along</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>Please also include in Section 5.7.11 (p5-139), a description of the liner system, its lifespan, and how groundwater will be protected to address public concerns. The response is already in the comment tables in Section 6 but needs to be added to Section 5.7.11.</p>	<p>with a brief discussion in Section 4.3.2.</p> <p>Based on the database search, there are no domestic water supply wells in the immediate vicinity of the Site. All water supply wells identified within 1.5 km of the Site draw water from the bedrock aquifer, which is not vulnerable to landfill-related water quality impacts.</p> <p>The MOECC has set standards for landfill liners and collection and treatment of leachate. In accordance with O. Reg. 232/98, the geomembrane liner component is assumed to have a 150 year service life as part of the primary landfill liner. The standard design allows for on-going collection of leachate until the point in time that if the liner does fail, there would not be any harm to the environment. This information has been added to Section 5.7.11.</p>
29.	MOECC	<p>The locations of Outfall 1 and Outfall 2 and their associated drainage areas are not shown.</p> <p>It is also unclear whether the stormwater management system described in the 2013 Stormwater Management Plan has been fully implemented.</p>	<p>A new Figure 4.14 showing outfall locations and drainage areas as per the 2013 Stormwater Management Plan (implementation in progress) has been added to Section 4.3.3.</p> <p>Text has been modified as suggested, from "will be" to "is".</p>
30.	MOECC	<p>The "Surface Water Resources Existing Conditions" section should identify watershed boundaries, watercourses,</p>	<p>A description of natural surface water features has been added to Section 3.3 of the Surface Water Resources Assessment Report and Section 4.3.3 of the EA Report.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		waterbodies and wetlands within the Local Study Area.	<p>Draft EA Figure 4.10 (Figure 4.15 in the Final EA Report) has been modified to include watershed boundaries.</p> <p>Surface water features are shown in Figures 4.20 to 4.23 in Section 4.3.4.</p>
		<p><i>(Subsequent comment)</i> Pike Creek and Norton Creek are not shown in Figure 4.14</p>	<p><i>(Subsequent response)</i> Pike Creek and Norton Creek labels have been added to Figure 4.15 (previously Figure 4.14).</p>
31.	MOECC	The ToR (10.1.1.4 Terrestrial & Aquatic Environment) stated that existing biological features and conditions within the site study area will be identified and described in the EA; however, Section 4.3.4 states that field investigations generally did not focus on the site study area but rather on the surrounding natural features in the Local Study Area. Section 4.3.4 should describe the existing terrestrial and aquatic features and wildlife at the landfill site.	Section 3.3.4 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report and Section 4.3.4 of the EA Report has been updated to adequately describe the existing terrestrial and aquatic features and wildlife at the landfill site.
32.	MOECC	North Lands, West Lands, and East Lands, are described as rural properties consisting of a combination of agricultural land and forest plots. It is important to note that within the North Lands, West Lands, and East Lands, that there are	Reference to the North Cayuga Swamp PSW complex has been added to the introductory paragraph of Section 4.3.4.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
33.	MOECC	<p>wetland areas that are part of the Provincially Significant North Cayuga Swamp Wetland Complex.</p> <p>The EA states that no fish or aquatic habitat surveys were conducted as part of the project. Section 10.2.1.4 of the ToR committed to identifying and describing existing biological features and conditions in the Local Study Area (e.g., ecosystems and terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna), including provincial and federal Species at Risk (SAR), at a level of detail sufficient to enable the identification of potential environmental effects on those biological features and conditions.</p> <p>As stormwater and treated leachate are/will be released to the environment, it is important to identify if surface drainage ditches discharge to watercourses and wetlands in the Local Study Area, and if there could be potential impacts on aquatic habitat and species.</p>	<p>An aquatic habitat screening has been completed and the results have been incorporated into Section 3.3.5 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report and Section 4.3.4 of the EA Report. The Surface Water Resources Assessment (SWRA) Report discusses potential effects of the proposed works on surface water quality and quantity. As the SWRA report concludes there are no anticipated changes in the surface water quality and quantity discharged from the site as a result of the proposed vertical expansion, this aquatic habitat screening is considered to be at the level of detail sufficient to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of the proposed development on the aquatic features of the study areas.</p>
		<p><i>(Subsequent comment)</i></p> <p>Section 4.3.4.5 discusses the Norton Creek drainage system, but Figure 4.21 only shows the Pike Creek drainage system.</p>	<p><i>(Subsequent response)</i></p> <p>Clarification on Pike Creek and Norton Creek watercourse drainage areas has been added to Section 4.3.4.5. Figure 4.22 (previously Figure 4.21) has been updated to</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		Clarification on these watercourse drainage areas is needed.	<p>show Norton Creek.</p> <p>The turquoise line running through the Brooks Road Landfill Site shown in Figure 4.22 identifies the boundary between two catchment areas. No watercourse runs through the Brooks Road Landfill Site.</p>
34.	MOECC	The EA should mention if terrestrial and avian wildlife access the landfill site and if there records of incidental species observations.	<p>No avian point count surveys or other wildlife species surveys were conducted on the landfill property due to active operation of the landfill site and limited suitable habitat; however, incidental observations were collected at all Site visits and are provided in Table 3.3 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report and Table 4.5 of the final EA Report. The species which have been utilizing the landfill site itself in some capacity include species known to frequent landfills such as turkey vultures and gull species. Incidental terrestrial species include chorus frog and eastern garter snake (2013). Records of incidental terrestrial wildlife species observed on Site were made prior to the following mitigation measures being put in place.</p> <p>There are a number of mitigation measures in place to dissuade wildlife access to the existing landfill Site. Chain link fence is present around the perimeter of the property, which dissuades larger reptile and mammal access to the site. The silt fence along the north perimeter of the property, a higher risk area for wildlife access to the Site based on proximity to the Provincially Significant Wetland</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			<p>to the north, is an effective deterrent for small reptiles, mammals, and amphibian access to the Site. There are also very limited natural areas on the landfill Site itself and daily landfilling activities (e.g., noise, human presence, heavy machinery) also provide deterrents for use of the Site by wildlife. Other operational practices (i.e., daily cover) further act to deter wildlife use of the Site.</p> <p>As part of proposed mitigation measures, on-site landfill staff will be instructed regarding best management practices for dealing with any wildlife encountered on Site. This includes information sheets to aid in the recognition of Species at Risk known to the surrounding areas, along with instructions about procedures to follow should they be encountered.</p>
35.	MOECC	<p>Existing traffic conditions during weekday and Saturday peak periods were determine using turning movement counts conducted on December 5, 2015 and December 7, 2015. However, busier months of landfill operation occur in the spring and summer, given that these times of year typically produce more construction waste than the winter months. It would have been more appropriate to conduct peak period turning movement counts during the spring and summer.</p>	<p>As noted under the Landfill Operations heading within Section 4.5.1, a review of the existing traffic counts confirms that the volume of inbound and outbound traffic from the landfill during the two survey dates was considerably higher than the typically expected volumes provided by the operator. It was confirmed that during the two survey dates, there was a transfer of clean clay to another property that resulted in approximately 75 additional loads throughout both days. As such, these traffic counts can be considered to exceed the expected volumes during peak truck traffic periods during the spring and summer construction season. A sentence confirming this has been added to the final EA Report.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
36.	MOECC	<p>The EA should be prepared in a way that is understandable by both an expert and the lay reader. Figure 4.19 (traffic count figure) and Table 4-7 (capacity analyses table) would be difficult for the lay reader to understand without explanations.</p> <p>These comments also apply to the figures and tables in Section 5.3.3.1 (Transportation Net Effects)</p>	<p>New Tables 4.7, 5.5 and 5.6 have been added to aid in understanding Draft EA Report Figures 4.19, 5.24 and 5.25 (Figures 4.25, 5.37 and 5.38 in the final EA Report).</p> <p>Tables 4.7, 5.5 and 5.6 from the Draft EA Report (Tables 4.8, 5.6 and 5.7 in the final EA Report) have been modified for clarity and additional text explaining what these tables show has been added to Sections 4.5.1 and 5.3.3.1.</p>
37.	MOECC	<p>Section 10.2.3.2 of the ToR indicates that the "existing and planned land use component of the EA will include a review of the undertaking in reference to the MOE Land Use Planning Guidelines D-4." A discussion of existing buffer areas, and the sensitivity/compatibility of adjacent land uses in relation to MOECC's Guideline D-4 Land Use On or Near Landfills and Dumps, needs to be included in this section.</p>	<p>MOECC's Guideline D-4 "specifies restrictions and controls on land use that the Ministry wishes to see implemented in the vicinity of landfills and dumps, in order to protect the health, safety, convenience and welfare of residents near such facilities." A discussion of Guideline D-4 has been added to Section 4.5.2.</p>
38.	MOECC	<p>The EA reports that there are no recreational facilities within the Local Study Area, but mentions that both Brooks Road and the abandoned railway to south of the Site parallel to Highway 3, are identified in the Official Plan as "Identified Trail Locations". This designation indicates that there may be multi-use or signed trail</p>	<p>The abandoned railway to the south of the Site as well as Brooks Road are identified in the 2009 Haldimand County Trails Master Plan as "Proposed Special Use Routes." The abandoned railway to the south of the Site is proposed as a multi-use trail and Brooks Road is proposed as a signed route, both of which are identified for implementation in the short-term (0 to 5 years from the publication date). There is presently no indication of the implementation of</p>



