

Minutes

March 07, 2024

Project name	Brooks Road Landfill	From	Katrina McCullough
Subject	2024 Brooks Road PLC #1	Tel	+1 416-866-2365
Date/Time	March 7, 2024/ 7:00pm-8:00pm	Project no.	018235
Attendees	Katrina McCullough (KM) – GHD Shelly Reed (SR) – GHD Ben Kempel (BK) - GHD Ryan Loveday (RL) – GHD Tim Danyliw (TD) – BRE Jordan Balch (JB) – MECP Hamilton District Dave Bruce (DB) - PLC Member, Chair Diane Manto (DM) – Member of the Public Laurie Woolner (LW) – PLC Member Richard Clark (RC) – Member of the Public Jane Van Dalen (JV) – Member of the Public John Metcalfe – Ward 2 Councillor Mike Pearson – Sachem Spectator	Copy to:	All Attendees

Summary of Action Items and Commitments

- KM will confirm if there is a limitation to the number of individual EAs that can be used.

Minutes	Action
Objectives and Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Introductions were completed for all in attendance. – KM provided an overview of the meeting agenda. – KM reviewed the ground rules as well as the purpose and objectives of the meeting. – SR introduced herself as the new facilitator for future meetings and BK introduced himself as the new project manager

Minutes	Action
Review of Previous Minutes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Previous minutes were accepted with no changes
Site Updates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD provided the Site Update. – TD noted that raw leachate is hauled to a licensed facility, and treated effluent is hauled to Dunnville WWTP. – Batch discharge to the roadside ditch has continued. – Planned leachate treatment plant maintenance (new membranes, purchased), installation planned for April. – BRE has submitted an ECA amendment to the MECP to bring the Dissolved Air Flotation (DAF) into the Leachate Treatment Plant approval, waiting for comments. – TD noted that zero complaints have been received through 2023 to present. – TD summarized the effluent leachate hauled off-Site from October 2023 to February 2024. BRE has treated and hauled 7 million litres. Tim noted that the 2024 interim leachate level 191.3 m AMSL, to be met by March 27 (+/- 15 days). TD noted the hauling rate has increased, including 6 tanker truck loads per day (1.1 million litres per week). – JB inquired about treated effluent. TD noted that treated effluent is discharged by batch or hauled to a Haldiman County WWTP. – RC inquired about the type of waste received as well as leachate generation. TD outlined how leachate is generated, saying that most doesn't infiltrate throughout but runs off the top and is collected, and that soil is received at the Site. RC asked why soil is disposed of at this landfill. KM responded that it needs to be disposed of at a licenced engineered landfill. DM inquired about contamination, TD noted for the most part is hydrocarbon. TD noted that the standards that it has to meet (O.Reg 347 Schedule 4) are strict. LW asked to confirm that some rain does infiltrate through the waste. TD responded that yes it does. – RC asked about the waste being received and the smell if its just hydrocarbons. TD noted that when the vertical expansion was in place, the waste type received had changed. TD noted complaints and odour have reduced since 2021, with one complaint in 2022. RC noted he agreed and that it has improved. TD noted that hauling raw leachate induces some potential odours (during tank filling) as well. DM noted that BRE depends on the winds to take care of odour and noted it doesn't make sense to make a complaint as BRE notes that it is other sources. DM noted that when there is no wind and lots of fog the odour is strong.

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD noted there is some venting at the Site but the odour is likely attributed to leachate pumping and hauling. TD confirmed no restaurant waste going into the landfill. – DB asked JB how he is going to confirm compliance with the levels on March 27. JB noted he'll go through the reports. RL noted that documentation is provided to the MECP within 15 days of March 27 (based on the pressure transducer and local level). JB said MECP keeps these records to ensure compliance and that we're progressing towards compliance, and that samples are checked and monitored.
Landfill Life Expectancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RL reviewed the landfill life expectancy based on the January 2024 survey and projected tonnage and waste characteristics (type, compaction, density, consolidation). Life expectancy is 4-6 months based on waste types and tonnages received. – JM asked if we're expecting the facility to reach capacity. DM noted that previous minutes (December 22) noted 4-6 months, RL noted that the remaining capacity is based on tonnage received, and life expectancy will fluctuate if incoming waste tonnage fluctuates. – TD noted that tonnage received in 2023 was substantially less than in previous years, and RL added that if you receive less tonnage than you have longer life expectancy. DM said this could go on and on and on.
MECP Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – JB provided an introduction and noted that he would take back any questions and is new to the file. – JB outlined that they are reviewing the expansion. – DM noted the garbage around the Site needs to be cleaned up. JM noted that people come to the landfill looking for another Site (Canborough), and when they realize its not there, they dump waste (couches, chairs, tires, etc.), and it can't be blamed on Brooks Road. TD noted that BRE Operations staff can review Brooks Road and clean up. TD noted they don't accept small loads, and BRE does try to keep the road clear. – KM inquired about reporting illegal dumping. JM noted that it is potentially occurring consistently and difficult to report if not caught in the act.
Approvals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – KM outlined the current approach for the Environmental Screening Report (ESR), scheduled for posting in March 2024. JM inquired about the limits of expansion and property. KM noted that this is on the existing property and this process is permitted as a screening (10-year limitation). JM asked about the limit on approvals. KM responded that a proponent cannot undertake multiple screening processes to avoid an Individual EA. JM asked if there was a limit on the

