

Minutes

March 14, 2025

Project name	Brooks Road Landfill	From	Vincent Cooney
Subject	2025 Brooks Road PLC #4	Tel	+1 647-617-4946
Date/Time	March 12, 2025 / 7:00pm-8:00pm	Project no.	018235
Attendees	Vincent Cooney (VC) – GHD (facilitator) Ben Kempel (BK) – GHD (technical) Tim Danyliw (TD) – BRE (project manager) David Bruce (DB) – PLC Chair Diane Manto (DM) – PLC Member Laurie Woolner (LW) – PLC Member Kim Seaben (KM) – PLC Member Clarence Houwer (CH) Michelle Slump-Houwer (MSH) Samuel Stephan (SS) Mackenzie Clarke (MC) – MECP Hamilton Kayla Buck (KB) – MECP Hamilton Catherine Caldwell (CC) – MECP Regrets: Jordan Balch (JB) – MECP Hamilton District	Copy to:	All Attendees

Summary of Action Items and Commitments

- BRE will consult internal decision makers in an effort to provide better details to the PLC regarding site improvements that have been promised but not completed. Best efforts to provide this
- Provide DB confirmation at the next meeting of the planned new footprint of the 219,000m³. Include a schematic of the expansion in the slide deck for the next (June 4) PLC meeting.

Minutes	Action
Purpose and PLC Objectives	

Minutes	Action
<p>Review of Previous Minutes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Is the driveway paved – not yet, it will be done this year. – Dave - Questions about the Nov 12 survey. TD noted that as the site was reaching capacity. Was the fourth survey of the year. Results showed 9,000 m3 of airspace left, and end result was that BRE paused receiving of waste. GHD completed the survey – VC noted: – Regarding the first bullet on notification of approval of 32,000 m3 of capacity. This was approved on February 28, 2025, and that this approval was publicly posted online by MECP for anyone to access and has been cross-posted to the BRE website. – Proposed meeting dates and invites – these have been circulated for the next two proposed meeting dates. So that action can be closed – Regarding third bullet action. VC noted that we at GHD made a mistake. Due to an error the 2024 June and 2024 November PLC meetings were NOT advertised in the Haldimand Press. They were advertised in the online edition of the Sachem and beginning in November 2024, individuals on the contact list who are not PLC members were notified about the meetings directly by email. VC apologized, and noted that GHD have reviewed our internal procedures and put procedures and controls in place to ensure this does not happen again, – On the fourth bullet, we have a slide on community donations, and with PLC member general agreement, we will table this action until that discussion later on today’s agenda.
<p>Site Updates</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD provided update as per slides for the meeting – Talk of “good bugs” by DM regarding recommissioning activity – TD confirmed re Laurie question regarding treatment being transported to Beamsville. Other hauling does take place to Dunnville Waste Water Treatment Plant. – Questions: – DB asked MECP in terms of overall recommissioning and testing process. MECP asked if BRE had submitted to MECP approvals branch. TD noted that on restart operational testing takes place, once satisfied that effluent will meet ECA. Cannot do that test without discharging. “Pre tests” are done in the above ground tanks before discharging to the roadside ditch. MECP MC confirmed that MECP is overseeing testing and results. Treatment plant has been shut down for approximately a year, which is why leachate is being hauled.

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD noted that it is too early to reach out to MECP and provide internal testing that will show appropriate consistency to start back up. – CM asked if leachate is going directly to trucks. TD goes directly from cell into the tanker. TD explained that the pump is operated directly in the cell into the truck. CM asked for clarity that some goes into the above ground ditch and some goes to a tanker. TD noted that the processes would not happen coincidentally.. – DG asked about what happens during a potential rainstorm. TD noted that runoff conventionally will collect in its storm ponds. Rain that touches waste is collected and flows into the cell. TD notes that we do see it spike in the spring and fall with rainfall. – KS asked a question about the quantity of waste – Ben noted that there is quarterly testing of the rainwater pond and downstream of the pond according to ECA requirements. – MECP noted that the cap would also be inspected. BK and TD confirmed. – KS asked about penetration through the cap. BK noted that the cap is made of clay so penetration by water is <i>de minimus</i> in quantity. – DG asked about “clay being washed away”. Asked if any grass is being grown on the clay cap. TD noted that we are working towards [improving] the cap as part of upcoming intended works. TD confirmed this has not been done yet. – BK noted that there is more maintenance when the cap is ‘vegetated’. – TD noted that a date cannot be confirmed for when the final cap will be in place. – LW talked about “beautifying” the entrance of the facility. Noted that mud comes off to the main road and is “horrendous”. LW suggested that TD and BRE were “not being truthful”. TD responded that BRE makes good faith efforts to come to meetings and respond to questions and inquiries in good faith, but that some interdependencies on the project do create schedule uncertainty and an inability to confirm specific dates for projects LW was referencing. – Acknowledging significant discussion of the topic, VC noted concerns from LW and a desire to get more complete information which it appeared could not be furnished immediately in the current meeting. Suggested that given the importance to have further update that perhaps BRE could provide a more complete update regarding timing of improvements after consulting internally. Refer to action section above.