No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		plans for the area (e.g., Haldimand County Trails Master Plan)	the proposed trails along either of these routes. This information has been added to Section 4.5.2.
39.	MOECC	Section 10.2.3.3 of the ToR indicates that agricultural/soils and mining features, conditions and activities in the Local Study Area will be identified and described to provide information at a level of detail sufficient to enable the identification of potential environmental effects that may be expected to occur. The EA does not describe the activities on Farm Tax Rated Parcels and Assessment Parcels (shown in Figure 4.2.2) adjacent to the landfill site. It is unclear if these parcels are actively being farmed, are being used as livestock pasture, or if they serve other business or recreational purposes.	Additional information regarding farms within the Local Study Area has been added to Section 4.5.3., along with information on Farm Tax Rated Parcels and Assessment Parcels adjacent to the landfill site.
40.	MOECC	This section should provide a more detailed description of the landfill site and existing conditions. It should indicate the types of waste accepted as well as illustrate the overall site layout and existing landfill components so that readers can understand the extent of proposed works relative to existing operations.	Additional detail regarding the landfill site and existing conditions as well as a site layout figure have been added to Section 4.5.4.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
41.	MOECC	It is mentioned throughout Chapter 4 that landfilling operations at the landfill site are slowing down as the landfill continues to reach its current approved capacity; however, the EA does not indicate how much capacity currently remains, and the time remaining before the expansion is needed.	The capacity remaining at the existing Brooks Road Landfill Site, as reported in the 2015 Operations and Monitoring Report, has been added to Section 4.5.4.
42.	MOECC	<p>Section 10.2.4.2 of the ToR indicates that economic conditions in the Local Study Area will be identified and described so as to determine any potential adverse effects on the economic (i.e., business) aspects of human activities, including, but not limited to commercial/business operations, recreational and social facilities and activities, etc.</p> <p>Section 4.6.1 of the EA describes the existing economic conditions within Haldimand County and not specifically within the Local Study Area.</p>	Additional detail on the social and economic environment within the Local Study Area has been added to Sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.2.
43.	MOECC	Section 10.2.5.1 of the ToR indicates that the EA will include studies to identify potential effects on the use of lands for traditional Aboriginal purposes within the Local Study Area. The EA does not describe the historic and current Aboriginal uses of	Additional detail regarding use of lands for traditional Aboriginal purposes within the Local Study Area has been added to Section 4.6.3.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		lands for traditional purposes within the Local Study Area.	
44.	MOECC	An explanation of the technical basis for determining a vertical expansion capacity of 421,000 m <sup>3</sup> would complement this conceptual design basis section.	The rationale developed in the ToR was based on a business case which established the total volume of 421,000 m <sup>3</sup> . The feasibility of this capacity was confirmed through volumetric calculations based on the limitations of the site geometry (i.e., slopes, footprint and height).
		<i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please add this response to the EA report.	<i>(subsequent response)</i> Reference to volumetric calculations has been added to Section 5.1.1.2.
45.	MOECC	The precipitation records from the Dunnville, Hagersville, and Simcoe federal weather stations used to estimate the average annual precipitation at the landfill site, do not cover years after 1990. The average of the precipitation records from the three stations provided an anticipated average annual precipitation of approximately 915 mm. Government of Canada 1981-2010 Climate Normals for the Hagersville station are available and indicate an average annual precipitation of 956.2 mm. Future leachate generation rates may be underestimated, if average annual precipitation is underestimated.	Annual average precipitation provided in Section 5.1.1.4 was misrepresented. Canadian Climate Normals between 1981 to 2010 for the Hagersville station were used to estimate the anticipated annual precipitation at the Site, resulting in an anticipated average annual precipitation of approximately 956 mm. This has been corrected in the EA Report and the CDR; therefore, the predicted leachate volumes incorporate the correct annual average precipitation.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
46.	MOECC	<p>Section 6.0 of the Brooks Road ToR Errata Letter stated commitments to reviewing landfill gas production/emissions as part of the air study, and to provide further commentary on a landfill gas collection system in the EA. The potential for landfill gas collection at the site was not discussed in landfill gas management Sections 5.1.1.6 and 5.7.1.6.</p>	<p>O. Reg. 232/98 requires the mandatory collection of landfill gas for sites with a waste capacity greater than 1.5 million m<sup>3</sup>. Given that the total expanded capacity of the landfill will be 1,045,065 m<sup>3</sup>, gas collection is not required. Further, given that the anticipated types of waste to be accepted will consist primarily of non-hazardous IC&amp;I wastes, it is unlikely that there will be sufficient landfill gas produced to warrant collection.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, we have revised the EA Report to include an analysis of gas generation rates using the Scholl Canyon model based on site-specific waste characterization to determine if landfill gas collection is technically and economically feasible within Sections 5.1.1.6 and 5.7.10 of the final EA Report as well as in Appendix F. The main conclusions are:</p> <p><i>Based on the low level of methane generation at the Brooks Road Landfill and the negative environmental, energy and economic factors associated with a gas collection and control system, it has been demonstrated that the operation of such a system is not considered feasible.</i></p>
47.	MOECC	<p>The identification of data sources associated with evaluation criteria and corresponding indicators are required in the EA. Table 5-3 should have a column with updated data sources.</p>	<p>Data sources used for the evaluation of alternative methods have been added to Table 5.3 from the discipline reports contained in Appendix E.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
48.	MOECC	<p>The EA should identify thresholds for each level of effect (no, low, medium, or high), in other words, specify how each level of effect was determined based on the indicators for each environmental criterion.</p>	<p>The comparison of net effects was completed using a Reasoned Argument or Trade-off method, as provided for in the approved ToR. The Reasoned Argument or Trade-off method was used to highlight the relative level of effect of each alternative based on the net effects determined by each individual technical discipline. More specifically, a relative level of effect ranging from <i>No effect</i>, <i>Low effect</i>, <i>Medium effect</i> or <i>High effect</i> was determined for each alternative by each indicator. As the Reasoned Argument or Trade off method is not a quantitative evaluation, thresholds were not established for assigning low, medium or high effects; rather, professional judgement was used in determining relative level of effect.</p> <p>Additional text has been added to Section 5.2 of the final EA Report to more clearly explain the assessment methodology.</p>
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i></p> <p>The level of significance for net effects needs to be defined with reference to a basis or standard (e.g. MOECC air quality standards) so that the assessment is not open to interpretation, and that the evaluation process is traceable and transparent.</p>	<p><i>(subsequent response)</i></p> <p>Section 5.2.3.1 has been updated to clarify that professional judgement, based on established standards (e.g., MOECC air quality standards), where applicable, was used to determine relative level of effect.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		For clarity 1st, 2nd and 3rd place rankings could be described as 1 – most preferred, 2 – less preferred, 3 – least preferred.	
49.	MOECC	The information on previous odour analyses and odour monitoring results would be more appropriate in Section 4.3.1.1 (Air Quality & Odour Existing Conditions) where existing conditions are discussed.	A discussion of previous odour analyses and existing odour levels has been added to Section 4.3.1.1. We have still included some discussion on odour monitoring within 5.3.1.1.1 to provide context to the reader. Given that odour is one of the main items brought forward by the public, we feel it is important to continually reiterate the work that has occurred at the site from an odour perspective.
50.	MOECC	Explanations of the air quality modelling results shown as Figures 5.9 to 5.20 are needed to help readers understand the scenarios being modelled and where air quality impacts are most likely to occur. The figures should show the location of site roads, berms and residences.	The Air Quality Assessment considered the three landfill expansion alternatives. Each Alternative has eight model runs (and eight corresponding figures: 5.10 through 5.33) at 25 trucks per day and 50 trucks per day for the disposal of waste in the four corners of the landfill, representing the worst case locations with respect to proximity to residential receptors and the travel length of roads. These are represented by the four possible truck routes. A statement to this effect has been added to Section 5.3.1.1.1.
	MOECC	<i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please show and clearly label the truck routes, berms, waste piles, major roads and residential dwellings (may need to change the image scale) in the model run figures.	<i>(subsequent response)</i> Model run figures have been modified to label clearly truck routes, berms, waste piles, major roads and residential dwellings.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
51.	MOECC	A description of existing worst-case noise levels at the site and at each POR is needed for comparison with predicted worst-case noise impacts that would result from each alternative method.	Existing worst-case Landfill noise contours are presented in Figure 4.5. Noise levels at each POR have been added to this figure for ease of comparison with the alternative methods.
52.	MOECC	The noise level at POR5 is shown in Figure 5.22, but not in Figure 5.21 or Figure 5.23. For consistency, noise levels should be labelled for all off-site residential dwellings (PORs).	Noise levels for each POR have been added to Figure 5.34, Figure 5.35 and Figure 5.36.
53.	MOECC	The Surface Water Resources work plan (Attachment 3) in the ToR stated that future surface water runoff and peak flows and quality conditions associated with each of the proposed expansion alternatives would be predicted and assessed based on the Conceptual Design Report. Modelling was only completed for Alternative Method 2 and the results were applied to Alternative Methods 1 and 3. Greater rationale is required to explain why the runoff peak flows, volumes, and quality modelled for Alternative Method 2 are applicable for Alternative Methods 1 and 3. Runoff peak flows, volumes, and quality from the Stormwater Management Plan should also be reported in the EA.	The slopes for the three alternatives range from approximately 23% to 26%. The hydrologic modelling is not very sensitive to slope, and we anticipate minimal changes to the runoff volumes and peak flows generated for each Alternative. Contributing drainage area, depression storage, and overland flow length are the main parameters that affect peak flow and runoff volume, and all of those parameters remain constant regardless of the Alternative. The peak flows, runoff volumes, and quality information from the Stormwater Management Plan has been added to Section 5.3.1.3 of the final EA Report.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please copy the summary table in Appendix C of the Surface Water Resources Assessment Report (Appendix E-5) to this section of the EA.	<i>(subsequent response)</i> Table 5.4 summarizing 100 year peak flows and total runoff volumes for all alternatives has been added to Section 5.3.1.3.
54.	MOECC	Section 4.5.1 states that the maximum daily truck traffic at the landfill, assuming delivery of 500 tonnes of material per day is a total of 17 inbound and 17 outbound trucks plus another one or two trips for staff. Section 5.3.3.1.1 indicates that an additional 16 trucks per day (33 trucks in total) would result from the proposed expansion during peak periods; however, the corresponding peak fill rate was not specified.	Section 5.3.3.1.1 has been updated to clarify that the transportation analysis considered existing truck traffic as identified in Section 4.5.1 (i.e., 17 inbound and 17 outbound trucks plus another one or two trips for staff) corresponding to approximately 500 tonnes per day plus 16 site trucks per day as a result of the proposed vertical expansion conveying an additional 500 tonnes per day, for a peak fill rate of 1,000 tonnes per day.
		<i>(subsequent comment)</i> The air quality assessment used an average of 25 trucks and a maximum of 50. It would be helpful to specify the types of trucks, e.g. garbage trucks, site compactor trucks etc. used in the air quality assessment versus traffic assessments for garbage haul trucks entering and leaving the site to avoid confusion.	<i>(subsequent response)</i> Section 5.3.3.1.1 has been revised to provide the breakdown of the types of trucks modelled. Conservatively, all were assumed to be waste trucks.



No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
55.	MOECC	This section references Section 2.3.3 of the CDR. It may be more helpful to readers, to summarize or copy the information in Section 2.3.3 of the CDR to the EA report. If references to the CDR will be made throughout the EA, an explanation of the purpose of the CDR relative to the EA process is needed.	A description of the CDR has been added to Section 5.1 of the EA Report.
56.	MOECC	Examples of BMPs to mitigate impacts during operation were not provided.	Section 5.3.3.4 has been modified to include examples of site design and operation BMPs to be implemented in order to mitigate impacts.
57.	MOECC	The EA mentions the design of screening berms to mitigate visual and noise impacts; however, details of the berms (approximate height, type etc.) are not specified.	The landfill is adequately screened by existing vegetation to the north, east and south sides of the Site. There is an existing vegetated screening berm (approximately 4 m high, with an additional 2 m of vegetation on top) that runs the entire length of the west side of the Site (excluding Site access points), adjacent to Brooks Road. Based on Site operations and the lack of current surrounding developments and dwellings (nearest residential dwelling is approximately 232 m northwest of the existing property boundary), the landfill is adequately screened. The need for additional visual screening will be reviewed, as required, based on Site operations and surrounding developments (i.e., additional plantings on the Site and on top of the existing berm). Renderings of the vertical expansion alternatives are provided in Section 5.3.4 of the final EA Report and demonstrate the sufficient screening measures currently in place.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
58.	MOECC	The EA indicates that mitigation measures for managing the visual and nuisance-related impacts of Alternatives 1 to 3 are to increase the height of the berm along the western property boundary and/or plant trees or shrubs on top of the berm, in addition to implementing BMPs during construction and operation. However, the types of BMPs are not identified.	Typical operating practices related to minimizing nuisance impacts including noise, litter, vectors, dust and odour are noted in Section 5.1.1.8 and Section 5.3.3.4. Reference to Section 5.3.3.4 has been included in Section 5.3.4. A list of possible BMPs has also been included in Section 7.0.
59.	MOECC	The EA should summarize the information provided in Table 5.9 to highlight why Alternative 2 is the preferred method of landfill expansion.	A summary as to why Alternative 2 is preferred has been added to Section 5.4.
60.	MOECC	<p>Clarification is needed as to why increased leachate generation would reduce the contaminating life span of the landfill.</p> <p>The addition of text from Rowe, 1990 to the following sentence is recommended:</p> <p>"For landfills with a leachate collection system which removes leachate for subsequent treatment, increased infiltration (and therefore increased leachate generation) will reduce the CLS, <i>since there is greater opportunity for contaminants to be leached out and</i></p>	The suggested text has been added to Section 5.5 for clarity and reference to Rowe, 1990 has been added to Appendix C – List of Studies and Reports.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p><i>removed from the landfill (Rowe, 1990)."</i></p> <p>Rowe, R. Kerry. 1990. Contaminant impact assessment and the contaminating lifespan of landfills.</p>	
61.	MOECC	<p>Section 5.6 appears to summarize the assessment of leachate alternatives in the "Leachate Management Plan, Assessment of Alternatives" (Conestoga-Rovers &amp; Associates, 2007) and the comparative evaluation discussion only focuses on the logistics and economic aspects of the alternatives. The ToR Errata letter stated a commitment to assess leachate treatment alternatives in the EA. The EA should assess leachate treatment alternatives against all the environmental components considered in the assessment of alternative methods, to demonstrate that the on-site leachate treatment system currently being constructed has the least environmental impact. The EA should indicate whether this new leachate collection and treatment system has sufficient capacity to collect and treat additional leachate generated from the expanded landfill.</p>	<p>A description of the current leachate management system has been moved to the beginning of Section 5.6.</p> <p>Further detail on each of the leachate treatment alternatives has been added to Section 5.6.</p> <p>The assessment of leachate treatment alternatives is described in further detail in Section 5.6, including methodology and a comparative evaluation table.</p> <p>The leachate treatment facility currently under construction at the Site has been sized to accommodate existing leachate volumes as well as future volumes associated with the expansion.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>The current method for leachate management at the landfill site should also be described at the beginning of Section 5.6 for reference.</p>	
62.	MOECC	<p>It is acknowledged that Section 5.7 presents the impact assessment for the preferred alternative (Alternative Method 2); however, the EA is missing a section describing the preferred undertaking in detail.</p> <p>Section 4.2.5 (p33) of the EA Code of Practice states that the "description of the undertaking is more detailed than the description of the alternatives....The description must cover the entire life cycle (for example, establishment, construction, operation, retirement) of the undertaking The environmental assessment must provide sufficient information so that the Minister can have a clear understanding about the undertaking about which he or she will be asked to make a decision."</p> <p>Section 16 of the ToR also states that "The final description of the undertaking will be included in the EA report"</p>	<p>A new subsection 5.7 has been added to Section 5.0 in the final EA Report that describes the undertaking in detail.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
63.	MOECC	<p>Table 5-11 should summarize the mitigation measures for all environmental components for which net effects will result from the implementation of the vertical landfill expansion. The environmental components with low (negative) net effects, as identified in Table 5-7 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Predicted off-Site point of impingement concentrations (<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math>) of indicator compounds</li> <li>– Number of off-Site receptors potentially affected</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Odour               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Predicted off-Site odour concentrations</li> <li>– Number of off-Site receptors potentially affected</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Noise               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Predicted off-Site noise level</li> <li>– Number of off-Site receptors potentially affected</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Transportation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Effects from Truck Transportation Along Access Roads</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Land Use               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Type(s) and proximity of off-Site</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>A summary of the potential environmental effects, mitigation measures, and net effects associated with the Preferred Undertaking is provided in Table 5.16. The design mitigation measures for the Preferred Alternative are summarized in Table 5.11 (Table 5.15 in the final EA Report).</p> <p>The Executive Summary has been revised accordingly.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>recreational resources within 500 m of landfill footprint potentially affected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Type(s) and proximity of off-Site sensitive land uses</li> <li>• Agriculture/Soils &amp; Mining               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Predicted impacts on surrounding agricultural operations</li> <li>- Type(s) and proximity of agricultural operations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Site Design &amp; Operations               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Complexity of Site infrastructure</li> <li>- Operational flexibility</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Social               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Visual Impact of Facility</li> <li>- Effects on Local Residents</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
64.	MOECC	<p>The cumulative effects section states that "There are no major water bodies (e.g., rivers, lakes, ponds, dam-created reservoirs, etc.) or other significant landscape features within the Local Study Area. Therefore, post-closure, the Site is not likely to cause significant adverse cumulative environmental effects."</p> <p>This statement overlooks the presence of the Provincially Significant North Cayuga Wetland Complex.</p>	<p>All Site stormwater is isolated from any leachate systems, is contained on-Site, and is routed through on-Site stormwater management ponds and into a south draining ditch on the east side of Brooks Road. The aquatic habitat screening did not find any direct fish use within the Local Study Area. Barriers to fish use exist in the Local Study Area and are described in greater detail in revised Section 3.3.5 of the Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment Assessment Report and Section 4.3.4.5 of the EA Report. As there is no proposed change from past to present discharge quality or quantity and Site operations will continue to meet the design criteria of the pond, there are no off-Site cumulative</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			impacts to water features anticipated as a result of continued operation, including to the North Cayuga Wetland Complex.
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please mention that the North Cayuga Wetland Complex is a provincially significant landscape feature within the Local Study Area.</p> <p>Please discuss potential cumulative impacts of past (Edwards Landfill site activities), present (current operations) and future landfilling activities (expanded landfill operations), including post-closure activities (e.g. long term leachate &amp; stormwater management activities) on the North Cayuga Wetland Complex.</p>	<p><i>(subsequent response)</i> Section 5.8.1 of the EA Report has been updated accordingly.</p>
65.	MOECC	The EA should describe historical climate and climate trends to identify climate change hazards of concern at the landfill site.	We have included historical climate trends within Section 5.8.2.1 of the final EA Report.
66.	MOECC	Section 6.0 of the Brooks Road ToR Errata Letter contains commitments to reviewing the landfill gas production/emissions as part of the air study, and to provide further commentary on a landfill gas collection system in the EA.	O. Reg. 232/98 requires the mandatory collection of landfill gas for sites with a waste capacity greater than 1.5 million m <sup>3</sup> . Given that the total expanded capacity of the landfill will be 1,045,065 m <sup>3</sup> , gas collection is not required. Further, given that the anticipated types of waste to be accepted will consist primarily of non-hazardous IC&I

