



# Appendix J. Comment Response Tables

## Comments Received after the Publication of the Notice of Commencement for the Terms of Reference

### Indigenous Community Comment Response Table

Comment	Response
<b>Nation Huronne-Wendatt Bureau du Nionwentsiö – January 16, 2020</b>	
<p>First of all let me thank you for your letter addressed to Grand Chief Konrad Sioui on the Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility Project.</p> <p>Could you please let us know if you plan to conduct any archaeological assessment as part of the EA process ?</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and interest in our project.</p> <p>It is our intention to undertake a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment as part of the Terms of Reference process. We anticipate that this work will be completed in the first half of 2020.</p> <p>We would be pleased to provide you with a copy of the report when it is available. A copy of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of our existing landfill site property, adjacent to the proposed expansion area, was provided previously.</p> <p>A description of the results of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment will be included in the Terms of Reference.</p> <p>Please let me know if you require any additional information.</p>
<b>Nation Huronne-Wendatt Bureau du Nionwentsiö – January 20, 2020</b>	
<p>Thanks for following-up quickly.</p> <p>Please effectively share with us the Stage 1 report once completed.</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged.</p>

### Public Comment Response Table

Comment	Response
<b>Member of the Public – January 20, 2020</b>	
I would like to be added to your email list in regards to the project of the Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility in Moose Creek.	Comment Acknowledged. The mailing list has been updated accordingly.
<b>Member of the Public – January 21, 2020</b>	
Hi.... Please add me to your mailing list for the Open House on 30 Jan 20. Thanks	Comment Acknowledged. The mailing list has been updated accordingly.
<b>Post Media Reporter – January 22, 2020</b>	
<p>I've been tasked with writing an article on the upcoming Public Open House that is scheduled to take place on Jan. 30th, regarding the Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility expansion project.</p> <p>Does GFL Environmental Inc. need to obtain public opinion on the expansion prior to its inception? Is local public opinion needed for the ministry to approve the environmental assessment?</p> <p>Will the company proceed with the expansion in the near future?</p> <p>Thank you very much for your time and have a great day,</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and interest in our project. The Environmental Assessment process requires that the public be notified and given sufficient opportunity to comment and provide input on the proposed project. All correspondence and input related to the project is recorded and considered in the preparation of the Environmental Assessment (EA) documentation. The Environmental Assessment report is then made available to all interested parties, including the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks, for review and comment. Following this review, the Ministry will consider approval of the EA.</p> <p>Based on past experience, GFL anticipates that the approval process for the proposed project will take approximately four to five years.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any additional questions. Additional information about our project will be available at the Open House event on January 30th in Moose Creek.</p>



Member of the Public – January 28, 2020	
<p>My family lives in the town of Casselman. I was advised that you will be holding an open house in the village of Moose Creek on January 30, 2020 to discuss the expansion of your operation, Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility (EOWHF), which is seeking to grow by as much as 15.1 million cubic metres in the next 20 years.</p> <p>I cannot attend the meeting due to previous commitments however, my neighbours and I would like to express our deep concerns about the expansion .</p> <p>In April 2017, I wrote a letter to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment about my concerns over the toxic smel<sup>1</sup> emanating from that area. The smell was alarming locals as it seemed to be getting increasingly worse. It is not unusual to drive on HWY 138 - hundreds of metres from the site - and be overtaken by a putrid stench, so strong it often burns the eyes. The ministry representative from the Cornwall office assured me that the stench was not hazardous and fell within acceptable air quality thresholds.</p> <p>Now, my question today is - will this still be the case with the expansion? If the facility is growing in size, that means more toxins in the air. This will surely increase the impact on air quality in the area, especially to surrounding communities like Casselman, located less than 10 kilometres away from the facility.</p> <p>Therefore, due to the fact that the expansion could mean more toxic smells, which could ultimately increase and affect the air in the surrounding area and ultimately, the health of local citizens, we would like to add our names to the list of concerned citizens. We would also like to have a copy of the environmental assessment of the expansion and be kept updated on any and all studies, decisions and expansion plans.</p> <p>We have grave concerns that the quality of life for local citizens will be negatively impacted by the growth of the facility as planned.</p>	<p>In 2017, GFL initiated a 3-year plan to enhance the landfill gas management system at the EOWHF and substantial improvements in landfill gas odour have been achieved from past operations. Additional gas wells have been installed, and, a second blower skid and a third flare will be installed in 2020, which are anticipated to continue to minimize odours at the site. GFL will continue to undertake measures to minimize the potential for odours from operations.</p>

**Agency Comment Response Table**

Comment	Response
<b>Mary Dillon - Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry - January 28, 2020</b>	
<p>Thank you for the Notice of Commencement and Public Open House Terms of Reference for an EA for future development of the EOWHF. We would like to be engaged in this project through the EA process and would like to review and comment on the Environmental Assessment document that is prepared.</p> <p>I am not sure if you are aware of the process, but I have attached a guide to help you or your consultant access natural heritage data from convenient online sources and in-water timing guidelines should the proposed project activities require fisheries considerations. It is the proponent's responsibility to complete a preliminary screening for each project, obtain available information from multiple sources, conduct any necessary field studies, and to consider any potential environmental impacts that may result from an activity. If there are any questions or concerns regarding the Ministry's interests following completion of the preliminary screening, we would be happy to provide technical information and advice. Please note that Species at Risk data is no longer provided by the MNRF. All Endangered Species Act or Species at Risk enquiries should be directed to the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Parks at SARontario@ontario.ca.</p> <p>There may be petroleum wells within the proposed project area. Please consult the Ontario Oil, Gas and Salt Resources Library website (<a href="http://www.ogsrlibrary.com">www.ogsrlibrary.com</a>) for the best known data on any wells recorded by MNRF. Please reference the 'Definitions and Terminology Guide' listed in the publications on the Library website in order to better understand the well information available. Any oil and gas wells in your project area are regulated by the Oil, Gas and Salt Resource Act, and the supporting regulations and operating standards. If any unanticipated wells are encountered during development of the project, or if the proponent has questions regarding petroleum operations, the proponent should contact the Petroleum Operations Section at 519-873-4634.</p> <p>If you have any specific questions or concerns about addressing MNRF interests in the Terms of Reference, please let me know.</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged.</p>