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MECP has noted the “drag out” at the site from mud. Asked that residents please contact MECP with these concerns so they can be aware from an oversight perspective. – SS expressed that the mud drag out was not a good look at the intersection with the main road. – Questions: – Slide 7 – DB asked about when the site is required to meet the 191m level of leachate above sea level. TD noted this is captured on slide 10 of the presentation. – Slide 8 – BK provided a summary of the Amended ECA and leachate levels. All of the measures have been removed. BK noted that through pumping the leachate level will be measured again on March 14 (by MECP) ahead of the March 27, 2025 date in regulation. – CM asked how long it needs to stay at 191m. BK and TD confirmed it needs to be maintained indefinitely. – DB asked that it be confirmed that 191m will be maintained. And wanted to confirm that there are monthly measurements and that the level would be maintained from March 27, 2025 onwards at 191m or less than 191m. – KB noted that there were discussions about the leachate levels in October 2024, but very important that these levels be maintained below the new threshold. And MECP noted that leachate level has come down from 197m to 191m – DB asked about why the leachate level was reduced. K.Buck noted that this was reflecting the margin of safety and pressure on the liner. – MSH asked if there is a procedure or test of liner penetration. BK noted that yes this is monitored at the site. Quarterly reporting subject to check. BK noted that all of the data is included in the annual report.
Waste Placement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – BK noted that the waste would placed on the north side of the site in the grey trapezoid at the site, and as shown in the slides – TD noted that waste placement is currently paused as noted earlier. TD noted that over time waste condenses, and at some point, there may be a need to place the 32,000 to the east or west (with the majority of the waste in the north trapezoid, perhaps ~30,000 m3 of referenced quantity from the ECA emergency approval)

Minutes	Action
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD noted that a lot of construction waste is in the profile, however there is a greater quantity of soil being received as well. TD expects this trend to continue. – KS asked about glass in the soil. Suggested that it may cut the liner. TD noted this is unlikely since the base of the landfill is 2-3 feet of compacted clay, followed by HPDE, followed by geotextile cushion, and drainage stone 300m thick. In short, not likely to have tearing. TD further noted that when commissioning a new cell there is great care taken to put 'good waste' at the base pile.
Leachate Levels	– See above discussion
Site Approvals – EA summary	– In addition to details on slide, BK noted there is a small additional footprint to the north side of the site for the expansion approval currently being reviewed by MECP.

DRAFT

Minutes	Action
Community Donations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – TD discussed community donations program and its continuance into 2025 – TD asked to be as specific as possible about the specific contact within the organization so that TD can directly follow-up with. Specifics are very helpful in this regard. – LK referenced materials sent to Shelly in 2024. – LK asked when the decision was made to donate to the foodbank in other years. – TD confirmed two payments in 2024 totalling \$20,000. – TD noted there is no defined budget at BRE, in response to LK. – VC noted that TD had expressed he is not senior enough otherwise aware of donation fund commitments for 2025 at this time. VC suggested that efforts of the discussion may be best directed into identifying organizations. VC stressed, based on experience that community advocates are experts in their own lives, and can best inform where to direct funds, or to compile a list of charities so as to inform later allocations. VC reiterated that BRE is seeking this community-informed input to ensure that funds go to worthwhile local organization that can provide the greatest impact.
MECP Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – MC noted that she is now managing the file for Haldimand County for MECP including Brooks Road Landfill. – MC noted that there was an inspection in late October regarding the leachate levels. – KB noted that the inspection was done over a certain amount of time, with Jordan attending site several times, and then set about the report to be developed and released. Approvals branch has been involved. – Catherine is a junior who will be supporting MC as well. – MC noted that all concerns should be forwarded to MECP – DB asked about the smell of the leachate. DB asked why is a leachate pond permitted at a landfill site? MC noted that it is not untreated leachate at site, it must be treated leachate to be stored on site. DB confirmed his understanding. MC noted that there is air monitoring on site to remain below levels in regulation. – MC confirmed that an untreated leachate pond is permitted, in some situations. Brooks Road.

Minutes	Action
Next Meeting and Other Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- VC summarized next meetings- DB asked about further plans for expansion. VC, BK confirmed no expansion <p>Other business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- DB asked for greater clarity on who is ultimately in charge at Brooks Road Environmental. TD noted that Bill Sutton is on site, and Richard Weldon is Bill's boss.- TD noted that Bill Sutton is on site at Brooks Road- TD noted that his title is Project Manager, and that he is very low on the ladder at BRE, and expressed that he does his best to share the information that he is aware of with his position and regards to the Brooks Road site, specifically.- At 8.14 Vince called for motion to adjourn the meeting- DB motioned <p>Meeting adjourned at 8.15pm</p>

DRAFT