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>The statement that the waste received at the Brooks Road Landfill contains very little organics and has a low potential for producing methane and other GHGs needs to be substantiated.</p> <p>The EA and Air Quality and Odour Assessment study (Appendix E-1) should present estimates of landfill gas production and greenhouse gas emissions during construction/operation of the expanded landfill to post-closure.</p>	<p>wastes, it is unlikely that there will be sufficient landfill gas produced to warrant collection.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, a discussion of the feasibility of landfill gas collection at the expanded Site has been added to Sections 5.1.1.6 and 5.7.10 of the final EA Report based on the requirements of O. Reg. 232/98 as well as landfill gas generation modelling. The main conclusions are:</p> <p><i>Based on the low level of methane generation at the Brooks Road Landfill and the negative environmental, energy and economic factors associated with a gas collection and control system, it has been demonstrated that the operation of such a system is not considered feasible.</i></p>
67.	MOECC	<p>The assessment of the effect of climate change on the undertaking should examine the potential severity of climate impacts on waste management infrastructure components (e.g., geotextile liner, waste piles, leachate management system, berms, stormwater system etc.) from construction/operation of the expanded landfill to post-closure. The assessment should identify the vulnerability of each infrastructure component to risks such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Power interruption</li> </ul>	<p>Although this type of analysis/ methodology was never committed to in the ToR or the Errata letter, Brooks Road has undertaken additional analysis to determine what adaptation measures may be required for the site, included in Section 5.8.2.2 of the final EA Report.</p> <p>While not currently approved, the MOECC has prepared a draft <i>Guide: Consideration of Climate Change in Environmental Assessment in Ontario</i>, which was posted to the EBR after the Draft Brooks Road Landfill Vertical Capacity Expansion EA. We have used this guide to address the climate risks to key infrastructure components at the landfill site.</p>



No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Physical damage</li> <li>• Water damage</li> <li>• Reduced access</li> </ul> <p>For higher risk components, adaptation measures should be identified.</p>	
68.	MOECC	<p>Section 8.0 (Alternative Method Assessment Criteria and Indicators) of the ToR indicates that the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative would be identified based on the differences in net effects between the alternative methods. Therefore, the identification of advantages and disadvantages was intended for the comparative evaluation of alternative methods.</p> <p>Table 5.13 appears to be summarizing the net effects of the preferred undertaking, rather than highlighting the advantages and disadvantages of this project on the environment and community.</p>	<p>Advantages and disadvantages of the Alternative Methods of carrying out the proposed undertaking are described in Section 5.3 of the EA Report and summarized in Table 5.12. Advantages and disadvantages of the Preferred Undertaking are further presented in Tables 5.16 (Potential Environmental Effects, Mitigation Measures &amp; Net Effects for the Preferred Undertaking) and Table 5.25 (Advantages and Disadvantages of the Preferred Undertaking).</p>
69.	MOECC	<p>As the Record of Consultation was not provided with the draft EA, MOECC will not be assess the adequacy of agency, Aboriginal, and public consultation at this</p>	<p>An electronic copy of the Record of Consultation was submitted for MOECC review in advance of the final EA Report submission.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		time. It is recommended that this documentation be provided before the final EA is submitted.	
70.	MOECC	Feedback and comments raised at GRT meetings/teleconferences should be summarized in this section. Records of meetings (e.g., minutes) should be provided in the Record of Consultation.	<p>No key comments were raised at GRT Meeting #1 and one request for discipline assessment reports was made by GRCA. This information has been added to Section 6.6.1.</p> <p>Several key comments were raised by MOECC at GRT Meeting #2. A summary of this meeting as well as key comments raised has been added to Section 6.6.2.</p> <p>Meeting summaries for both GRT meetings are included in the Record of Consultation.</p>
71.	MOECC	<p>This section on the changes to the EA due to public input only addresses odour concerns and does not address the other concerns raised during Public Open House #1 pertaining to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The height of the vertical expansion</li> <li>• Visual impact</li> <li>• Noise</li> <li>• Wetland protection</li> <li>• Potential for impacts to surface and groundwater</li> <li>• Traffic</li> <li>• Site life</li> <li>• Post-closure use</li> </ul>	<p>The inclusion of the Gypsum Mine Investigation Report as an appendix to the Geology and Hydrogeology Assessment Report in response to public concern, both prior to and during the EA, regarding the potential presence of karst topography and abandoned gypsum mines in the Site vicinity has been added to Section 6.7.2.</p> <p>A summary of the verbal comments received during Public Open House #1 have been added to Table 6.1. The response column in Table 6.1 has been modified to read "Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered" and the responses and/or consideration of these comments is captured there.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
72.	MOECC	<p>Verbal comments received at Public Open Houses and at PLC meetings should be noted in Table 6.1.</p> <p>Included in the Table 6.1 should be an indication of where in the EA concerns are addressed (Section 4.3.7 of the EA Code of Practice).</p>	<p>A summary of the verbal comments received during Public Open House #1 have been added to Table 6.1. The response column in Table 6.1 has been modified to read "Response Summary/How the Comment Was Considered" and the responses and/or consideration of these comments is captured there, including, where appropriate, the EA section where they have been addressed.</p>
73.	MOECC	<p>Section 4.3.7 of the EA Code of Practice states that a detailed description of how Aboriginal communities were identified and special efforts undertaken to consult them are required.</p> <p>Proponents are encouraged to keep detailed logs of meetings, phone calls and emails to demonstrate that special efforts were made to confirm receipt of project notices/information, and to obtain input.</p> <p>All comments received (written or verbal) should be documented in Table 6.1 with proponent responses.</p>	<p>The Aboriginal communities on the project contact list were originally identified based on the contact lists from previous projects conducted within Haldimand County. A November 25, 2013 letter from the Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation (previously the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs) verified that Six Nations, HCCC, and MNCFN should be contacted regarding this project (see ToR Record of Consultation).</p> <p>Copies of all notification provided to Aboriginal communities, comments received from and responses provided to Aboriginal communities, and records of meetings with Aboriginal communities are included in the Record of Consultation.</p> <p>All written comments received from Aboriginal communities are included in Table 6.1. Verbal comments from the July 21, 2016 meeting with Six Nations have been added to Table 6.1.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			<p>Comments received from Aboriginal communities regarding the Draft EA Report are provided in Table 6.4.</p>
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i>            Include text from this response table indicating how Aboriginal communities were identified, to Section 6.8.</p> <p>Please note that MAA is now MIRR</p>	<p><i>(subsequent response)</i>            Section 6.8 has been updated to include a summary of how Aboriginal communities potentially affected by or interested in the undertaking were originally identified.</p> <p>Reference to the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs has been updated to the Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation.</p>
74.	MOECC	<p>This section on land use monitoring should mention how the proponent will monitor for adherence to MOECC Guideline D-4 Land Use On or Near Landfills and Dumps, and Haldimand County approved "buffer zones".</p>	<p>Reference to Guideline D-4 has been added to Section 7.1. It is noted that this guideline describes the restrictions and controls on land use in the vicinity of operating and non-operating landfills. While it is the responsibility of operators and/or owners of operating landfills to comply with the Environmental Protection Act and O. Reg. 347 (Waste Management) requirements for the control of adverse effects caused by landfills under Guideline D-4, the onus is on both the land use development proponent to implement and monitor proper control measures associated with new, sensitive developments and the local municipal authority to ensure the implementation and monitoring of said control measures.</p> <p>The policies of the Haldimand County Official Plan requiring agency consultation and a study on potential environmental impacts of a landfill for any proposed</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			development within 500 m of either a former or existing landfill have also been added to Section 7.1. New development within 30 m of a non-operating waste disposal site shall generally be discouraged, according to the Official Plan.
75.	MOECC	<p>Other relevant contingency plans that could also be included in Table 7.3 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leachate seeps/ leachate system failure</li> <li>• Landfill gas migration/ fires and explosions</li> <li>• Surface water and groundwater contamination</li> <li>• Storms and inclement weather</li> <li>• Accidents and injuries</li> </ul>	Reference to possible other contingency plans has been added to Section 7.4.
76.	MOECC	<p>Section 7.5 and 13 of the ToR states the EA will provide a strategy and schedule for the preparation of a post-EA approval compliance monitoring plan.</p> <p>Section 4.3.5 of the EA Code of Practice states that the EA must provide a plan that sets out how and when all commitments made in the EA and any conditions of approval will be fulfilled, in addition to how the proponent will report to the ministry about compliance. This</p>	Section 7.3 lists the recommendations and commitments made by Brooks Road Environmental in the EA Report related to construction, operation, and maintenance of the undertaking. If the proposed undertaking is approved by the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change under the <i>EA Act</i> , then Brooks Road Environmental will prepare an EA Compliance Monitoring Program, which will include all of the commitments outlined in Section 7.3, as well as any <i>EA Act</i> conditions of approval. This note has been added to Section 7.3.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		information should be summarized in a table, with columns describing the commitments and the timing for completion.	
77.	MOECC	Section 14.0 of the ToR states that a specific list of other approvals required for the undertaking will be provided in the EA. Section 8 should include approvals from other regulatory agencies/authorities into addition to ECA approvals from the MOECC, such as permits from Grand River Conservation Authority, or planning approvals from Haldimand County.	Section 8.0 describes all permits and approvals required for the preferred undertaking. No permits from GRCA or Haldimand County are required.
78.	MOECC	The name of MOECC's Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) has been changed to the Environmental Approvals Branch (EAB).	References to Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) have been changed to Environmental Approvals Branch (EAB) in Section 9.0.
79.	MOECC	The column "How the Commitment was Addressed in the EA" should provide more specific details on how each ToR commitment was fulfilled.	The ToR Commitments Table has been updated to provide additional detail regarding fulfillment of ToR commitments. All section references have been updated and confirmed.
		Some EA report sections are also incorrectly referenced.	
80.	MOECC	The undertaking includes an alteration from a maximum of 500 tonnes per day to a maximum fill rate of 151,000 tonnes per	To be conservative, it is anticipated that the maximum fill rate that may be experienced at the Site would be 1,000 tonnes per day (i.e., double the currently approved

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>year.</p> <p>The EA should specify the anticipated minimum and maximum daily fill rates and duration over which the forecasted maximum receipt of waste will occur. As well, the EA should specify and address any expected impacts (e.g., traffic, dust, litter, odour etc.) caused by the maximum rate of fill and include a description of how the impacts will be addressed.</p>	<p>maximum rate), to accommodate busier months of operation in the spring and summer, and that the minimum daily fill rate would be 0 tonnes per day. This equates to an annual average of 500 tonnes per operating day (302 annually) and an annual maximum fill rate of 151,000 tonnes per year. This has been clarified in Section 5.1.1.2.</p> <p>From a noise perspective, the Site could accommodate up to 20 trucks per hour and still remain below the 55 dBA noise limit. The main noise source on-Site is the operation of the shredder.</p> <p>The air quality, odour, and transportation assessments considered a daily maximum of 1,000 tonnes per day as a worst-case scenario and an annual maximum fill rate of 151,000 tonnes per day.</p>
81.	MOECC	<p>Odour impact modelling should be conducted to confirm potential odour effects based on the anticipated maximum fill rate and the expanded height.</p>	<p>Odour modelling for landfills is normally only conducted for municipal landfills with defined landfill gas production. The landfill gas is assigned an odour concentration and the amount of landfill gas and associated odour released can be modelled. In this landfill there is no landfill gas production rate to be modelled; therefore, we cannot complete an odour modelling exercise.</p>
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i></p> <p>Odour is a key public concern as there have been odour complaints reported to</p>	<p><i>(As discussed during Nov. 8, 2016 meeting)</i></p> <p>As discussed, the predicted landfill gas generation rate at the landfill is extremely small, equivalent to the flow of a</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>the MOECC District Office. The EA should determine the predicted off-site odour concentrations from the expanded landfill as the proposed vertical expansion may result in changes to the degree and frequency of odours from the landfill site, and determine whether these changes are significant.</p> <p>The Atmospheric Environment Work Plan presented in Attachment 1 of the approved ToR stated that emissions for each alternative (including delivery of raw wastes, LFG collection system, etc.) will be estimated and air dispersion modelling will be undertaken to predict maximum air quality and odour effects associated with each of the alternatives. Predicted off-site odour concentrations (<math>\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3</math> and odour units) were identified as the indicators to assess odour impacts. This odour assessment has yet to be completed.</p>	<p>small residential bathroom fan exhaust of less than 200 cfm. This is an insignificant gas generation rate, and will be referenced in the report as such.</p> <p>There are some monitoring probes at the landfill but they have not been used to collect any useful air quality data. We expect to monitor for H<sub>2</sub>S for a short period of time to address this public concern. We will not be installing a permanent monitoring system as the amount of gas produced is insignificant and does not justify that expense.</p> <p>Additional information has been included in the Air Quality and Odour Assessment report regarding the amount of gas generated at the site being very small, and the fact that it is insignificant from an odour perspective. Reference to the site odour monitoring visits completed over the past few years, including the recent visits, has also been provided to better describe the odour emissions from the existing landfill.</p> <p>Discussion has also been added regarding how the expanded landfill would provide an insignificant change or an improvement to the existing odour.</p>
82.	MOECC	<p>The vertical capacity expansion entails re-engineering of the Site's final contours (i.e., height and slopes) within the approved fill area. Given that the ultimate height of the proposed expanded Site</p>	<p>The landfill is adequately screened by existing vegetation to the north, east and south sides of the Site. There is an existing vegetated screening berm (approximately 4 m high, with an additional 2 m of vegetation on top) that runs the entire length of the west side of the Site (excluding Site</p>



