

GFL COMMUNITY LIAISON COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday June 12, 2023
VIA TEAMS MEETING
6:00 pm

MINUTES

ATTENDEES:

Members: Sarah Solter (SS), *Community Representative*
Chris Hagg (CH), *Community Representative*
David Schoenholz (DS), *Community Representative*
Councillor Brad Clark (BC), *City of Hamilton, City Representative*
Vince Ramelli (VR), *Manager of Real Estate, Community Partnerships & Transportation – H.W.C.D.S.B.*
Michael Durst (MD), *Supervisor, Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks*
Lorenzo Alfano (LA), *GFL Environmental, Regional Operations Manager*

Regrets: Jeff Isowa (JI), *Community Representative*
Ellen Warling (EW), *Manager, Planning, Accommodations & Rentals – H.W.D.S.B.*
Councillor Jeff Beattie (JB), *City of Hamilton, City Representative*

Assisted By: Kim Bailey

1. Welcome, Advice on Public Delegations for Consideration

Sarah Solter welcomed the committee members as well as well as guests who were in attendance.

No additions or deletions to the agenda currently.

The CLC had a request for one delegation from Mr. Dave Strecker who submitted questions for response. Attached on a separate page is a copy of Mr. Strecker's questions together with the responses from the CLC.

2. Matters Arising from March 2023 Meeting:

A request for comments from GFL on how they plan to keep First Road W. clean from dirt and debris coming off the trucks when exiting the landfill: GFL has procedures in place to monitor the road on a daily basis. Our operators will scrape and sweep the roads when required. There is a working wheel wash where all trucks must drive through before leaving the site. As an extra measure GFL has signs near the exits for the drivers to stop before leaving the site and check their axles for any material stuck between the tires and axles. This will allow them to clean these areas before going on

the public roadways. Both Sarah Solter and Councillor Brad Clark acknowledged First Road W. has been kept clean and all concerns have been resolved.

3. Site Update:

Quarterly Update of Operational Activities at the Landfill:

Construction activity during the three-month period: GFL is currently conducting cell liner construction at the landfill site.

Review of Monitoring: Particulate Matter (PM10)

March 2023 – No exceedances to report

April 2023 – 3 MECP 1 HR average exceedances and 0 daily average exceedances

April exceedances due to:

- April 11th, 12th & 14th - Facility activity a contributing factor (landfill construction activity).

May 2023 – 6 MECP 1 HR average exceedances and 1 daily average exceedances

May exceedances due to:

- May 10th, 11th, 15th & 16th – Five of the exceedances were facility activity a contributing factor (landfill construction activity). One outside operating hours due to fugitive dust.

Review of Complaints:

During this time the site received six complaints regarding odours.

April 14th & 15th – Complaint via Emergency Response Team, the odour was due to a malfunction in the leachate pumping station.

April 21st – Complaint via Councillor Clark’s office, the odour was caused by third party contractor on site constructing landfill cap.

May 16th – Complaint via the MECP, unfortunately the complaint was not received until a few days after the actual occurrence. The site was not operational at the time and therefore could not be clearly identified.

May 27th – Complaint via MECP Office but was sent two days after the occurrence. Landfilling was shut down for the weekend, therefore the source of the odour could not be clearly identified.

May 30th – Complaint via Councillor Clark’s Office, very little information was provided other than an odour was detected. There was no follow up information provided there it is difficult to investigate the situation. It is important to have geographical information, type of odour and timing to help locate the source.

Sarah commented that most complaints come in a few days after the fact through the Councillor’s office of the MECP, is there a place on the company’s website that advises what to

do should there be an issue? Mr. Alfano advised there is an after-hours telephone number for citizens to call posted on the signs at both entrances of the site. Should a call come in the after-hours service can get in touch with staff and someone would be dispatched immediately to assess the situation. Michael Durst mentioned the MECP does their best to contact the company immediately as well as having a Ministry Officer cover off the area periodically even when there are no complaints. Councillor Clark also suggested that he would put a public service announcement in his next newsletter to the surrounding community to advise of where to call should they smell any odours.

Status of Applications Pending with the MECP:

No applications pending.