**Municipal Comment Response Table**

Comment	Response
<b>Guylain Lafleche – The Nation Municipality – January 17, 2020</b>	
<p>Could you please send me a copy of the notice for the public meeting schedule on January 30th in Moose creek. Regards</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and interest in our project. Please find attached a copy of our notice of commencement.</p> <p>Please contact me if you have further questions.</p>
<b>Sebastien Dion – Village of Casselman – January 20, 2020</b>	
<p>Très important de retirer l'adresse 1250 chemin du Théâtre. Mettez l'adresse municipale qui est 751 St-Jean.</p>	<p>Merci pour votre courriel. On va faire le changement immédiatement.</p>

## Responses to Comments Received from Public Open House #1 Comment Forms

Comment	Response
<b>Open House Materials</b>	
The information provided was well done and very informative. My expectation is all materials displayed will be available on-line.	The materials from Public Open House #1 are available on the project website at: <a href="http://gflenv.com/moose-creek-eowhf">http://gflenv.com/moose-creek-eowhf</a> .
A lot of information to absorb in a short period of time. Would appreciate having it available online.	
High level of the project only, at first glance the presentation is good.	Comment acknowledged.
The project seems valuable and well measured.	Comment acknowledged.
Good explanation of your process and plan and timeline/schedule.	Comment acknowledged.
I wish there was more of a presentation with general discussion and Q&A presented to a group as I am not the type to walk up to people and would benefit from listening to everyone's questions and concerns.	GFL has found that the Open House drop-in format with display panels allows participants to review the information at their own pace and obtain the same information as other participants regardless of what time they attend the Open House. The format of future public events will be reviewed as appropriate. With the current COVID-19 pandemic situation and limitations on future public gatherings, the public is encouraged to contact Greg van Loenen of GFL directly to answer any questions or obtain additional information. Contact information is available on the project website.
The presentation is excellent.	Comment acknowledged.
Good general presentation but I have to wait until more specific details are available.	Additional details will be available on the project website and in the draft Terms of Reference.
Nicely presented. Well explained. Lots of information on chart.	Comment acknowledged.
It was well setup and I got my answers - Well done.	Comment acknowledged.
<b>Odour</b>	
GFL would need to improve the reduction of odours that the site is producing.	In 2017, GFL initiated a 3-year plan to enhance the landfill gas management system at the EOWHF and substantial improvements in landfill gas odour have been achieved from past operations.
It is important that odour elimination be the priority in your operation. This issue would need to be resolved before any future expansion.	Additional gas wells have been installed, and a second blower skid and a third flare will be installed in 2020, which are anticipated to continue to minimize odours at the site. GFL will continue to undertake measures to minimize the potential for odours from operations.
Despite the promises, the reductions did not occur. It is sometime unbearable especially in summer which constraints us to keep the house's windows closed and to use the AC. The project doesn't demonstrate a reduction of the smells.	
At Casselman, the air quality is poor, the smells. Please help with the smells.	
On paper it all sounds/looks good but in reality the smell in Casselman is at a high level - daily at various intensity.	
I/we currently smell the dump from our business and house. I don't think you should expand until you learn to manage the current smell issue!	
In the summer of 2018 (the worse year ever) the smell in Casselman was daily and very intense. Last summer (2019) there were days (~3-4/month) with no smell. However 2 days we actually had the smell inside the physio clinic - that is not acceptable.	
Casselman business (i.e., our St. Hubert restaurant) has a lot of out of town visitors commenting on the smell. We are afraid it will cost business in terms of deterring people (Highway commuters) from stopping again *We need the business.	
Smell!	
For current operations, my concern or comment would be about the smell as it's the easiest to "see"	
Our concern is smell - please ensure GFL can successfully handle the gas smell before increasing cells.	
I live South east of landfill site and concerned about odours.	
At municipality [Nation], we get a lot of complaints about the smells, affecting living standards and property values.	
Smelly.	
The company has mentioned in "Le Droit" (I guess this is a new paper) that they are putting in place a system to reduce the smell. An evaluation criteria should be that the system shall be operational and clearly demonstrates a reduction of the smell before any authorization is been granted.	Odour has been identified as an evaluation criteria to be applied as part of the Environmental Assessment process. In 2017, GFL initiated a 3-year plan to enhance the landfill gas management system at the EOWHF and substantial improvements in landfill gas odour have been achieved from past operations. Additional gas wells have been installed, and a second blower skid and a third flare will be installed in 2020, which are anticipated to continue to minimize odours at the site. GFL will continue to undertake measures to minimize the potential for odours from operations.
From the perspective of a region's resident and a 417 user, the main actual issue is the smell. I was surprised it was only very little mentioned on the presentation boards.	Additional information is presented in a Landfill Gas Management handout to outline the work that GFL has undertaken at the site since 2017 to minimize odours, and the additional work that will be undertaken in 2020 to continue to minimize odours from operations. The Fact Sheet has been sent to everyone on the project contact list and posted on the project website.
<b>Alternatives</b>	
The alternative presented is acceptable in the location presented but it would be very important to maintain the aesthetics of the site because of its location. A tree line should be planted along the whole site so the traffic, visitors to the area would not be able to see the operation.	The potential for visual effects related to the project will be considered as part of the assessment criteria during the Environmental Assessment and potential mitigation measures (e.g., screening) will be considered for any identified visual effects.
Alternative 1 would be the one I choose if I had to choose only because I live directly south and this would slow down the timeline where the landfill would be at its closest.	Comment acknowledged.
With either alternative, the closer the landfill site comes to Hwy 138, expect more noise, odour complaints from users of both Hwy 138 & Hwy 417.	The potential for noise and odour effects associated with the project will be considered as part of the assessment criteria during the Environmental Assessment and potential effects will be assessed relative to regulatory standards.
Alternatives - incinerators should be implemented. No need to upload landfill.	GFL has considered a range of alternatives to the project, including thermal treatment, as part of developing the Terms of Reference. Based on the nature of the wastes typically managed at the EOWHF, GFL has identified that incineration is not a practical or cost effective option for the company and its customers.
Incineration.	
Modernisation - Incinerators.	
Should be going to newer technologies. Burying garbage is old school.	