No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>(ranging from 20.69 m to 23.17 m in relation to the surrounding topography/landforms), may have significant environmental impacts (i.e., visual, odour, dust, blowing litter, etc.), the EA should provide specific design details regarding the proposed maximum height, to provide stakeholders and affected public with adequate information to provide comments. Details regarding the height of screening berm with trees in relation to the final contours of the vertically expanded Site should be provided to confirm the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation method for dealing with the visual impacts of the expanded Site.</p>	<p>access points), adjacent to Brooks Road. Based on Site operations and the lack of current surrounding developments and dwellings (nearest residential dwelling is approximately 232 m northwest of the existing property boundary), the landfill is adequately screened. The need for additional visual screening will be reviewed, as required, based on Site operations and surrounding developments (i.e., additional plantings on the Site and on top of the existing berm). Renderings of the vertical expansion alternatives are provided in Section 5.3.4 of the final EA Report and demonstrate the sufficient screening measures currently in place.</p>
83.	MOECC	<p>The EA should provide confirmation that there are no regulatory or approval requirements concerning landfill height.</p>	<p>A statement noting that there is no by-law restricting the height of a landfill in Haldimand County has been added to Section 5.1.1.3.</p>
84.	MOECC	<p>It is understood that the application for approval of the proposed vertical expansion of the site under the EPA, will consider all applicable legislative requirements, the Ministry's policies, standards and guidelines, such as Reasonable Use Policy (Guideline B-7), Provincial Water Quality Objectives</p>	<p>NA</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>(PWQO), etc., for effective groundwater and surface water protection, as appropriate to the geologic conditions, and provision will be made for adequate buffer/contaminant attenuation. As well, the EPA application should address all impacts associated with the operation and post-closure of the site, including but not limited to nuisance control and management programs, particularly odour, dust, litter, visual impacts, vector/vermin, etc., and contingencies.</p>	
85.	MOECC	<p>In addition to the requirements noted above, it is also understood that the EPA application will include, a financial assurance evaluation to confirm the adequate amount to be posted with the Ministry to pay for compliance with and performance of any required action/condition in the approval, as necessary.</p>	NA
86.	MOECC	<p>It is my opinion that BRE has addressed the commitments made in the ToR with regard to our mandate, which is defined under the Ontario Water Resources Act (OWRA).</p>	NA
87.	MOECC	<p>The consultant has attributed PAH detections to railway ballasts. This has not</p>	<p>GHD acknowledges that within the context of this EA and the evaluation of the three vertical expansion alternatives,</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>been fully explored or accepted by the ministry as there has not been evidence provided to support this statement or to indicate the ballasts are the only source of PAHs. The statement has not been properly substantiated and is misleading within context of EA report.</p>	<p>a discussion on the PAHs has not been fully explored. The annual monitoring reports (2015 and previous annual versions) have provided a discussion and recommendations on addressing the PAH concerns. The mitigation measures will be the same for all three alternatives being evaluated and, as such, the alternative selection will not alter the potential for surface water quality impacts. GHD does not believe that landfill wastes are a source of PAHs, as such the vertical expansion alternatives will not have an impact on PAHs and the proposed mitigation measures are intended to address the historical PAH impacts.</p>
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i>            Wording in the EA report was changed to state that "elevated lead and PAH concentrations were previously interpreted to be the result of an historic railway ballast stockpile located in the catchment area". What are elevated PAH results currently attributed to? Additional information/discussion is needed in the EA to address the Surface Water Reviewer's comment.</p>	<p><i>(subsequent response)</i>            The interpreted source of PAHs in surface water at SW3 and SW5 has not changed. The source of detectable concentrations of PAHs at these locations is interpreted to be the historical stockpiling and handling of railway ballast in the southern portion of the site. This interpretation is based on a thorough review of potential sources undertaken during previous Site water quality assessments.</p> <p>Between November 2006 and January 2007, railway ballast was recovered from the former Canada-Southern Railway (Railway) spur directly north of the Site (which is now part of the waste disposal Site as additional buffer land). The Railway, between Brooks Road and Windecker Road, an approximate distance of 2600 m, was acquired by Haldimand Norfolk Sanitary Landfill Inc. (HNSLI). The</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			<p>railway ballast was intended to be reused as a drainage medium in the Stage 1 cell construction of the leachate collection system (LCS). Further studies indicated the ballast material contained too many fine particles to suitably meet the design specifications of the LCS and difficulties were encountered in trying to screen the material. It was indicated through laboratory analysis that the ballast material contained low level concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).</p> <p>This material was previously stockpiled in the southern portion of the Site. The majority of the ballast has since been relocated to the engineered lined landfill cells; however, a portion of it was used in construction of the Site entrance roadway located in the southwest portion of the Site, upstream of SW3.</p> <p>Although it is recognized that some waste exhumed from the historical "dump area" may contain PAHs, all wastes landfilled at the Site are secured within engineered landfill cells that are fully lined and under-drained. All surface water that can potentially come into contact with waste or waste-contact soils is directed to the leachate collection system.</p> <p>On the basis of the above, the interpreted source of PAHs at SW3 and SW5 continues to be as previously concluded.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
88.	MOECC	<p>The third bullet states that any surface water that comes into contact with waste via infiltration through the cap will be captured and treated by the leachate collection system. The treatment system that was originally approved approximately 2-3 years ago has never been constructed. To my knowledge the design is going to be revisited so a definitive means of effectively treating the leachate is currently unknown. Also, I do not think it is a reasonable assumption to expect there will not be leachate seeps as mentioned in the fourth bullet which could have implications with evaluating and addressing potential environmental impacts. Additionally, there is no plan to address a leachate seeps if they were to occur. These assumptions are not realistic and relate both to the EA report and existing/future regulatory instruments i.e., ECAs.</p>	<p>As noted in Section 5.1.1.4 of the EA Report, the leachate treatment facility is currently under construction at the Site and has been sized to accommodate existing leachate volumes as well as future volumes associated with the expansion.</p> <p>Contingency measures related to leachate seeps are included in the existing approved Design and Operations Report for the Site and will be updated as part of the future ECA process.</p>
89.	MOECC	<p>The report states that soil loss from the steeper slopes will be minor as slope is only one of "numerous" factors. The discussion is specific to the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) which has five factors for predicting long-term soil losses on a</p>	<p>We anticipate minor variance in soil loss; however, the calculations are provided for all three alternatives in Appendix E-5. The stormwater management monitoring, inspection, and maintenance procedures for the Site should include use of staff gauges for assessing sediment accumulation. In practice, it is typically noted that the</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>yearly basis. Slope and slope length are combined as one factor in the equation and after rainfall would likely have the most influence on potential soil erosion. The report has not quantified the potential soil losses for the three alternatives or discussed the implications regarding the operation of the stormwater management pond. The report states that sediments in the pond will be removed when 1/3 of the storage capacity has become unavailable, but how this will be determined or the estimated frequency for which sediments will need to be removed has not been addressed. The issue is related to the EA report as I view it as a deficiency in the study. In the end, it may be a non-issue, but until the analysis has been completed, this is a knowledge gap.</p>	<p>sediment capture volume is depleted by 1/3 in a 5 to 10-year period post construction. The annual monitoring should identify and recommend sediment removal activities for the designed operational level of maximum sediment accumulation.</p>
90.	MOECC	<p>The monitoring program outlined in Section 7.1.4 is consistent with what has been required historically. The proposed expansion if it were approved would not necessitate a change in the monitoring locations, other than the addition of SW2, and would be adequate moving forward. Historically, the monitoring program has not been carried out as required in terms</p>	NA

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>of both the timing (i.e., following precipitation events) and required number of yearly sampling events. Accordingly, the monitoring plan is only adequate if it is completed as presented. The issue I have is that the monitoring program will not be compliant with the regulatory instrument (ECAs) which hinders the ability to evaluate potential surface water impacts because of the paucity of data. It is recommended that the surface water monitoring program be incorporated in the EPA approval.</p>	
91.	MOECC	<p>This section provides a concise summary of the net effects on land use expected to result from each of the three alternative methods. The evaluation of the alternative methods and the conclusions as to net effects appear reasonable. As this is an expansion of an existing landfill that has been in operation for decades, it is reasonable that the impact to land use change will remain the same regardless of the alternative method chosen, with the obvious difference being that operation of the landfill will continue for an additional 5-7 years and therefore, potentially result in the same types of impacts already being</p>	<p>The following text addressing the lifespan of the existing Brooks Road Landfill has been added to Section 4.5.4:        "...the remaining Site capacity was approximately 42,918 m<sup>3</sup> as of November 30, 2015. This equates to less than one year of remaining capacity based on assumed fill rates, waste to daily cover ratio, and material densities."</p> <p>The proposed undertaking, as described in Section 3.1, is "the vertical expansion of the capacity of the existing Brooks Road Landfill Site to allow the continued receipt of post-diversion IC&amp;I waste over a five to seven year planning period and an amendment to the Site's rate of fill to provide for a maximum of 151,000 tonnes per year." As such, the implementation of BMPs by Brooks Road Environmental, as noted in Section 5.3.4 to manage</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>experienced in the vicinity of the landfill for the duration of the landfill's operational phase.</p> <p>Impacts to surrounding land uses are already present and planning tools (i.e., County of Haldimand Official Plan policies and MOECC D-4 land use guidelines are already in place, and can continue to be used to ensure that land use incompatibility is properly addressed should there be any future land use changes proposed in proximity to the landfill.</p> <p>Visual impacts have been discussed and some renderings of the three alternatives have been provided from a limited number of locations. However, there are no renderings from the actual residences within the study area. Someone driving along Highway #3 or Brooks Road will be less affected by the visual impact of the vertical expansion compared to residents living in much closer proximity.</p> <p>As each of the alternatives will result in a significant increase in height, is there any</p>	<p>nuisance related effects during construction and operation considers the five to seven year planning period.</p> <p>With respect to visual renderings, the vantage points selected (i.e., Brooks Road &amp; Highway 3 intersection and Brooks Road south of the abandoned railway line to the south of the Site) represent "worst-case" views of the existing landfill and proposed vertical expansion for residences located within the Local Study Area. Of the 6 residences located within 1 km south of the Site, 3 are proximal to the intersection of Brooks Road and Highway 3 and, therefore, their views of the proposed vertical expansion can be considered to be similar to the renderings from the intersection of Brooks Road and Highway 3. The remaining 3 residences south of the site within the Local Study Area are located approximately 500 to 700 m east of Brooks Road along Highway 3. From this vantage point the Site is obscured by the forested area bordering the southeastern edge of the Site (see Figure 4.32). As for the 5 residences within the Local Study Area located northwest of the Site, views of the Site are obscured in all directions due to dense tree cover along the northern Site boundary as well as the land kitty corner to the northwest corner of the Site (see Figure 4.32).</p> <p>There is no by-law restricting the height of a landfill in Haldimand County and this includes the site-specific zoning by-law.</p>