Heritage Green Community Trust Activities Update:

The Heritage Green Community Trust held their Annual General Meeting on May 29, 2023. A total of \$510,000.00 was awarded in grants as well as \$22,500.00 in scholarships to local organizations and students. The Trust is now on hiatus until September.

4. New Business:

This meeting marks the end of Sarah Solter's term on the CLC therefore the committee will be looking for interested candidates for the open Community position. Sarah has said she would put her name in for consideration should there be no other interest from the community. The committee administrator will place an ad in the Stoney Creek News and will follow up with the committee members on possible candidates.

5. Determination of Agenda Items for September 2023 CLC Meeting:

- Search for a new community representative.

6. Conclusion of Meeting

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm

Next meeting: Monday September 11, 2023, at 6:00 pm via Teams Meeting

Questions from Dave Strecker for the June 12, 2023 CLC Meeting:

Methane Barriers

1. Methane barriers that are required for new townhouse across street from landfills. Mud and first rd.
2. Why?

RESPONSE:

Michael Durst from the MECP stated the idea of the methane barriers is not a recommendation from the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, this is something that would have come out of the planning process through the city of Hamilton.

A representative from GFL's Consulting Engineers GHD limited states it's more of a planning process that is proponent driven. The developers would have been required to satisfy what's called a guideline D4, which defines land use on or near landfills, so through that process they undertook their own environmental impact, and it was determined or recommended by their consultant on why those barriers were constructed.

3. Is the west quarry leaking with uncontrolled plumes again?
4. Do the residents of Branthaven Dr. have to be concerned?
5. Will the new public elementary school have similar requirements imposed upon them?

RESPONSE:

GFL's environmental control systems pump all the lower flow zones and remove the contamination from the west side. All of the data supports that there are no concerns with the west landfill and the barriers are not for methane purposes as we do not take any putrescible waste.

Landfill Liner

1. The liner being used today was tested and engineered to take the weight of the 1996 projections for the amount of fill that was going to be deposited. There have been 2 additional approvals for more waste and height increases for the landfill. Have new calculations been done to see if the liner that is already in place, can withstand shearing and load tests for the added weight. If tests were done, the public has a right to see what the tests results were and who performed them. An independent third party should then review these findings.
2. The ministry should have ordered this as a condition of their approval. If not why not?
3. GFL data states that the engineering of the landfill liner system is new untested technology. On several of their reports it is stated that the system cannot be fully tested until the **landfill is capped**. If this technology leaks due to liner failure we will have our own Love Canal in our own backyard. Cleanup will be the responsibility of GFL, the City OF Hamilton and the Ministry. These three entities share equally for the costs. It will be in the billions of dollars due to class action law suits.

RESPONSE:

- *Detailed Impact Assessment Reports were prepared as part of the Environmental Assessment (EA) undertaken for the expansion of the SCRF. EA documents are available here: [Document Library — Stoney Creek Facility \(gflstoneycreek.com\)](#)*
- *Potential impacts to the liner system resulting from the proposed expansion were documented in the Design & Operations Detailed Impact Assessment Report, GHD, January 2019. It was determined that the existing design of the liner system was sufficient to support the increased loading as a result of the proposed height increase.*
- *The SCRF EA was reviewed by various stakeholders including the MECP. Review findings are available through the EA Document Library noted above.*

- *The SCRF uses an innovative double liner system that informed the development of the standard liner designs established by the MECP under O. Reg. 232/98: Landfilling Sites. This standard is the basis of landfill design in the province to this day and its effectiveness is well documented.*
- *The SCRF double liner system has a hydraulic control layer (HCL) that acts as a hydraulic trap to control contaminant migration out of the landfill. The HCL will be filled with water to establish the hydraulic trap once the construction of the landfill liner has been completed.*
- *In the interim, other components of the liner system (i.e., leachate collection system, high density polyethylene liner, primary clay liner) provide full containment as documented in the AMRs.*
- *As required under O. Reg. 232/98, GFL maintains Financial Assurance with the MECP to ensure that funds are available for future clean-up and remediation of the SCRF in the event that GFL is no longer able to fund the long-term care and monitoring requirements on their own.*