Consultation	
A committee should be created with the residents of Moose Creek including key members of volunteer groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, Optimist Club, Volunteer Fire Department and Moose Creek Recreation Association. By creating this consultation committee the host community would be involved.	A Community Liaison Committee (CLC) for the EOWHF has been in place since 1999. The CLC includes neighbouring landowners, the Township of North Stormont and the Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks. The CLC meets regularly during the year regarding operational matters related to the EOWHF. GFL would be pleased to meet with any interested stakeholders to discuss their specific interest in the project.
Make the information easily available with full transparency.	The materials from Public Open House #1 are available on the project website at: <a href="http://gflenv.com/moose-creek-eowhf">http://gflenv.com/moose-creek-eowhf</a> .
I really would like to get a tour of the facility.	Once the conditions related to the COVID-19 pandemic allow for tours of the facility to be conducted in a safe manner, GFL would be pleased to provide a tour of the facility and will contact the commenter to make the appropriate arrangements.
Basically [the consultation program] follows the procedures followed earlier from 2014-2018. The time frame may be too short especially if there is a repeat of the 2 1/2 years gap before the 2015 Terms of Reference was approved.	Comment acknowledged.
Transportation	
It is too early, but I expect questions regarding the use of the road 700.	A traffic impact assessment study for the local network will be completed as part of the Environmental Assessment.
For current operations, my concern or comment would be about Transportation = amount of traffic going by my house (large trucks, trailers)	
Important to improve road traffic on 138. Possible wider ramps - May review if traffic light is needed.	
Other	
GFL should include a plan to produce Natural Gas for heating in partnership with gas consortium providers and bring this utility to our area.	GFL is investigating a range of options to utilize the surplus landfill gas generated including the production of renewable natural gas.
Very supportive. Job creation and future use of methane gas.	Comment acknowledged.
Concerned of the size of the project and how if we are being affected by the landfill at its current size, how much worst it could get when it's at its maximum.	The rationale for the project will be prepared as part of the Terms of Reference and updated during the Environmental Assessment if appropriate. The size of the project is based on a 20-year planning period with no change to the currently approved annual fill rate. The potential effects of the project will be assessed as part of the Environmental Assessment and mitigation measures necessary to mitigate or minimize the effects will be identified.
Main concern for me is property value. I feel with the increased size of the landfill and potential effects of it will severely impact my property value.	The potential effects of the project will be assessed as part of the Environmental Assessment and mitigation measures necessary to mitigate or minimize the effects will be identified.
It may be advisable that the land adjacent to the 138 be kept apart for future commercial development of potential associated industries e.g., greenhouses.	The alternative concepts for the project will be developed in more detail during the Environmental Assessment. This may include associated business opportunities, although the potential exists for these to be developed in closer proximity to the energy or heat source (i.e., the landfill gas to energy facility).
With the expansion eastwards, it will affect the sod operations of Manderly Sod. It will only leave a small window of opportunity of site preparations for the next area by 2025.	The potential effects of the project on local business like Manderley Sod will be assessed during the Environmental Assessment.
There is obviously needs for landfill capacity in eastern Ontario. The city of Ottawa, for example, has grown extensively over the last 40 years. As more homes are built, there will be competition with pre-existing landfills in Ottawa.	The rationale for the project will be prepared as part of the Terms of Reference and updated during the Environmental Assessment if appropriate. This will consider the need for the EOWHF to continue to provide landfill capacity over the long term.
In the socio-economic report, how many other landfills in eastern Ontario will be closing in the next 5 years and then from 2025-2045.	The rationale for the project will be prepared as part of the Terms of Reference and updated during the Environmental Assessment if appropriate. This will consider the availability of landfill capacity in Eastern Ontario.
Invest in Prescott & Russel (After all we put up with the smell) like before which the funding was used to purchase land in bog and forest Larose - (it's good for public image).	GFL is an active supporter of the local communities in the area of the EOWHF. The company would be pleased to consider future opportunities to continue providing this support in a beneficial and meaningful way to these communities.
For current operations, my concern or comment would be about ecology, ground water, surface water	The potential effects of the project on ecology, ground water and surface water will be assessed during the Environmental Assessment.

## Comments Received after Public Open House #1

### Indigenous Community Comment Response Table

Comment	Response
<b>Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office - February 6, 2020</b>	
<p>Thank you for contacting the Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office. This automated response is your assurance that your message has been received by this office and will be reviewed as soon as resources permit. Due to the high volume of correspondence received by this office, we are not able to respond personally to every inquiry.</p> <p>On October 18, 2016, the AOO and the Governments of Ontario and Canada reached a major milestone in their journey toward reconciliation and renewed relationships with the signing of the Agreement-in-Principle (AIP). The signing of the AIP is a key step toward a Final Agreement, which will clarify the rights of all concerned and open up new economic development opportunities for the benefit of the AOO and their neighbours in the Settlement Area in Eastern Ontario.</p> <p>The AIP is not a legally binding document. Rather, it opens the way for continued negotiations toward a Final Agreement that will define the ongoing rights of the Algonquins of Ontario to lands and natural resources within the Settlement Area in Eastern Ontario. For further information about the AIP please refer to our website at <a href="http://www.tanakiwin.com">www.tanakiwin.com</a>.</p> <p>An interactive web-based map has also been developed to provide a single access point for users to easily explore and navigate through the AIP's various Reference Maps and Descriptive Plans associated with the proposed land selections and Areas of Algonquin Interest. To access the map, <a href="#">click here</a>.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact our office at the coordinates below should you have any questions regarding the status of your query.</p> <p>This automated message may not be relied upon to fulfil, in whole or part, any duty to consult the Algonquins of Ontario.</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged.</p>