Minutes	Action
	number of Individual EA. KM responded that she didn't think there was but would confirm.

DRAFT

Next Meeting and Other Business

- The proposed dates for the next PLC meetings were provided as June 6, 2024 and November 7, 2024. No objections were made.
- DB noted in the last PLC meeting that there was discussion about GFL. DB noted that at the time, KM said the odour was caused by leachate and not by cell construction, but the news article said the odour is not dangerous, and due to construction and that GFL had to excavate waste to construct. KM noted that the article was incorrect. There was construction previous to the leachate odour issue that caused some odour, however the MECP and GFL have confirmed that the odours that the residents have been experiencing since last summer was caused by leachate. DB noted that its hard to believe when the newspaper is reporting it differently. KM added that the construction being proposed by BRE is different than the construction at GFL. RL noted that we discussed in November through a sketch concerning the planned BRE tie-in for the Stage 9 work and that no waste will be dug up during construction, which is what could cause odour.
- DB noted that on the previous Site tour they were kept back from the south side and in the November 2023 meeting were told there was no fence there. DB noted he has photos of a fence there. KM noted she was responding in good faith at the time when she said there was no fence to separate the active construction area from where we were standing. DB noted there is a fence and that he wants the minutes to be accurate. He noted that if KMs statement about the fence is not true then he didn't know what other statements were being made that are untrue. KM noted that there may have been a misunderstanding about where DB was referring to.
- RL clarified that the DB may have been referring to a small portion of fence on the east side of the Site between the Site property and rail lands. RL noted that the fence was not there as we stood there on the Site tour, DB agreed, and that there was no fence between the walking area and work area – DB agreed. KM noted that as discussed at the November PLC, we could not enter the site further because it was an active construction area–
- RC noted that additional expansions and piecemealing continues to evolve and that they would like a response as to when the landfill is going to close. RC said it seems like we are stringing them along. RC noted that it can be managed within some tonnages slipping, but not longer years. TD noted he is not responsible for long-term planning and that it is a business decision. KM noted that for any landfill it is a business case that can be made when/if the facility reaches capacity.

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – JM noted that the game is played politically (referencing the vertical expansion approval). – JM re-read the building plan document that DB read at the November meeting. JM noted that no waste would be filled on the rail lands and that there would be no change to footprint. RC noted that that is why there have been no phone calls or complaints. DM noted that that is what BRE is hoping for. DM noted Shawn has asked for this, benefits – – DM provided a link to a CBC article about benefits program for nearby residents at the Green Lane Landfill (https://www.cbc.ca/news/6ondon/6ondon/green-lane-landfill-oneida-nation-smells-1.4567724). DM noted it is a dump just like “ours” in Toronto and that the residents should get something. DM acknowledged that the Food Bank gets a minimal amount and soccer/hockey too. DM noted that BRE is making millions and wants to know what they’re doing. DM noted the road is terrible and horrid and bumpy. DM noted that BRE said they would put shrubs and make it look lovely and now the hill has exposed glass and looks ugly. DM noted that it is everything in the hill, and includes glass, needles and everything. DM noted she has to stand up for the community and Haldimand County and tourism, and the leachate going through the creeks. DM noted the Grand River is full of weeds. – KM ended the meeting.
<p>Post-PLC Follow-up</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In response to the question regarding multiple Environmental Assessments, under the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> (O. Reg. 101/07: Waste Management Projects) a proponent must wait 10 years after completing an Environmental Screening Process before commencing another Environmental Screening Process. There is no limit or restriction on Individual Environmental Assessments because those are typically undertaken for larger volumes and longer periods of time. –