No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>existing restriction to height such as the zoning of the property?</p>	
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i>            The public would like to know when the landfill will be closed after the expansion. What is the ultimate build-out year?</p> <p>Transportation assessments mention years 2021 (4 years from Fall of 2017) and 2026 (7 years from 2019).</p>	<p><i>(subsequent response)</i>            The five to seven year planning period is expected to start in Fall 2017, following EA and ECA approvals (as noted in Section 3.1). Assuming a start date of Fall 2017, should the planning period extend to seven years, the proposed vertical expansion would be completed as late as Fall 2024.</p> <p>For the purposes of the transportation analysis, horizon year scenarios of 2021 (i.e., five years from 2016, the year that the transportation analysis was prepared) and 2026 (i.e., ten years from 2016) were assumed.</p>
92.	MOECC	<p>The geologic and hydrogeologic conditions are described in this section. The silty clay till layer within the landfill cells is not believed to be as thick as has been described in the draft EA document and it is not possible, based on the information provided, to determine the remaining actual aquitard thickness above the bedrock.</p> <p>It is stated that there is no evidence of influence of the former gypsum mine on the bedrock aquifer at the landfill site. The objective of the gypsum mine assessment</p>	<p>Geologic cross-sections have been incorporated into the Geology and Hydrogeology Assessment Report as Figure 3.3, Figure 3.4 and Figure 3.5 (Figures 4.9, 4.10 and 4.11 in the final EA Report). These cross-sections illustrate the geologic profile on-Site, including the areas within the landfill footprint.</p> <p>The reviewer is correct in that the overburden thickness beneath the landfill cells is less than outside the landfill footprint. Within the landfill footprint the overburden thickness ranges between 5 and 9 m.</p> <p>As stated in Section 1.1 of the Geology and Hydrogeology Assessment Report, the purpose of the gypsum mine</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		is unclear and therefore, we cannot comment on the content or conclusions of this section.	investigation is to assess "the potential for influences on groundwater conditions at the Site, specifically the bedrock aquifer, from former gypsum mine operations."
93.	MOECC	These sections outline the proposed landfill gas, groundwater and leachate monitoring program in generic terms without providing details of the monitoring programs such as a chemical testing protocol, monitoring well locations and installation details (the geologic units in which the wells are installed) and the rationale for the monitoring program. The monitoring locations have not been shown on a scaled site plan.	Tables outlining the proposed monitoring locations, frequency and parameters have been incorporated into Section 7.1 of the EA Report.
94.	MOECC	Section 8 of the ToR made a commitment to utilize existing available geologic and hydrogeologic data and new data acquired through new monitoring and boreholes. It is not clear whether additional boreholes and monitoring wells were drilled and installed.	<p>Due to the nature of the proposed expansion (vertical expansion only) the existing geologic/hydrogeologic data collected as part of the on-going environmental monitoring program and from previous investigations was sufficient. No additional field data collection was undertaken to support the EA.</p> <p>Section 4.3.2 of the EA Report states that "information on the Geology &amp; Hydrogeology existing conditions within the Study Areas was gathered from a combination of secondary source research and Site-specific reports" and goes on to list all reference material used to categorize existing conditions.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
95.	MOECC	<p>The environmental assessment report includes an assessment of air quality in order to predict changes in the concentrations of selected indicator compounds. In addition to particulate matter and odour, other compounds associated with landfill operations including combustion products, and constituents of landfill gas should also be included in the assessment.</p>	<p>The primary air contaminant of concern at this landfill is particulate from vehicle traffic on roads. Odour is a secondary air contaminant of concern, but, as noted, GHD has not identified any odour off site.</p> <p>Combustion gases will only be emitted from mobile equipment such as truck engines. These emissions are insignificant and are not required to be assessed by MOECC Emissions Summary and Dispersion Modelling Report guidance.</p> <p>As noted above, this landfill does not produce significant quantities of landfill gas; therefore, there is no way to quantify or model emissions of hydrogen sulfide and vinyl chloride. These are primarily of concern in a municipal landfill that produces significant landfill gas.</p>
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i></p> <p>The EA should identify and assess other indicator compounds associated with landfill operations for the three alternatives in addition to TSP (and its fractions of PM10, PM2.5) as part of a comprehensive air quality assessment. These indicators include NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub>, CO, H<sub>2</sub>S, C<sub>2</sub>H<sub>3</sub>Cl and odour. The significance of emissions for each indicator compound should be determined through this assessment.</p>	<p><i>(As discussed during Nov. 8, 2016 meeting)</i></p> <p>As discussed, the predicted landfill gas generation rate at the landfill is extremely small, equivalent to the flow of a small residential bathroom fan exhaust of less than 200 cfm. This is an insignificant gas generation rate, and is referenced in the Air Quality and Odour Assessment Report and Section 5.3.1.1 of the final EA Report as such.</p> <p>There are some monitoring probes at the landfill but they have not been used to collect any useful air quality data. We expect to monitor for H<sub>2</sub>S for a short period of time to address this public concern. We will not be installing a permanent monitoring system as the amount of gas</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>BRE committed to reviewing landfill gas production/emissions that were to be compiled as part of the air quality assessment in the ToR errata letter. If landfill gas emissions from existing operations are insignificant (e.g., concentrations are under detection thresholds), these conclusions should be supported by information from the landfill gas monitoring network at the site.</p>	<p>produced is insignificant and does not justify that expense.</p> <p>The low landfill gas generation estimate is referenced with respect to the insignificance of indicator compounds that might be present in landfill gas at a municipal landfill.</p> <p>GHD has added PM2.5 and PM10 model results to the Assessment report and Section 5.3.1.1 of the final EA Report.</p> <p>GHD has calculated the particulate emissions from truck brake and tire wear and the tailpipe emissions. These emission estimates have been added to the Assessment report and Section 5.3.1.1 of the final EA Report with some discussion on the significance of these sources.</p> <p>The particulate emissions are a very small fraction of the particulate generated from road dust re-suspension, and will not have a material additional impact on the predicted particulate levels from the road dust models.</p> <p>The tailpipe emissions from the vehicles at the landfill are very insignificant relative to vehicle exhaust emissions that anyone would be exposed to from municipal road.</p> <p>GHD has added the background monitoring data for PM2.5 that is available from the closest monitoring station, the MOECC Station #60513 Hamilton Mountain, which is about</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			<p>11 kilometres from the site, to the Assessment report and Section 5.3.1.1 of the final EA Report.</p> <p>Existing background levels of PM<sub>2.5</sub> at that MOECC monitoring station are fairly high relative to the Canada-wide standard, however the worst-case impact of PM<sub>2.5</sub> from the landfill at the nearest residential receptors is very small in comparison.</p>
96.	MOECC	<p>The assessment focuses on PM<sub>2.5</sub> as the main indicator compound. Monitoring data for other fractions of particulate matter including inhalable fraction (PM<sub>10</sub>) and total suspended particulate matter (TSP) should also be included in the assessment. PM<sub>10</sub> is linked with health effects while TSP is a major cause of visibility impairment.</p>	<p>The assessment of the alternatives evaluated all particle sizes. TSP was modelled, which includes all particle sizes. It was demonstrated in the TSP modelling that the MOECC Regulation 419 air quality standard of 120 µg/m<sup>3</sup> would not be exceeded at the landfill property boundary.</p> <p>If it can be shown that TSP meets the standards, then smaller particle sizes (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) will also be in compliance with the applicable standards. The emission standards of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are 50 ug/m<sup>3</sup> and 30 µg/m<sup>3</sup>, respectively. However, the emission rates of PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>30</sub> from vehicle traffic on paved and unpaved roads will also be lower, by a greater proportion than the lower air quality standard concentrations.</p>
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i> The air quality assessment for the alternatives should identify the concentrations of the PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> fractions of the modelled TSP</p>	<p><i>(As discussed during Nov. 8, 2016 meeting)</i> GHD has added PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> model results to the Assessment report and Section 5.3.1.1 of the final EA Report.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>concentrations.</p> <p>Please provide the AP-42 equation you are referring to. The AP-42 for paved roads (13.2.1.3) is a calculation for re-suspension of loose materials. It's not an equation for total vehicle emissions. Total vehicles must take into account emissions from vehicle exhaust, brake and tire wear. These emissions are obtained from vehicles emissions software such as EPA's Mobile6.2 and MOVES2014. In addition, fine particulate matter (PM2.5, PM10) is a concern in southwestern Ontario, especially PM2.5 as it is contributor to smog formation. There are human health impacts from exposure to fine particulate (PM2.5, PM10) which are well documented and it is important to know the concentrations of these contaminants, any exceedances of ambient air quality criteria and frequency of exceedance.</p>	<p>GHD has calculated the particulate emissions from truck brake and tire wear and the tailpipe emissions. These emission estimates have been added to the Assessment report and Section 5.3.1.1 of the final EA Report with some discussion on the significance of these sources.</p> <p>The particulate emissions are a very small fraction of the particulate generated from road dust re-suspension, and will not have a material additional impact on the predicted particulate levels from the road dust models.</p> <p>The tailpipe emissions from the vehicles at the landfill are very insignificant relative to vehicle exhaust emissions that anyone would be exposed to from municipal road.</p> <p>GHD has added the background monitoring data for PM2.5 that is available from the closest monitoring station, the MOECC Station #60513 Hamilton Mountain, which is about 11 kilometres from the site, to the Assessment report and Section 5.3.1.1 of the final EA Report.</p> <p>Existing background levels of PM2.5 at that MOECC monitoring station are fairly high relative to the Canada-wide standard, however the worst-case impact of PM2.5 from the landfill at the nearest residential receptors is very small in comparison.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please specify how particulate emissions from truck brake, tire wear and tail pipe emissions were calculated.	<i>(subsequent response)</i> A description of the methodology used for truck brake, tire wear and tail pipe emissions has been added to Appendix E-1 (Air Quality and Odour Assessment Report) and the corresponding section of the EA Report.
97.	MOECC	In Section 4.3.1.1 (p4-11) the discussion was focused on existing PM <sub>2.5</sub> levels as it is considered the main contaminant that will be released at the Brooks Road Landfill Site. However in Section 5.3.1.1.1 (p5-26) TSP was identified as the only compound of concern and only TSP emissions were modelled in the assessment of alternative methods. TSP, PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> fractions of particulate matter should all be assessed.	Please see response above (No. 96).
		<i>(subsequent comment)</i> See subsequent response to No. 96, above.	<i>(subsequent response)</i> Please see response above (No. 96), above.
98.	MOECC	In Section 5.3.1.1.1 of the draft EA (p5-27) GHD states that "in their experience, that if one can show compliance with the TSP standard (120 µg/m <sup>3</sup> on a 24-hour basis), a site with road traffic being the major source, then the PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentrations will also be below criteria.  This is not always the case. The standards/guidelines for PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub>	Please see response above (No. 96).  The emissions estimates for paved and unpaved road dust emissions are based on USEPA AP-42 emission factor equations. Review of those equations shows that the PM10 and PM2.5 emissions decrease by greater percentages than the respective air quality standards.

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		are more stringent and are intended to be protective of health. Furthermore, the assessment should also be looking at comparing fine particulate PM <sub>2.5</sub> concentration to Canadian Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for PM <sub>2.5</sub> (annual).	
		<i>(subsequent comment)</i> See subsequent response to No. 96, above.	<i>(subsequent response)</i> Please see response above (No. 96), above.
99.	MOECC	The report includes recommendations for particulate matter emissions mitigation including paving the road from the landfill entrance.	Thank you for the suggestion. We will propose in our Fugitive Dust Best Management Plan that Particulate Matter be monitored for an appropriate period of time to confirm the mitigation measures are effective.
		<i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please include this commitment in the revised EA report.	<i>(subsequent response)</i> This commitment is included in Section 7.3 of the final EA Report.
100.	MOECC	A comparison of the 3 alternatives to the present approved landfill design has not been provided to assess the nature and magnitude of change.	O. Reg. 232/98 requires the mandatory collection of landfill gas for sites with a waste capacity greater than 1.5 million m <sup>3</sup> . Given that the total expanded capacity of the landfill will be 1,045,065 m <sup>3</sup> , gas collection is not required. Further, given that the anticipated types of waste to be accepted will consist primarily of non-hazardous IC&I wastes, it is unlikely that there will be sufficient landfill gas produced to warrant collection.  Notwithstanding the above, a discussion of the feasibility of



No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
			<p>landfill gas collection at the expanded Site has been added to Sections 5.1.1.6 and 5.7.10 of the final EA Report based on the requirements of O. Reg. 232/98 as well as landfill gas generation modelling. The main conclusions are:</p> <p><i>Based on the low level of methane generation at the Brooks Road Landfill and the negative environmental, energy and economic factors associated with a gas collection and control system, it has been demonstrated that the operation of such a system is not considered feasible.</i></p> <p>The main emissions from the site are as a result of truck traffic, which we have modelled and provided data/information on.</p>
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please see the additional MOECC comments to [No. 27] and [No. 95].</p> <p>The comment on cumulative effects on air quality has not yet been addressed.</p>	<p><i>(subsequent response)</i> Please see responses to No. 27 and No. 95, above.</p>
101.	MOECC	<p>Odour – The District continues to receive odour complaints with respect to landfill operations. For 2016, the landfill has received 11 complaints related to odour (as of August 22, 2016). It should be noted that not all 11 complaints were substantiated by MOECC personnel and</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. As part of the ECA process, we will develop Best Management Practices/Standard Operating Procedures with respect to odour mitigation. A commitment to developing Best Management Practices/Standard Operating Procedures is included in Section 7.3 of the final EA Report. In terms of potential impact of the increase in capacity as it relates to off-site odour, no</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>some are related to the same occurrence.</p> <p>The landfill has been diligent about sourcing odours and conducting complaint response.</p> <p>The proposed capacity increase could have the potential to exaggerate existing odour issues at the site. The higher tipping face (+23.17 m according to EA) exposes waste to conditions which would not have previously been encountered.</p> <p>Leachate is thought to be a major off site odour contributor; it is not clear whether the capacity increase would impact leachate quality and/or quantity of odour caused by leachate. Section 5.1.1.4 indicates that no major changes to the leachate treatment system are anticipated to be required as a result of the proposed vertical expansion</p> <p>Odour is tied to conditions of ECA/CofA A110302 (i.e., complaint response, site inspection), but is not specifically addressed by a condition. The site does not currently have an odour mitigation plan/SOP.</p>	<p>change is expected. In fact, with the implementation of the on-site leachate treatment facility, we expect odour complaints to decrease.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>Odour assessments completed to date (most recent reference is September 11, 2015, found in the draft EA) utilize data obtained from short term assessments which may not reflect conditions at the site over long periods of time. It should also be noted that in June 2016, GHD began conducting odour surveys at the Site. The results of the surveys are not yet available.</p>	
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please include the commitment to in the EA report to develop Standard Operating Procedures that incorporate best management practices for odour mitigation.</p> <p>Please see the additional MOECC comments to WM2 regarding predicted off-site odour concentrations from the expanded landfill.</p>	<p><i>(As discussed during Nov. 8, 2016 meeting)</i> GHD has committed to preparing SOPs for odour and dust mitigation, after the EA is approved, as part of the ECA application process. A commitment to this effect is included in Section 7.3.</p>
102.	MOECC	<p>Dust – Fugitive emissions are generally managed well and it is a rare occurrence if dust/emissions are observed leaving the site.</p> <p>Section 5.1.1.8 – Landfill operation does (generally) address dust mitigation, listing some possible dust mitigation techniques</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. As part of the ECA process, we will develop Best Management Practices/Standard Operating Procedures with respect to fugitive dust mitigation. A commitment to this effect is included in Section 7.3.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>which may be utilized on site.</p> <p>This increase may have the potential for increased drag out due to a higher number of trucks utilizing the site (from &lt;4 to 16). It should be noted that the Site does not have a truck wash station.</p> <p>The higher tipping face (+23.17 m final grade) exposes waste and vehicle traffic to conditions which would not have previously been encountered.</p> <p>Dust is tied to conditions of ECA/CofA A110302 (i.e., complaint response, site inspection), but is not specifically addressed by a condition. The site does not currently have a Dust mitigation plan/SOP.</p>	
		<p><i>(subsequent comment)</i> Please include the commitment to in the EA report to develop Standard Operating Procedures for dust mitigation.</p>	<p><i>(subsequent response)</i> See response to No. 101, above.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
103.	MOECC	<p>The August 10, 2016 POH#2 had one member of the community attend. The following week MOECC was made aware of an issue with open house notices not being received by residents in time to make arrangements to attend the POH#2. Canada Post confirmed that 1674 notices received on August 2, 2016 were sent out late.</p>	<p>Notice of Public Open House #2 was posted on the project website, distributed to all individuals on the project contact list via mail and/or email, and advertised in the two local papers (Sachem/ Glanbrook Gazette and Haldimand Press). In addition, notices were distributed via unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the NOA postal code.</p> <p>At the request of the MOECC the Draft EA Report review period was extended for an additional two weeks, lengthening the total review period to seven weeks. Notification providing the updated Draft EA Report review period end date of September 9, 2016 was provided through the following means:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advertisement in the Sachem/Glanbrook Gazette newspaper publications (online and print) and the Haldimand Press during the weeks of August 22 and August 29, 2016</li> <li>• Direct mailing/emailing to review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of public on the stakeholder contact database on August 22, 2016</li> <li>• Posting on the project website</li> </ul> <p>The Project Team has committed to providing future notification material to Canada Post with more lead time to ensure timely delivery to all recipients.</p> <p>Further information is provided in Section 6.0 and all documentation is provided in the Record of Consultation.</p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
104.	MOECC	Further consultation with the local municipality about the visual impact of final landfill height and grade is recommended.	As described in Section 6.0, following submission of the Final EA, Brooks Road will continue to participate on and support the Brooks Road Landfill Site PLC. Consultation activities with stakeholders (i.e., PLC, Haldimand County, agencies, Aboriginal communities, and the public) will also be associated with the ECA amendment(s) and other regulatory approvals required at the Site.
105.	Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
106.	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	No formal comments on the Draft ESR. Note the misspelling of heritage in the title of Figure 3.1, page 3, in Appendix E-6.	<i>Spelling error has been corrected.</i>
107.	Ministry of Education	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
108.	Grand Erie District School Board (formerly Haldimand County School Board)	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
109.	Ontario Provincial Police	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
110.	Ministry of Municipal Affairs	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
111.	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Ministry of	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	Housing		
112.	Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
113.	Haldimand-Norfolk Health Unit	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
114.	MNRF	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
115.	Ministry of Transportation	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
116.	Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
117.	Environment Canada	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
118.	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	<i>No comments submitted</i>	<i>Not required</i>
119.	Transport Canada	<p>Request for project proponents to self-assess if their project will interact with a federal property and require approval and/or authorization under any Acts administered by Transport Canada.</p> <p>Under the CEAA, 2012, Transport Canada is required to determine the likelihood of significant adverse environmental effects of projects that will occur on federal property prior to exercising a power,</p>	<p><i>The project will not interact with any federal property or waterway.</i></p> <p><i>As noted in <b>Section 4.5.1</b>, there are no airports or aerodromes within the Local Study Area. The nearest airports and airfields are as follows: York Aeroclub (a private airfield used for soaring, approximately 7.5 km north of the Site); John C. Munro Hamilton International Airport (approximately 26 km north of the Site); and Niagara District Airport (65 km to the northeast of the Site).</i></p>