### Public Comment Response Table

Comment	Response
<b>Member of the Public – January 30, 2020</b>	
<p>I was at your Open House this afternoon. Thank you.</p> <p>I would like my community, Casselman, to consider using your services for composting. It is geographically so close. I do realise that a preliminary survey with the residents is necessary but what information can you offer me that I could bring to them at a municipal meeting to entice them in considering the possibility of this option?</p>	<p>Thank you for attending our Open House and showing interest in our Project. I hope it was informative and helpful.</p> <p>GFL can offer composting services to the Village of Casselman. The difficulty lies in the collection and delivery of organic waste to our facility. As I understand it, organics (compost) collection is not available in Casselman at this time.</p> <p>The potential solutions are door-to-door pick-up of organic waste, or the use of a central disposal depot in Casselman that has the organics bins picked up every 2nd, 3rd or 4th day, whatever the need is. These are ideas that can get the conversation started and GFL would be happy to continue this conversation with the citizens and Council of Casselman.</p>
<b>Reflet News – February 6, 2020</b>	
<p>Following our phone call, I would like to have an interview with an EOWHF project manager.</p> <p>I bring to your attention that I am a journalist at Reflet News below my contact details</p>	<p>Vous trouverez ci-joint le lien pour notre site internet qui contient tous les panneaux d'information utilisés lors de la soirée du 30 janvier dernier.</p> <p>La superficie totale visée par les études est de 233 hectares. Tel que mentionné au téléphone, il est difficile à ce moment-ci de déterminer avec précision les investissements nécessaires pour tout ce développement étant donné que nous ne connaissons pas les conditions d'opération qui seront imposées. Au minimum, des investissements de plus de 100 millions de dollars seront nécessaires.</p>



<b>Member of the Public – February 4, 2020</b>	
<p>How are you ? I received a letter from your consulting company HDR a few days ago concerning the future development of the EOWHF. I should be able to attend your open house on January 30, 2020 at the Moose Creek Rec Center. I have enclosed 2 articles that GFL may be interested in. GFL owns considerable acreage in the Moose Creek area, so there is no reason why they should not be able to maximize their potential earnings. The article “OMV transforms plastic waste into crude oil “might solve a general North American problem on what to do with plastics. OMV AG is an Austrian petroleum company. In this area, a few years ago a recycling center in Alexandria, Ontario had to send their excess plastics to a landfill site because said plastic tonnage exceeded MOECC compliance regulations. The EOWHF is a landfill site but GFL also has a container business that collects ICI waste ( part of which is probably plastics from wrapping at retailers ).</p> <p>The second article is entitled : “Using household waste to power planes — a new trick for old technology “comes from the Annual Report of Johnson Matthey plc for the year ended March 31, 2019. Johnson Matthey plc is a large precious metals and catalyst producing company based in the United Kingdom. Essentially there are using waste to produce aviation fuel.</p> <p>GFL also might want to consider that quite a few other landfill sites are nearing the end of completion dates. GFL is only now starting to be active in the ICI ( industrial , commercial and institutionalized ) waste market in the Ottawa area. A few years ago, on the website of the City of Ottawa, that ICI waste amounted to about 1,200,000 tons per year.</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged.</p>

<b>Member of the Public – February 10, 2020</b>	
<p>I went to your Open House 1 on January 30, 2020, and having seen your presentation, I would like to submit some comments. Before I begin, since your consultants are mostly based in the Toronto area, they can keep up to date on some of the current events via the Township of North Stormont website at <a href="http://www.northstormont.ca">www.northstormont.ca</a> ( council meeting agendas, notices, etc. ). There is also a website <a href="http://www.NorthStormontWatchdop.com">www.NorthStormontWatchdop.com</a> which adds additional information about the Township of North Stormont. There is a Facebook group entitled Concerned Citizens of North Stormont ( this mainly deals with the EdP Nation Rise wind turbine project ( whose Environmental Assessment Act review and subsequent Tribunal you may be interested in reviewing since I suspect that the same arguments will be brought up at Council Meetings and during your project Terms of Reference ( ToR ) and Environmental Assessment Act review , such as migratory birds ( in the fall and spring there are large flocks of Snow Geese and Canada Geese who reside on lots 14, 15, and 16 of Concessions 9 and 10 of Roxborough Township – sod farm operated by Manderley Sod currently ) ) ). There is a growing amount of Not In My Back Yard arguments for projects.</p> <p>The Township of North Stormont is a relatively thinly populated area, with the periphery of the Moose Creek Bog even more so. With the consolidation and enlargement of farming operations, the population of the Township of North Stormont is virtually stagnant. Even the population of the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry has only grown slightly over the past 20 years , while the population of the city of Cornwall has stagnated for the last 40 years. The Nation municipality has grown somewhat ( the population of Casselman has increased significantly in the last 30 years ). The largest center of population and business growth has been the city of Ottawa ( whose eastern most boundary is about 32 kms from the EOWHF ). I do not know the exact catchment area where material is being sourced for the EOWHF ( and for business and competition reasons, GFL may not want to give out ), however some total should be presented as landfill needs for the 2025 – 2045 interval. How many landfill sites are to be re – licensed during that interval , how many landfill sites will be shut down for one reason or another , how much garbage will be produced during that interval ( taking into account not everyone recycles ), etc in the service area of the EOWHF ? In the city of Ottawa, only about 50% of households put out organic wastes separately. GFL should ask some of their current customers what their projected garbage will be from the 2025 – 2045 period ( in any report, a total should be submitted only, solely for competitive reasons ).</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged.</p>



For the maps showing future cell locations of the EOWHF for the 2025 -2045 period on lots 13 to 16 of Concession 10 of Roxborough Township , and for this section , it does not matter whether they are orientated north – south or east – west : the closer the landfill cells get to Highway 138 or Highway 417, the Ministry of Transportation will probably require iron clad proof ( both with field tests and modelling ) that with a hill on lots 13 and 14, it will not create white out conditions during snow storms, wind events ( loose snow drifting ) during the winter on the highways or that any garbage flies off the EOWHF site at any time of the year. During the infrastructure construction phase, with the removal of the organic soils, similar constraints will apply during hot, dry summers where the organic soils form dust clouds on windy days ( my guess is that if those dust clouds reach either Hwy 138 or 417, someone may have some explain to do ). About 25 or 30 years ago, there was a fire in the organic soils close to where the present EOWHF site is : the smoke created dense clouds along part of Hwy 417 for several months before the fire was finally extinguished. The northern boundary of the EOWHF is less than 1500 feet from the Highway 417 and the cells on lot 13 will be less than a thousand feet from Highway 138.

A few other points that may come up. Right now, on Norman Drive (just south of the EOWHF ), from lots 14 and 15 of Concession 8 of Roxborough Township, drivers have a line of view to see all the way to the Gatineau hills. The landfill cells will block that view in the future. What is the reaction going to be of users of Highways 417 or 138 to a fifty foot hill being created next to a major artery ? The farther something is from public view, the less the problems going through regulatory processes.

Wherever the EOWHF goes after 2025, the Township of North Stormont should still be receiving from \$ 550,000 to \$700,000 per year per the Host Community Benefit Agreement. Since there is harmonized sales tax on material coming into the EOWHF, I calculate that roughly the province of Ontario will receive about \$ 4,800,000 in sales tax while the federal government will receive about \$ 3,000,000 per year in GST. The present government in Ontario will look at any future project based on revenues generated and landfill needs. Since the information presented at Open House 1 was preliminary and will probably change to some degree in the future, I will wait until more details are available.

**Reflet News – February 13, 2020**

Je tiens à vous remercier pour le temps que vous m'avez accordé pour répondre à mes interrogations et merci aussi pour les informations complémentaires.

Comment Acknowledged.

Je vous souhaite une excellente journée.

**Member of the Public – April 28, 2020**

Hi I just heard your presentation at North Stormont Council. Please add me to your distribution list.

We will add you to the list – thanks for listening in.

**Agency Comment Response Table**

Comment	Response
<b>Adam Sanzo – Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks – Environmental Assessment and Permissions Branch – February 5, 2020</b>	
As discussed with Larry over the last few weeks, the ministry has begun to implement this step at the commencement stage of any project- the delegation of consultation with Indigenous communities.	Comment Acknowledged.
Although it is understood that proponents already undertake this aspect of consultation when undertaking environmental assessments, this letter is just the confirmation of the procedure so that there is no confusion during the process. Please see attached.	
In addition, the ministry will send out letters to each of the communities that are listed in this letter. You will be cc'd on those emails, which will be sent out shortly.	
Let me know if you have any questions.	



**Annamaria Cross – Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks – Environmental Assessment and Permissions Branch – February 5, 2020**

GFL Environmental Inc. has initiated an individual environmental assessment process under the Environmental Assessment Act for the Future Development of the Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility (the project).

Comment Acknowledged.

The Crown has a constitutional duty to consult Indigenous communities and, where appropriate, accommodate impacts to their rights, when the Crown contemplates conduct that may adversely impact known, established or asserted Aboriginal or treaty rights. Although the Crown remains responsible for ensuring the adequacy of consultation with Indigenous communities to whom the duty to consult is owed, it may delegate procedural aspects of the consultation process to project proponents.

The Crown may use existing regulatory processes as a vehicle for fulfilling its constitutional duty. In this case, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (the ministry) will be relying on the Environmental Assessment Act process, including the mandatory public consultation requirements, as a means of ensuring relevant information is shared and that identified Indigenous communities have an opportunity to participate by asking questions and bringing forward their concerns.

Based on information GFL Environmental Inc. has provided to date on the nature and location of the project, the anticipated environmental effects, and the ministry's current understanding of Aboriginal and treaty rights in the area, the ministry has concluded that a duty to consult may arise in respect of your project. Accordingly, the ministry is delegating procedural aspects of Indigenous consultation to GFL Environmental Inc. for the environmental assessment for the project.

GFL Environmental Inc. is required to consult the following communities that may be potentially affected by and/or interested in the project:

- Mohawk Council of Akwesasne
- Huron Wendat Nation Council
- Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office

Under the Environmental Assessment Act, consultation with interested persons, which may include Indigenous communities, is also required. Please be aware that this list may be subject to change as new information becomes available and/or there are changes to the scope of the project.

Unless otherwise directed, you are advised to initiate contact through the elected Chief and Council of each First Nation and through the leadership of Métis organizations copying the Métis Nation of Ontario Head Office. Please let the ministry know if you require contact information for any of the communities listed above.

The ministry relies on consultation conducted by proponents when it assesses the Crown's obligations and it also provides direction to proponents during the environmental assessment process. GFL Environmental Inc.'s responsibilities for procedural aspects of consultation include:

- Preparing an Indigenous consultation plan, as required, which may include seeking input from communities on how to collect and incorporate Indigenous knowledge into the environmental assessment
- Providing identified Indigenous communities with information about the proposed project/activity including anticipated impacts and information on timelines;
- Following up with communities to ensure they received project information and that they are aware of the opportunity to express comments and concerns about the project;
- Gathering any information the communities may wish to share about their Indigenous knowledge and land uses associated with the project area and incorporating this information into the environmental assessment
- Gathering information from the communities about how the project may adversely impact their Aboriginal and/or treaty rights (for example, hunting, fishing) or sites of cultural significance (for example, burial grounds, archaeological sites);
- Where appropriate or requested, assisting with a community's technical review of the environmental assessment documents
- Considering the comments and concerns provided by communities and providing responses to the communities;
- Where appropriate, discussing potential mitigation strategies with communities;
- Bearing the reasonable costs associated with these procedural aspects of consultation; and,
- Notifying the ministry if new information comes to light about potential adverse impacts to Aboriginal and/or treaty rights, or if consultation stalls.