No.	Agency	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
		<p>performing a function or duty in relation to that project. The project proponent should review the Directory of Federal Real Property to verify if the project will potentially interact with any federal property and/or waterway.</p> <p>The project proponent should also review the list of Acts that Transport Canada administers and assists in administering that may apply to the project (e.g., <i>Aeronautics Act</i>).</p> <p>If the aforementioned does not apply, the EA program should not be included in any correspondence.</p>	<p><i>According to Section 5.2 - Airport Bird Hazard Zone Dimensions of TP 8240 - Airport Wildlife Management Bulletin No. 38 (Appendix B - Airport Bird Hazard Risk-Assessment Process)<sup>2</sup>, putrescible waste landfills are not permitted within 5 km of the end of a runway for FAR 23 recreational aircraft as this area is categorized as "Bird Hazard Zone." The Brooks Road Landfill is located approximately 7.5 km from the southern end of the York Aeroclub runway and, as such, is situated beyond the Bird Hazard Zone.</i></p> <p><i>Transport Canada will be removed from the stakeholder contact list and will receive no further correspondence related to this EA.</i></p>

<sup>2</sup> *Airport Wildlife Management Bulletin No. 38 (Appendix B - Airport Bird Hazard Risk-Assessment Process* available at: <https://www.tc.gc.ca/eng/civilaviation/publications/tp8240-awmb38-appendix-b-5033.htm#5-1>.



**Table 6.3 Summary of Public Comments Received During Review of the Draft EA Report and How They Were Considered in Finalizing the EA Report**

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<b><i>Alternatives to Landfilling</i></b>	
<p>New technologies are available that make more sense than landfills. There is too much evidence of the problems caused by landfills no matter what the precautions are taken to reduce or eliminate this pollution.</p>	<p>Brooks Road is a waste management service provider that operates an approved landfill under Ontario Regulations and has a demonstrated compliance record with the conditions of their ECA.</p> <p>(see Section 3.3 and the ToR for a discussion of Alternatives To the Undertaking)</p>
<b><i>Community Benefit</i></b>	
<p>After reading comments from Councillors and Haldimand County staff wondering how this expansion is going to benefit Haldimand County...and why they should support such a project....I don't think that Haldimand County should support this expansion of the Brooks Road Environmental. Mayor Ken Hewitt has also questioned as to why Haldimand County should support it since Haldimand County has made the decision to get out of the landfill business....currently all of Haldimand County's waste is being trucked away since Tom Howe closed last fall. Good point why should we support this expansion?</p> <p>I retired from Haldimand County waste department a few years ago and I know that Norfolk Disposal and Cookson....as well as other companies etc., used the Brooks Road Environmental landfill instead of Tom Howe because of the cost. So at that time when Tom Howe was still open....Haldimand County lost revenue because</p>	<p>The Brooks Road Landfill Site (Site) supports local businesses by providing local disposal for residual IC&amp;I waste. Providing a local disposal option for residual IC&amp;I waste generated locally is an environmentally responsible practice and Brooks Road Environmental wishes to continue to provide this service.</p> <p>In terms of financial gains for Haldimand County resulting from the continued operation of the Brooks Road Landfill Site, in addition to the taxes collected directly by the County from the Site, the County also collects taxes from those local businesses that rely on the Brooks Road Landfill Site for local disposal of their residual IC&amp;I waste. It should be noted that the County does from time to time utilize the Brooks Road Landfill (i.e., street sweepings from the County are disposed at the site) and we will continue to work with the County should they require a local site for their waste material.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>of Brooks Road Environmental.</p>	<p>(see Section 3.2 and the ToR for a discussion of the business opportunity identified by Brooks Road Environmental, see Section 4.6.1 and Section 5.3.4 for a discussion of benefits to the local community)</p>
<p><b><i>Consultation Notification</i></b>            Brooks Road Environmental mailed out notices to citizens in the local area about an information session at a local hall. The notices were received after the date of the information session! This is a deterrent. What is going on</p>	<p>Our approach from the start of the EA process going back to the Notice of Commencement for the ToR was to contact stakeholders via a three-pronged approach – emails, letters/ mailouts and advertisements in local papers. The information session referred to in your letter was Open House #2 for the Brooks Road Landfill Vertical Capacity Expansion EA. Advanced notification for Open House #2 was distributed to all individuals on the project contact list via mail and/or email as well as advertisements in the two local papers (Sachem/ Glanbrook Gazette and Haldimand Press). The notice was also distributed via unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the NOA postal code. We received one comment from a resident stating that they did not receive the notice until after the Open House date. In response to this comment, we extended the review period for the Draft EA Report for an additional two weeks to allow interested stakeholders to contact us with questions, concerns, comments or requests for information regarding the proposal. We have been and remain open to meeting with any residents who wish to discuss the project one-on-one.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>During the distribution of notices for the Final EA Report, we will provide Canada Post with additional lead time in order to deliver the notices to all addresses with an NOA. Notwithstanding this, we will continue to post advertisements in the local papers and distribute notices to the contact database via email and direct letter.</p> <p>(see Section 6.6.3 for the commitment to provide additional lead time to Canada Post for distribution of future notification material)</p>
<p>I am writing to let you know we just received this Notice of Public Open House &amp; Draft EA Report in the mail today. The date on the printout for the meeting is Wednesday, August 10th, 2016. Today's date is August 17th I'm not sure who to contact about this, but if anyone is expecting people to attend meetings, it would be helpful to have the mail outs actually sent prior to the meeting date!</p>	<p>The information session referred to in your letter was Public Open House #2 for the Brooks Road Landfill Vertical Capacity Expansion EA. Advanced notification for Open House #2 was distributed to all individuals on the project contact list via mail and/or email as well as advertisements in the two local papers (Sachem/ Glanbrook Gazette and Haldimand Press). The notice was also distributed via unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the NOA postal code. We received one comment from a resident stating that they did not receive the notice until after the Open House date. In response to this comment, we extended the review period for the Draft EA Report for an additional two weeks to allow interested stakeholders to contact us with questions, concerns, comments or requests for information regarding the proposal. We have been and remain open to meeting with any residents who wish to discuss the project one-on-one.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>During the distribution of notices for the Final EA Report, we will provide Canada Post with additional lead time in order to deliver the notices to all addresses with an NOA. Notwithstanding this, we will continue to post advertisements in the local papers and distribute notices to the contact database via email and direct letter.</p> <p>(see Section 6.6.3 for the commitment to provide additional lead time to Canada Post for distribution of future notification material)</p>
<b>Employment</b>	
<p>I realize that one resident of Haldimand County Mr. Plug is employed at the landfill but are there any other Haldimand County residents employed there? So it is not a business that employs a lot of Haldimand County residents like for example the grocery stores!</p>	<p>The site employs local residents both on a permanent and temporary construction basis. In addition, the Site supports local businesses by providing local disposal for residual IC&amp;I waste.</p> <p>(see Section 4.6.1 and Section 5.3.4 for a discussion of benefits to the local community)</p>
<b>Financial Benefit</b>	
<p>There is no financial interest or gain for Haldimand County if the Brooks Road Environmental proposal goes through. I realize that they pay taxes on the property, but does that cover all the infrastructure that they are using? Our bridges and roads have extra heavy trucks/traffic on them therefore are wearing down and will need repair and replacement earlier.</p>	<p>In terms of financial gains for Haldimand County resulting from the continued operation of the Brooks Road Landfill Site, in addition to the taxes collected directly by the County from the Site, the County also collects taxes from those local businesses that rely on the Brooks Road Landfill Site for local disposal of their residual IC&amp;I waste. It should be noted that the County does from time to time utilize the Brooks Road Landfill (i.e., street sweepings from the County are disposed at the site) and we will continue to work with the County should they require a local site for their waste material.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	(see Section 4.6.1 and Section 5.3.4 for a discussion of benefits to the local community)
<p>The owners of the site are lining their pockets at the taxpayers' expense.</p>	<p>In terms of financial gains for Haldimand County resulting from the continued operation of the Brooks Road Landfill Site, in addition to the taxes collected directly by the County from the Site, the County also collects taxes from those local businesses that rely on the Brooks Road Landfill Site for local disposal of their residual IC&amp;I waste. It should be noted that the County does from time to time utilize the Brooks Road Landfill (i.e., street sweepings from the County are disposed at the site) and we will continue to work with the County should they require a local site for their waste material.</p> <p>(see Section 4.6.1 and Section 5.3.4 for a discussion of benefits to the local community)</p>
<p><b><i>Future Expansion</i></b></p>	
<p>If this vertical expansion is approved, will there be another request in the future?</p>	<p>There are no plans to expand the Brooks Road Landfill Site beyond the current proposal for approximately 421,000 m<sup>3</sup> of additional capacity.</p> <p>(see Section 3.2 and the ToR for a discussion of the business opportunity identified by Brooks Road Environmental)</p>
<p><b><i>Landfill Gas</i></b></p>	
<p>In the errata letter of January 21, 2015 there is mention of a gas capture consideration and climate change adaptation measures. These have never been mentioned in the past and may be an attempt to get you to approve the expansion.</p>	<p>O. Reg. 232/98 requires the mandatory collection of landfill gas for sites with a waste capacity greater than 1.5 million m<sup>3</sup>. Given that the total expanded capacity of the landfill will be 1,045,065 m<sup>3</sup>, gas collection is not required under the Regulation. Further, given that the anticipated types of waste to</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>be accepted will consist primarily of non-hazardous IC&amp;I wastes, it is unlikely that there will be sufficient landfill gas produced to warrant collection.</p> <p>As committed to in the approved ToR and January 21, 2016 errata letter, Section 5.8.2 of the EA Report describes how climate change, as it may affect or be affected by the Proposed Undertaking, was considered as part of the Brooks Road Landfill Site Vertical Capacity Expansion EA.</p> <p>We have included additional analysis and information with respect to landfill gas collection and climate change mitigation measures in the final EA Report, including a description of the Scholl Canyon model completed to demonstrate minimal landfill gas at the site as well as described additional climate change adaptation measures for the site.</p> <p>(see Sections 5.1.1.6 and 5.7.10 for a discussion of landfill gas collection, including the additional analysis noted above, see Section 5.8.2 for a discussion on climate change)</p>
<b>Landfill Liner</b>	
<p>Can anyone tell me the life of the liner?</p>	<p>The MOECC has set standards for landfill liners and collection and treatment of leachate. In accordance with O. Reg. 232/98, the geomembrane liner component is assumed to have a 150 year service life as part of the primary landfill liner. The standard design allows for on-going collection of leachate until the point in time that if the liner does fail, there would not be any harm to the environment.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>This information has been included in the final EA Report.</p> <p>(see Section 5.6 for a discussion of leachate treatment, see Section 5.7.11 for a discussion of landfill liner design)</p>
<p>How deep is the landfill site? Our water wells are 50-100 feet deep. If there is leakage from a torn liner, who supplies water to the residents?</p>	<p>The depth of the existing landfill is up to approximately 11 m below the existing grade around the site. The MOECC has set standards for landfill liners and collection and treatment of leachate. In accordance with O. Reg. 232/98, the geomembrane liner component is assumed to have a 150-year service life as part of the primary landfill liner. The standard design allows for on-going collection of leachate until the point in time that if the liner does fail, there would not be any harm to the environment.</p> <p>Brooks Road Environmental is required to meet groundwater quality standards for the entire site, including the existing landfill and the proposed vertical expansion, at the site property boundary.</p> <p>A description of the liner system and how groundwater is protected has been provided in the Final EA Report.</p> <p>(see Section 5.6 for a discussion of leachate treatment, see Section 5.7.11 for a discussion of landfill liner design)</p>
<p>If there is leakage into gas well pockets, who supplies natural gas?</p>	<p>A review of oil, gas and salt resource mapping in Ontario indicates that several active and plugged gas wells are located within the Local Study Area. No active/plugged gas wells were identified on the Site, however research indicates that 23 current</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>and former gas wells are located within the Local Study Area. A total of 16 gas wells have been identified as abandoned, of which 15 have been identified as plugged, and a total of seven gas wells that may be active, suspended, or abandoned are found within the Local Study Area. The gas wells all targeted the Haldimand Pool within the Clinton Group and were drilled to a total depth (true vertical depth) ranging from 207.6 to 229.5 m BGS at approximately the top of the Queenston Formation. A natural gas pipeline is also located approximately 400 m south of the Site. Due to the depths of the natural gas wells, it is not anticipated that there would be any influence from the landfill on the natural gas wells.</p> <p>(see Section 4.3.2 for a description of gas wells in the Local Study Area)</p>
<p><b><i>Leachate Treatment</i></b></p> <p>Proponent said they were taking in an amount of contaminated soil full of hydro-carbons. The leachate bacteria would devour the hydro-carbons. Would the same bacteria devour other contaminates in the leachate? We were given a list of parameters the discharged leachate was tested for. Mercury is not on the list! Who operates the leachate system when Brooks Road Environmental is gone?</p>	<p>Mercury is currently included as a monitored parameter in the leachate, groundwater, and surface water monitoring programs. Monitoring results for each program are reviewed against historical values to track changes in each parameter over time and to determine the need for continued monitoring. The list of monitored parameters may be adjusted periodically by the MOECC if it is determined that continued monitoring of a given parameter is not required.</p> <p>Brooks Road Environmental is responsible for the safe closure of the existing site and the future proposed vertical expansion. When a landfill permit is granted by the MOECC, the landfill</p>



Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>operator must post and maintain a significant financial assurance in the form of an irrevocable letter of credit issued by a Canadian Chartered Bank in favour of the Province to ensure the safe closure and long-term management of the landfill. A significant sum of assurance has already been given for the long-term management of the Brooks Road site.</p> <p>(see Section 5.6 for a description of the leachate treatment alternatives, as well as the leachate treatment system)</p>
<p>If Brooks Road Environmental get their leachate treatment plant up and running....will the leachate be trucked in from other communities as well? More wear and tear on Haldimand County infrastructure... If this proposal goes through will Brooks Road Environmental in the future be going door to door to local residents to hand out air conditioners to those who don't already have one or central air because of the odor like was done to the Hall Road area residents a few years ago?</p>	<p>An on-site leachate treatment system for the Site is currently being designed and constructed. The site is currently approved for a leachate treatment system with a rated capacity of 30 m<sup>3</sup>/day and peak daily flow of 60 m<sup>3</sup>/day. Treated leachate that ECA requirements will be discharged to the roadside ditch that runs along the east side of Brooks Road. No major changes to the leachate treatment system are anticipated to be required as a result of the proposed vertical expansion alternatives. This on-site leachate treatment system would service the Brooks Road Landfill Site only. No leachate will be trucked to the Site for treatment.</p> <p>(see Section 5.6 for a description of the leachate treatment alternatives, as well as the leachate treatment system)</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p><b>Location</b></p> <p>No resident within 3 kilometres wants this dump site in operation.</p>	<p>The Brooks Road Landfill Site supports local businesses by providing local disposal for residual IC&amp;I waste. We have received numerous letters of support for the continued operation of the Site from our local customers as well as some residents.</p> <p>(see Table 6.3 and the Record of Consultation for comments in support of the expansion received from local residents and businesses)</p>
<p>It is a done deal that the Brooks Road Environmental landfill is there but does it need to expand vertically with this proposal? No, it ticks off the local residents. My husband and I are very local residents and have lived in Haldimand County for over 60 years.</p>	<p>Brooks Road Environmental wants to be a part of the community and respectful of our neighbours. The Site supports local businesses by providing local disposal for residual IC&amp;I waste. We have received numerous letters of support for the continued operation of the Site from our local customers as well as some residents.</p> <p>(see Section 4.6.1 and Section 5.3.4 for a discussion of benefits to the local community), see Table 6.3 and the Record of Consultation for comments in support of the expansion received from local residents and businesses)</p>
<p>Find another location and a community that will welcome this type of enterprise.</p>	<p>Brooks Road Environmental looked at different ways of meeting the need for waste disposal capacity (as established in the ToR) in the ToR and also revisited this evaluation in the EA Report. In EA terms, this is the assessment of "Alternatives To" the proposed undertaking. There are a number of possible options or "Alternatives To" for satisfying the business opportunity identified by Brooks Road Environmental to provide continued</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>IC&amp;I solid, non-hazardous waste disposal capacity within Haldimand County, including: establishing a new landfill; expanding the existing landfill (vertically); and exporting waste to another disposal facility. As stated in the Code of Practice and noted previously, <i>"a private sector proponent's inability to expropriate land or implement public programs will influence the range of alternatives it may examine,"</i> and, as such, the Alternatives To explored as part of the ToR did not include thermal treatment, biological processing, or expanding horizontally onto land not owned by the proponent. In order to identify the most appropriate way to satisfy the identified need or "Preferred Alternative To", Brooks Road Environmental applied a set of screening criteria to each of the proposed Alternatives To the undertaking, including the option to do nothing. The screening criteria selected range from approvability to feasibility to economic vitality.</p> <p>Given that Brooks Road Environmental is successfully operating the existing Site and wishes to continue the business opportunity at this Site, the establishment of a new landfill site or export of waste elsewhere are not feasible options. As a result, expanding the existing landfill (vertically) is the only practical, environmentally sound and financially feasible means of addressing the identified business opportunity for providing solid, non-hazardous waste disposal capacity within Haldimand County for the next five to seven years.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	(see Section 3.3 and the ToR for a discussion of Alternatives To the Undertaking)
<p><b>Odour</b></p>	
<p>I appreciate that Brooks Road Environmental have listened to the community's concerns regarding odour emanating from the land fill and taken steps to try and reduce the odours. I still have concerns about expanding the landfill. The odours have been greatly reduced in both frequency and intensity, but I do still detect the occasional odour at our property. If the dump expands, I am worried the problem may occur again and take more months to fix. Mostly I am concerned about our property values. I plan on selling our property in the next 5 years and I am sure potential buyers will be turned off by having a "dump" around the corner. Ideally, once the current area is full Brooks Road Environmental will continue to do an excellence job of maintaining the landfill without expanding it.</p>	<p>From an odour perspective, Brooks Road Environmental has taken a number of steps to ensure that 1) the odour is reduced/mitigated and 2) that a continuous monitoring program be put in place at the site to detect odour in real-time in order to proactively address any potential issues. That said, as a matter of protocol and standard operating procedure, every complaint that Brooks Road Environmental receive is thoroughly reviewed and our onsite manager personally investigates to conduct testing and prepare a report on the issue.</p> <p>The final EA Report has included information on odour mitigation, and future monitoring, including a commitment to undertake continuous monitoring at the site.</p> <p>(see Section 4.3.1.1, Section 5.3.1.1.1, Section 7.1, and Section 7.3 for information regarding odour mitigation, future monitoring, and continuous monitoring)</p>
<p>Following up the phone message concerning the terrible smell from the landfill. At 5:45 a.m. my wife and I were awakened from the smell coming in our bedroom window. It was so bad I got up and drove right to your site to confirm it was the source, and of course it was much worse there. It is a very still morning, so it was not the wind blowing and carrying that smell that woke me a kilometer and a half away.</p>	<p>We believe that there may have been an issue from the Leachate Treatment Plant testing since that was working all week-end.</p> <p>From an odour perspective, Brooks Road Environmental has taken a number of steps to ensure that 1) the odour is reduced/mitigated and 2) that a continuous monitoring program be put in place at the site to detect odour in real-time in order to proactively address any potential issues. That said, as a matter of</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>The fact that this is the Tuesday after a long weekend, when the facility was closed, shows this is not an aberration but a daily problem that has never been solved. To the hapless residents that live across the road from your site this can only be a misery in their lives. To consider a vertical expansion, when you cannot contain the smell on a flat surface, is ludicrous. When you pile garbage in the air, to cap the top of it will be even less successful. Just letting you know how intolerable this situation is.</p>	<p>protocol and standard operating procedure, every complaint that Brooks Road Environmental receive is thoroughly reviewed and our onsite manager personally investigates to conduct testing and prepare a report on the issue.</p> <p>The final EA Report includes information on odour mitigation, and future monitoring, including a commitment to undertake continuous monitoring at the site.</p> <p>(see Section 4.3.1.1, Section 5.3.1.1.1, Section 7.1, and Section 7.3 for information regarding odour mitigation, future monitoring, and continuous monitoring)</p>
<p>At the last PLC meeting there was an issue with the citizens about smells. It was mentioned by the proponent that there were very few logged complaints. Let's face it, there will be people who smell it but don't know where it is coming from, others that smell it but don't know how to complain. The proponent said at the last PLC meeting the smells were not methane gas and yet in the errata letter they talk of gas capture?</p>	<p>The following operational measures are currently implemented in order to reduce and/or mitigate odour impacts from the Site and will continue throughout the vertical expansion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuing with the daily odour monitoring program carried out by the Site Operator</li> <li>• If odours are evident on the property boundary, increase the amount of daily cover applied on the waste</li> <li>• Minimize the active working face. Apply interim cover at a minimum thickness of 300 mm on areas of the landfill where landfilling has ceased for 6 months or more</li> <li>• Limit exposed areas of the leachate collection system</li> <li>• When not in use, ensure blind flanges are placed on leachate collection system cleanouts and sump risers</li> </ul>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make every effort to limit spilled leachate within the leachate storage tank (Baker Area) containment area and immediately clean up any spills when they occur</li> <li>• Continue with the use of odour control granules for odour mitigation. Assess areas of placement and their effect on odour mitigation.</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to continue and modify, as necessary, these odour control measures is included in this EA Report. As an example, Brooks Road Environmental has made the commitment to implement continuous odour monitoring on-site in order to address comments and concerns from the public around odour.</p> <p>(see Section 4.3.1.1, Section 5.3.1.1.1, Section 7.1, and Section 7.3 for information regarding odour mitigation, future monitoring, and continuous monitoring)</p>
<p>I walk my dog each morning on the Townline Road from the west side of Hwy. 54 to the old railway crossing on Townline about a kilometer east of Hwy. 54. Many mornings there has been a smell which I associate with the dump and have noticed it varies day to day. Today it is worst. Last week I read about a purposed expansion for the Brooks Road site. There is no possible way this can be supported, when speaking with people living in the Montour Road survey, in town and those living near to the site many of them complain about the smell daily. Such an expansion should not be considered.</p>	<p>The following operational measures are currently implemented in order to reduce and/or mitigate odour impacts from the Site and will continue throughout the vertical expansion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuing with the daily odour monitoring program carried out by the Site Operator</li> <li>• If odours are evident on the property boundary, increase the amount of daily cover applied on the waste</li> <li>• Minimize the active working face. Apply interim cover at a minimum thickness of 300 mm on areas of the landfill where landfilling has ceased for 6 months or more</li> </ul>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit exposed areas of the leachate collection system</li> <li>• When not in use, ensure blind flanges are placed on leachate collection system cleanouts and sump risers</li> <li>• Make every effort to limit spilled leachate within the leachate storage tank (Baker Area) containment area and immediately clean up any spills when they occur</li> <li>• Continue with the use of odour control granules for odour mitigation. Assess areas of placement and their effect on odour mitigation.</li> </ul> <p>A commitment to continue and modify, as necessary, these odour control measures is included in this EA. As an example, Brooks Road Environmental has made the commitment to implement continuous odour monitoring on-site in order to address comments and concerns from the public around odour.</p> <p>(see Section 4.3.1.1, Section 5.3.1.1.1, Section 7.1, and Section 7.3 for information regarding odour mitigation, future monitoring, and continuous monitoring)</p>
<p><b><i>Opposed to the Vertical Expansion</i></b></p> <p>The environmental assessment talks of alternatives. The best alternative is no expansion.</p>	<p>Brooks Road Environmental looked at different ways of meeting the need for waste disposal capacity (as established in the ToR) in the ToR and also revisited this evaluation in the EA Report. In EA terms, this is the assessment of "Alternatives To" the proposed undertaking. There are a number of possible options or 'Alternatives To' for satisfying the business opportunity identified by Brooks Road Environmental to provide continued IC&amp;I solid,</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>non-hazardous waste disposal capacity within Haldimand County, including: establishing a new landfill; expanding the existing landfill (vertically); and exporting waste to another disposal facility. As stated in the Code of Practice and noted previously, <i>"a private sector proponent's inability to expropriate land or implement public programs will influence the range of alternatives it may examine,"</i> and, as such, the Alternatives To explored as part of the ToR did not include thermal treatment, biological processing, or expanding horizontally onto land not owned by the proponent. In order to identify the most appropriate way to satisfy the identified need or "Preferred Alternative To", Brooks Road Environmental applied a set of screening criteria to each of the proposed Alternatives To the undertaking, including the option to do nothing. The screening criteria selected range from approvability to feasibility to economic vitality.</p> <p>Given that Brooks Road Environmental is successfully operating the existing Site and wishes to continue the business opportunity at this Site, the establishment of a new landfill site or export of waste elsewhere are not feasible options. As a result, expanding the existing landfill (vertically) is the only practical, environmentally sound and financially feasible means of addressing the identified business opportunity for providing solid, non-hazardous waste disposal capacity within Haldimand County for the next five to seven years.</p>



Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>My husband and I are very much against the Brooks Road Environmental proposal. Where or when is it going to stop? I think that the Haldimand County Mayor and Councillors need to get behind the residents and NOT support the Brooks Road Environmental proposal!</p>	<p>(see Section 3.3 and the ToR for a discussion of Alternatives To the Undertaking)</p> <p>Brooks Road Environmental wants to be a part of the Community and respectful of our neighbours. The Site supports local businesses by providing local disposal for residual IC&amp;I waste. We have received numerous letters of support for the continued operation of the Site from our local customers as well as some residents.</p> <p>(see Section 4.6.1 and Section 5.3.4 for a discussion of benefits to the local community), see Table 6.3 and the Record of Consultation for comments in support of the expansion received from local residents and businesses)</p>
<p>No expansion is the only expansion; council should not give you the time of day!</p>	<p>Brooks Road Environmental looked at different ways of meeting the need for waste disposal capacity (as established in the ToR) in the ToR and also revisited this evaluation in the EA Report. In EA terms, this is the assessment of "Alternatives To" the proposed undertaking. There are a number of possible options or 'Alternatives To' for satisfying the business opportunity identified by Brooks Road Environmental to provide continued IC&amp;I solid, non-hazardous waste disposal capacity within Haldimand County, including: establishing a new landfill; expanding the existing landfill (vertically); and exporting waste to another disposal facility. As stated in the Code of Practice and noted previously, <i>"a private sector proponent's inability to expropriate land or implement public programs will influence the range of alternatives it may examine,"</i> and, as such, the Alternatives To explored as part of the ToR did not include thermal treatment,</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	<p>biological processing, or expanding horizontally onto land not owned by the proponent. In order to identify the most appropriate way to satisfy the identified need or "Preferred Alternative To", Brooks Road Environmental applied a set of screening criteria to each of the proposed Alternatives To the undertaking, including the option to do nothing. The screening criteria selected range from approvability to feasibility to economic vitality.</p> <p>Given that Brooks Road Environmental is successfully operating the existing Site and wishes to continue the business opportunity at this Site, the establishment of a new landfill site or export of waste elsewhere are not feasible options. As a result, expanding the existing landfill (vertically) is the only practical, environmentally sound and financially feasible means of addressing the identified business opportunity for providing solid, non-hazardous waste disposal capacity within Haldimand County for the next five to seven years.</p> <p>(see Section 3.3 and the ToR for a discussion of Alternatives To the Undertaking)</p>
<p><b><i>Remediation of the Former Landfill</i></b></p>	
<p>Brooks Road Environmental has done a great job of refurbishing the old landfill site and making it less harmful to the environment.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<b>Site Design</b>	
<p>Back in 2004 when the landfill site was starting the reactivation, there was an environmental assessment done with all the engineering approvals. How can adding 70% more fill on top be environmentally sound? Can the subsurface take the added weight, without subsidence? Can the liner and leachate system take the added weight without a failure?</p>	<p>As part of the current EA, we are required to review the technical aspects of the proposed vertical expansion. We have demonstrated through our analysis that the existing infrastructure, including the liner, leachate collection system and other ancillary infrastructure will accommodate the expansion and will operate in accordance with O. Reg. 232/98 and the approvals in place.</p> <p>(see Section 5.7 for a description of the Preferred Undertaking)</p>
<b>Source of Waste</b>	
<p>Most of the industrial waste is coming from other communities although some is coming from Haldimand County.</p>	<p>Many local businesses rely on the Brooks Road Landfill Site for local disposal of their residual IC&amp;I waste. It should be noted that the County does from time to time utilize the Brooks Road Landfill (i.e., street sweepings from the County are disposed at the site) and we will continue to work with the County should they require a local site for their waste material.</p> <p>(see Section 3.2 and the ToR for a discussion of the business opportunity identified by Brooks Road Environmental, see Section 4.6.1 and Section 5.3.4 for a discussion of benefits to the local community)</p>
<p>Let Toronto and other municipalities take care of their own garbage.</p>	<p>Many local businesses rely on the Brooks Road Landfill Site for local disposal of their residual IC&amp;I waste. It should be noted that the County does from time to time utilize the Brooks Road Landfill (i.e., street sweepings from the County are disposed at the site) and we will continue to work with the County should they require a local site for their waste material.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
	(see Section 3.2 and the ToR for a discussion of the business opportunity identified by Brooks Road Environmental, see Section 4.6.1 and Section 5.3.4 for a discussion of benefits to the local community)
<p><b><i>Support for the Vertical Capacity Expansion</i></b></p>	
<p>We have been working with the Cayuga Landfill (Brooks Road Environmental) for the past several years. We find their service crucial in order to service our customers in a timely and cost effective manner. As a relatively small business we do not have the resources to handle all of our garbage to alternative landfill sites that are hours away.</p> <p>We fully support the expansion of this dump so they can continue to provide a fair and competitive landfill for our business and many other small businesses in the area. Please take this into consideration as you are making your decision.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am writing in regard to the Brooks Rd landfill vertical expansion. I think it is essential for this type of business to be able to provide an opportunity for local business to be able to use their services within Haldimand County. If they need to make this expansion to continue to operate I think it is necessary. I have driven past the landfill on many occasions and have seen the progress they have made and the improvements they have done with cleaning up the area and are still doing. As far as I am concerned they are moving forward in the right direction to making this a long term facility.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>This letter is to express my support for the vertical expansion of the Brooks Road Facility. I have been working with this facility and cannot believe the changes and improvements that have been done to this site over the years. I do a lot of work for local businesses in Haldimand County and if it was not for Brooks Road Landfill, many local businesses would not be able to survive if they had to transport waste material outside of Haldimand County. The location of the facility is very central to the County and in my opinion is very well managed and operated. In my opinion the vertical expansion is minor, is built on the existing footprint and had been originally approved many years ago before it was cut back into two permits. The Province is not approving any new landfills so the preservation and expansion of well-run existing ones is critical to the local, regional and provincial economy.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>Please accept this letter in support of the proposed Brooks Road Landfill vertical expansion to the existing landfill footprint. It is our understanding that Brooks Road Landfill (in Cayuga) has proposed to expand the site vertically, thereby extending its life by approximately 5-7 years. As per the draft ToR Brooks hopes to add about 421,000 m<sup>3</sup> of capacity to the site, and on top of the vertical expansion, they also want to go from a daily maximum fill rate to an annual maximum fill rate, allowing them some flexibility in taking on larger loads on busier days of the year. At the end of the year, the fill rate would still be the same at 151,000 tonnes/year.</p> <p>In conclusion we support the proposed Brooks Road Landfill vertical expansion as outlined in their ToR.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>Thought I would let you know that I received info from the Brooks Landfill concerning your vertical expansion that is under review as we speak. I have watched the development of this site over time and have also visited the site in its initial stages as well as driven by a number of times out of interest. I know that landfills are a contentious subject at best but, such as it is, a necessity. Your site has always appeared to be neat, clean and presentable. I have never seen any amount of excess traffic and certainly not any backup of traffic caused by your site. I noted no excessive noise or smell during my drive by as well. I know that any type of change or expansion connected to a landfill will usually bring some form of opposition but I just wanted you to know that by your operations to date that there would appear to be no reason for me to oppose your vertical expansion. I'm sure you and your staff will keep trying to keep this site in good order, as you have in the past, to ensure that there will be minimal concern re issues connected to this site. Please keep me posted in your future endeavours.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>I am writing in support of the proposed vertical expansion of the Brooks Road Environmental facility. I am a retired elementary school teacher and a partner in a local automobile end-of-life recycling facility, otherwise known as a scrap yard. While I understand the "NIMBY" mindset that opponents of the Brooks Road facility are basing their opinions on, it is important to recognize that the present owners of this facility are not operating in the same manner as the previous owners. Looking through all the information on the company website it is obvious that it is an environmentally conscious firm. Clearly the improvements that have been made to this facility to mitigate concerns of leakage or</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>contamination go above and beyond minimum standards. Past practices by previous ownership were not acceptable and Brooks Road Environmental has addressed these through massive investments. Again, in reading through this information, improvements have not just been made as stop-gap measures to mitigate present concerns, but have been done to ensure a safe facility where leeching and seepage should not be an issue. The fact of the matter is that this type of facility, especially since it has been improved to exceed minimum standards, is vital to our local economy. Industrial, commercial and residential waste has to go somewhere, so why not in a facility that can handle it? I commend Brooks Road Environmental for recognizing and accepting that there are legitimate and serious issues in the handling of these wastes. As I said at the start of this letter, the "NIMBY" mindset is understandable, but that alone cannot and should not be enough to decline the proposed expansion. Brooks Road Environmental has certainly gone above and beyond, at great expense, to ensure that this facility operates in a safe and environmentally responsible manner.</p>	
<p>This letter is to express our support for the vertical expansion of the Brooks Road facility.</p> <p>We have an excellent working relationship with Brooks Road and rely heavily on them as a local partner in ensuring that waste is disposed of at a fair price and at the highest environmental standards.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>Having a close and efficient means of disposal of waste is critical to the business community in and around Haldimand Country and we believe that the preservation and support of jobs and businesses should remain paramount to our elected officials.</p> <p>We support the vertical expansion of this facility.</p>	
<p>I wish to share my thoughts on Brooks Road Environmental and my business dealings with them.</p> <p>We have been dealing with Brooks Road Environmental for several years now. Our main business with Brooks Road is picking up their scrap tires, which go for recycling through the Ontario Tire Stewardship program. The purpose of the OTS program is to keep waste tires out of the landfills through recycle and repurpose. These tires could have easily been put into the landfill to never be seen again. Brooks Road took the initiative to reach out to us, in order to find a plan for their accumulation of waste tires.</p> <p>Through the last few years, the commitments to improvements in operations are very evident. The changes I have seen include a new scale, improved road ways, a new cell, a big reduction in debris around the site, and Brooks Road is also kept clean and tidy by their road brush.</p> <p>The improvements are such a positive turn for a site that may have lacked the amount of care and attention that should have been provide by the previous owners. I have no doubt in my mind that Brooks Road are doing what they can to constantly maintain and</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>



Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>improve their operations in order to make the landfill a sustainable service for the community, while employing local residents, for many years to come.</p>	
<p>I would like to express my support for the proposed vertical expansion of the Brooks Road Landfill.</p> <p>As a small business owner in the trucking industry, I know that all of our businesses, ventures and residents create garbage and it must to go somewhere. I believe it would an ideal fit for the community and county to allow the vertical expansion of Brooks Road to be approved. The Brooks Road site already has the infrastructure in place to receive waste and it is an advantage for our local economy to have the site remain open to keep our operators in the area. I encourage you to support this expansion.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>Brooks Road has been very beneficial for our business. The prices we get are very competitive and they are always willing to help. As a local small business we appreciate the efforts they have shown in continuing to work with is with our needs. Dan's Roofing and Siding supports the vertical expansion as it will allow our business to continue to stay competitive.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>Supports the vertical expansion. Brooks Road Environmental have reached out numerous times for work to be done on their site. Them working with us shows the willingness to help out the small business in the community. The work they have done to improve their site is noticeable and we hope to continue to have a strong relationship with them going forward.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
<p>I am writing in support of Brooks Road Landfill's proposed vertical expansion. I operate a small local waste management company and have been using Brooks Road for the past few years. I find them to be very competent operators. The facility is clean, safe, and efficient. I have observed their staff conducting regular odour checks, and have noted that the road leading to their site is always kept clean and swept.</p> <p>The management and staff at Brooks Road are very supportive of local business. They extend smaller local companies special pricing normally reserved for large companies. This allows us to remain competitive against large multi-nationals.</p> <p>Because having an inexpensive and secure method of waste disposal in the community is absolutely essential for any local economy, I encourage you to support this expansion.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>We have had the pleasure of using Brooks Road landfill site off and on for the past 5 years. It is always a clean facility with easy and safe access for our vehicles.</p> <p>Brooks Road is the only private landfill facility in Haldimand County. When operating a small business, keeping our operating costs low is imperative to our survival. Brooks road does just that. They charge a reasonable rate and the accessibility is fantastic. We are eagerly awaiting their re-opening as we now have to haul all of our waste material into Hamilton, drastically increasing our trucking fuel costs.</p> <p>Please accept this letter as a raving endorsement of the Brooks Road Landfill Site, we are in desperate need of the facility.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>

**Table 6.4 Summary of Aboriginal Community Comments Received During Review of the Draft EA Report and How They Were Considered in Finalizing the EA Report**

No.	Aboriginal Community	Comment Summary	Response/How Comment Was Considered in Finalizing the EA Report
1	HDI	No comments on the Draft EA Report, as discussed during August 9, 2016 follow-up call to the Notice of Availability of the Draft EA Report.	HDI will continue to be informed throughout EA process and will receive a copy of the final EA Report for review and comment.
2	HCCC	No comments submitted. Voicemail left on August 9, 2016 follow-up call to the Notice of Availability of the Draft EA Report.	HCCC will continue to be informed throughout EA process and will receive a copy of the final EA Report for review and comment.
3	Six Nations	No comments submitted. Voicemail left on August 9, 2016 follow-up call to the Notice of Availability of the Draft EA Report. No comments on the Draft EA Report noted during subsequent call on October 31, 2016 regarding attendance at the PLC.	Six Nations will continue to be informed throughout EA process and will receive a copy of the final EA Report for review and comment.
4	MNCFN	No comments on the Draft EA Report, as discussed during August 9, 2016 follow-up call to the Notice of Availability of the Draft EA Report.	MNCFN will continue to be informed throughout EA process and will receive a copy of the final EA Report for review and comment.
5	Metis Nation of Ontario (representative for MNO Hamilton-Wentworth Metis Council)	No comments on the Draft EA Report, as discussed during August 9, 2016 follow-up call to the Notice of Availability of the Draft EA Report.	MNO will continue to be informed throughout EA process and will receive a copy of the final EA Report for review and comment.

Two meetings were held with MOECC staff in order to clarify their comments and come to a resolution on how to consider them as part of finalizing the Draft EA Report.

The first meeting took place on September 21, 2016 between Brooks Road Environmental, GHD and the MOECC EA Project Officer to review and discuss MOECC comments on the Draft EA Report.

The second meeting was held via teleconference on November 8, 2016 to discuss MOECC comments on the Draft EA Report and GHD responses specifically related to Air Quality and Odour. In attendance were GHD Air Quality and Odour specialists and a Planner and from the MOECC the EA Project Officer, West Central Region staff, and Hamilton District Office staff. Notes from this meeting are provided in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment C)**.

The Draft EA Report was finalized for formal submission to the MOECC taking into consideration the comments received from agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of the public during the review of the Draft EA Report.

## **6.12 Formal EA Submission Consultation**

In accordance with the MOECC's Code of Practice for Preparing and Reviewing Environmental Assessments in Ontario (January 2014), the EA Report was submitted to the MOECC for a decision by the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change on the proposed undertaking. The formal review period for the EA Report started on February 10, 2017.

### **6.12.1 Notification and Availability of the EA Report for Review**

The EA Report was available for review on the project specific website ([www.brenvironmental.com](http://www.brenvironmental.com)) and at the following locations from February 10, 2017 to March 31, 2017:

- Haldimand County Office (45 Munsee Street North, Cayuga, ON N0A 1E0)
- Cayuga Public Library (28 Cayuga Street North, Cayuga, ON N0A 1E0)
- MOECC, Hamilton District Office (Ellen Fairclough Building, 9th Floor, 119 King Street West, Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y7)
- MOECC, Environmental Approvals Branch (135 St. Clair Avenue West 1st Floor, Toronto, ON M4V 1P5)

The EA Report was also provided directly to agencies and Aboriginal communities in a format of their choice (hard copy and/or electronic versions) prior to the start of the formal review period.

Notification of the availability of the EA Report for review was provided through the following means:

- Advertisement in the Sachem/Glanbrook Gazette newspaper publications (online and print) and the Haldimand Press during the weeks of February 6, 2017 and February 13, 2017
- Direct mailing/emailing to review agencies, Aboriginal communities, and members of public on the stakeholder contact database during the week of February 6, 2017
- Unaddressed Canada Post mail-drop to 1,674 addresses within the NOA postal code, covering the town of Cayuga, during the week of February 6, 2017
- Posting on the project website

A copy of the Notice of Submission is included in **Supporting Document #1 – Record of Consultation (Attachment L)**.

### **6.13 Commitments for On-Going Consultation**

Following submission of the final EA, Brooks Road will continue to participate on and support the Brooks Road Landfill Site PLC. Consultation activities with stakeholders (i.e., PLC, Haldimand County, agencies, Aboriginal communities, and the public) will also be associated with the ECA amendment(s) and other regulatory approvals required at the Site.