GFL Environmental Inc. is also required to maintain an accurate and up to date record of consultation for each individual community, that contains all related communications including letters/emails/phone calls (outgoing & incoming), public notices, meetings (agendas, meeting minutes), issues raised and how they have been addressed, evidence of follow up responses, and documentation of any follow up responses or comments from the communities. This information will be a vital component for the Crown's consideration prior to making required decisions about your project. It should be noted that although the record of consultation becomes part of the public record for the environmental assessment, the 'Relations with Aboriginal Communities Exemption' under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act allows the ministry to protect sensitive or confidential information provided by Indigenous communities.

Please let us know if any such information should be protected from public disclosure.

#### Next Steps

The ministry is committed to environmental protection and engaging Indigenous communities and other interested persons throughout the environmental assessment process. The ministry encourages you, and your community, to participate in the consultation process and will be available throughout should you have any questions or concerns.

If you have any questions or concerns at this time, please don't hesitate to contact Adam Sanzo, Project Officer, at 416-314-8360 or by e-mail at [adam.sanzo@ontario.ca](mailto:adam.sanzo@ontario.ca). If you have any questions about the project, you may also contact Mr. Greg van Loenen, Environmental Compliance Officer at GFL Environmental Inc. at 613-538-2776 ext. 223 or [gvanloenen@gflenv.com](mailto:gvanloenen@gflenv.com).

## Comments Received after the Distribution of the Project Update

### Agency Comment Response Table

Comment	Response
<p><b>Terri Forrester – Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MOECC) – May 8, 2020</b></p> <p>Good Afternoon Kelly</p> <p>I have forwarded your email with attachments to Senior Environmental Officer Candice McKay, who is now covering the GFL EOWHF file.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged. The mailing list has been updated accordingly.</p>
<p><b>Gillian Lee – OPP – May 8, 2020</b></p> <p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Please update your records to send these emails to Jennifer.Davey@opp.ca</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged. The mailing list has been updated accordingly.</p>
<p><b>Mary Dillon – Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) – May 11, 2020</b></p> <p>Thank you for the project update.</p> <p>We look forward to providing feedback on the draft Terms of Reference in June. To that end, will you please update the distribution list to include Kristen Wagner (copied here)? I will be moving into a new position next week and Kristen will look after EAs and other planning files for Kemptville District until July.</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged. The mailing list has been updated accordingly.</p>
<p><b>Emily Webb – Impact Assessment Agency of Canada/Government of Canada – May 15, 2020</b></p> <p>Dear Greg van Loenen:</p> <p>Subject: Information on the projects subject to the Impact Assessment Act</p> <p>The Impact Assessment Agency of Canada has reviewed the project update, dated May 8, 2020, for the Future Development Project at the Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility in Moose Creek, Ontario.</p> <p>The Impact Assessment Act (IAA) outlines a process for assessing the impacts of major projects, including the assessment of positive and negative environmental, economic, health and social effects that are within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada. The Physical Activities Regulations (also known as the Project List) describe those projects that have the greatest potential to cause adverse effects in those areas. Proponents of those projects are required to submit a project description to the Agency.</p> <p>Based on the information available to the Agency, your project does not appear to be described on the Project List. Kindly review the requirements of IAA, including the Project List.</p> <p>If you believe that your project is not subject to IAA, and do not intend to submit an initial Project Description, we kindly request that you remove the Agency from your distribution list.</p>	<p>Comment Acknowledged.</p>



[www.canada.ca/iaac](http://www.canada.ca/iaac) [www.canada.ca/aeic](http://www.canada.ca/aeic)

If you have any questions, please contact us at 416-952-1576. We can also be reached by email to [iaac.ontarioregion-regiondntario.aeic@canada.ca](mailto:iaac.ontarioregion-regiondntario.aeic@canada.ca). The attachment that follows provides web links to useful legislation, regulation, and guidance documents.

Sincerely,  
 Loraine Cox  
 A/Director, Ontario Region

Enclosure: Useful Legislation, Regulation, and Guidance Documents  
 Attachment – Useful Legislation, Regulation, and Guidance Documents

For more information on the Impact Assessment Act, please refer to the following links:

Legislation and Regulations:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/corporate/acts-regulations/legislation-regulations.html>

Impact Assessment Process Overview:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/services/policy-guidance/impact-assessment-process-overview.html>

Practitioner's Guide to Federal Impact Assessments under the Impact Assessment Act: <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/services/policy-guidance/practitioners-guide-impact-assessment-act.html>

Compendium of Policies and Guidance Documents:

<https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/services/policy-guidance.html>

Government of Canada News Release dated August 8, 2019: <https://www.canada.ca/en/impact-assessment-agency/news/2019/08/better-rules-for-impact-assessments-come-into-effect-this-month.html>

**Public Comment Response Table**

Comment	Response
<b>Member of the Public – May 14, 2020</b>	
I appreciate the needs and issues of your operations. However, the smells we get at the physio clinic and at St-Hubert Casselman are still considerable and quite frequent. I don't think it is appropriate that you expand when the smells are an ongoing issue for businesses and residents in Casselman.	In 2017, GFL initiated a 3-year plan to enhance the landfill gas management system at the EOWHF and substantial improvements in landfill gas odour have been achieved from past operations. Additional gas wells have been installed, and, a second blower skid and a third flare will be installed in 2020, which are anticipated to continue to minimize odours at the site. GFL will continue to undertake measures to minimize the potential for odours from operations.

## Responses to Indigenous Community Comments on the Archaeological Assessment Stage 1

Comment	Response
<b>Mohawk Council of Akwesasne – Phillip White-Cree – June 24, 2020</b>	
<p>After reviewing the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, 'Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility Future Development Part of Lots 13-16, Concession 10 and Lots 16-19 Concession 9 Township of North Stormont' report dated June 17, 2020, our office concurs with the recommendation that no further work is needed. As there are no archaeological resources found.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>We do have a recommendation within the Historical Context section of the report. The outdated hierarchical term of 'Band' is used in several areas, to which the more correct term would be 'groups.' Our recommendation would be to refrain from using the antiquated term of 'Bands' in describing any Historical context.</p>	<p>The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment report prepared in support of the EA has been updated by replacing the term "band" in the report with the term "group" and/or "community" as appropriate.</p>
<b>Nation Huronne-Wendatt Bureau du Nionwentsio – Maxime Picard – July 29, 2020</b>	
<p>After review the Huron-Wendat Nation does not have any comments on the Stage 1 report. However we insist to be informed and updated on any archaeology that would be initiated as part of next project phases.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. The Huron-Wendat Nation will continue to be informed and updated on the project as it progresses through the environmental assessment process.</p>

## Comments Received on Draft Terms of Reference

### Responses to Agency Comments on the Draft Terms of Reference

Comment	Response
<b>Ministry of Natural Resources &amp; Forestry (MNRF) – Kristen Wagner – June 19, 2020</b>	
<i>General</i>	
<p>Our Management Bio is currently reviewing the draft ToR and has asked if we can have the report from the consultants showing the results of the fisheries surveys conducted on the Fraser Drain and Tayside-Legault Drain that were completed in 2019?</p>	<p>In response to this request, the preliminary draft Natural Environment Existing Conditions report for the future development of the EOWHF was provided to the MNRF on June 23, 2020. The report will be revised to include additional data that will be collected in 2020. GFL expects to broadly circulate the existing conditions report for review as part of the environmental assessment following the approval of the Terms of Reference (ToR).</p>
<b>Ministry of Natural Resources &amp; Forestry (MNRF) – Kristen Wagner – June 29, 2020</b>	
<i>Bird Migration</i>	
<p>Although not currently mapped in Land Information Ontario, the site is now a part of the larger Migratory Bird Staging and Migration Stopover Area to the north, more so as it pertains to Snow Geese and Canada Geese, for both spring and fall. This natural heritage value needs to be incorporated in the description of the local Ecological Environment.</p>	<p>The description of the Ecological Environment existing conditions in the ToR has been updated to acknowledge that the study area is part of a larger natural heritage feature that spans to the north and includes a Migratory Bird Staging and Migration Stopover Area, specifically for Snow Geese and Canada Geese during both the spring and fall, as well as a Raptor Wintering Area for various species.</p>
<i>Surface Water Quality and Fish Habitat</i>	
<p>We have general concerns with how potential environmental effects are proposed to be evaluated/predicted as it directly relates to surface water quality, and its fish and fish habitat. This concern applies not only to watercourses on site, but also to receiving watercourses downstream (i.e. Moose Creek and Scotch River), with more complex fish communities. The proposed evaluation criteria seem strictly focused on contaminants (page B-4) but they also need to incorporate nutrient, silt and sediment loading from this proposed landfill expansion which will essentially double the size of the current facility. The latter stressors have a direct impact on these fisheries' thermal regimes and fish habitat (water) quality. We feel that as currently worded, the proposed criteria will under-evaluate environmental effects as they relate to potential impacts on aquatic ecosystems on site, and downstream.</p>	<p>The "rationale" for the Surface Water Quality criteria in Table B-1 has been revised to better reflect that the assessment completed for the EA will be broader than contaminants.</p> <p>The Surface Water Quality effects assessment will include total suspended solids (TSS) and nutrients in addition to other pollutants. The environmental assessment will examine the potential for on-site and downstream water quality impacts from the landfill over and above background conditions and potential effects on aquatic habitat and biota. The Data Sources for this criteria have been updated to reflect the broader technical information to be considered to address these potential effects.</p>
<p>On page B-5, under Aquatic Ecosystems, using fish and fish habitat survey data from previous studies and previous existing conditions reports is fine for use as baseline data/information, but the Evaluation Criteria should focus on modeling the potential environmental effects based on abiotic stressors, as outlined in the previous bullet point.</p>	<p>As noted above, the environmental assessment will examine the potential for on-site and downstream contaminant loading and the associated impact on aquatic habitat and biota. Factors that will be considered include changes in water temperature, TSS, and nutrients. The assessment of effects on aquatic biota will involve the comparison of receiving environment conditions (under a mixed scenario) to tolerances of the biota in the receiving environment as summarized by published water quality guidelines, or other technical information as is appropriate. Examples of this technical information have been added to the Data Sources column for this criteria.</p>
<i>Significant Woodlands</i>	
<p>On page 34 0 Section 7.2.1.4 Ecological Environment, it is stated that 'a locally significant woodland' is located within the Moose Creek wetland complex. The use of the term 'locally significant' in this context is misleading. This woodland is mapped as a Significant Woodland, as per the Provincial Policy Statement (2020) and the Planning Act.</p>	<p>The description of the woodland in the ToR as been modified to 'Significant Woodland' as per the Provincial Policy Statement and <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>
<b>Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) – Khalid Hussain – July 15, 2020</b>	
<i>Leachate Treatment and Stormwater Discharge</i>	
<p>The proponents should consult MECP Regional Technical Support Section to determine the level of treatment required for discharge to the receiving surface water body(ies). This may be treated as a guidance to determine the objectives for design of the newly proposed leachate treatment process at the site.</p>	<p>As indicated in Section 6.2 of the ToR, alternative methods for treating landfill leachate will be identified and assessed, as appropriate, during the environmental assessment. Leachate management requirements over the life of the project will be established. GFL will continue to consult with the MECP to identify and establish treated leachate discharge parameters and the methods to achieve these parameters.</p>



<b>Stormwater Management</b>	
As per the ToRs the existing SWM works are designed for Enhanced level of protection, quantity control and erosion protection. The proponents should evaluate whether the conventional stormwater treatment process will be adequate to remove the potential landfill related contaminants from the stormwater effluent from the site. The stormwater treatment may need to be based upon advance treatment process in order to be more robust in providing effective treatment. In addition, monitoring, contingency and trigger mechanism will need to be developed in order to ensure that the proposed stormwater works can consistently and reliably provide the contaminants control as related to the nature of the landfilling operation on the subject site. The final discharge from the stormwater works should meet a criteria to be set by MECP Regional Technical Support Section staff.	The stormwater management system (SWM) will be designed to minimize the potential effects on the environment in a manner consistent with the requirements of the MECP. GFL will continue to consult with the MECP during the environmental assessment process. The detailed design of the SWM will be prepared following the approval of the environmental assessment to address the requirements of an Environmental Compliance Approval. This will include details like monitoring, contingency, and trigger mechanism.
<b>Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) – Rick Li – July 15, 2020</b>	
<b>Rationale for the Undertaking</b>	
In Section 5.1 Rational for the Undertaking, the need for the additional disposal capacity should be elaborated to include assessment on the projection of future waste quantities in Eastern Ontario that takes into account the increased waste diversion as per Waste Free Ontario, the available disposal capacity, and the projected future waste disposal need in the region.	An extensive description of the requirement for long term disposal capacity in eastern Ontario has been provided in Section 5.1 of the ToR. This includes the lack of disposal capacity in the region and how the various facilities and programs associated with the EOWHF are consistent with Provincial waste diversion legislation.
<b>Alternative Methods</b>	
For the alternative methods for landfill expansion, only horizontal expansion is considered. Other alternative expansion methods including vertical expansion, and vertical plus horizontal expansion needs to be considered.	The vertical expansion of the existing EOWHF landfill is not a reasonable alternative to be considered because the underlying geological and geotechnical conditions will not support an increase in landfill height, and the associated weight, without becoming unstable. An explanation for why vertical expansion alternatives are not being considered has been added to Section 6.2 of the ToR.
<b>Public Consultation</b>	
As part of the public consultation, only one public open house was held. As the province re-opens and eases restrictions on social gathering, additional in-person public meetings that are allowed by provincial and local government should be considered, in order to eliminate barrier and provide the opportunity for anyone who have interest to provide input and express concerns on the proposal.	Comment acknowledged. As outlined in Section 9.1 of the ToR and in the Record of Consultation and Engagement Supporting Document, a number of consultation and engagement activities were undertaken, along with Open House #1, to continue to obtain feedback and input on the project during the COVID pandemic. As outlined in Section 9.2 of the ToR, a range of consultation and engagement activities are planned for the environmental assessment, the format of which will be confirmed subject to any future social gathering restrictions.
<b>Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) – Lauren Forrester – July 8, 2020</b>	
<b>Surface Water Environment</b>	
Effluent from both the existing stormwater management facility and LTF is discharged to the Fraser Drain. Information available in this office identifies the Fraser Drain as an intermittently flowing Class C Municipal Drain (warm water fish habitat, without top predator fish or indicator species). This is contrary to the statement in the report that there is an overall lack of fish habitat within the on-site study area.	The last paragraph in Section 7.2.1.4 of the ToR has been revised. Field studies are underway to further characterize the existing environment as part of the environmental assessment process. These studies have identified the Fraser Municipal and Upper Tayside Drains as providing habitat for fish communities in the summer. The completed existing conditions reports will be circulated during the environmental assessment.
Moose Creek is considered a Policy 2 receiver for iron, phosphorus and nitrate, as noted by HDR. For Policy 2 receivers, effluent must not cause further deterioration of water quality relative to those parameters that currently exceed applicable water quality guidelines (i.e. concentration in effluent must be no higher than that in the receiving stream). Policy 2 deviation was granted for phosphorus for the existing facility (memorandum of Brian Ward, MECP Eastern Region Director, April 22, 2003). The agreement authorizes the discharge of effluent with up to 0.3 mg/L TP, provided conditions are met. A new agreement for phosphorus will be required to support this new/additional phosphorus loading to Moose Creek. No such deviation exists for nitrate.	The need for, and extent of, a new agreement related to the discharge of phosphorus to Moose Creek will be considered in conjunction with landfill leachate treatment alternatives as part of the environmental assessment. Appropriate mitigation measures regarding the discharge of nitrate will also be identified and assessed during the environmental assessment.
The authors suggest that existing water quality effects in the Fraser Drain from LTF effluent are transient. While this may be true during high flow conditions, during low flow conditions effluent has been shown to become stranded within the Fraser Drain, with potential to cause impairment. It is the expectation of this office that the EA provide a complete and accurate description of the existing effects of LTF effluent to the Fraser Drain.	As noted in Section 7.2 of the ToR, the descriptions of existing environmental conditions presented in the ToR are considered preliminary. The environmental assessment will include more detailed descriptions based on various studies, investigations, field work, etc. The surface water quality existing conditions will be documented in detail as part of the environmental assessment process, including a description of the existing effects of LTF effluent discharge to the Fraser Drain based on on-going sampling and monitoring. The existing conditions report will be circulated for review and comment as part of the environmental assessment process. The description of existing conditions for surface water quality in the ToR has been revised to distinguish high and low flow periods.
Any descriptions of the existing environment and effects of current operation must be representative of the actual effects of operations during high and low flow periods.	Comment acknowledged.

<b>Leachate Treatment</b>	
An existing leachate treatment facility is located at the north end of the site, with discharge to the Fraser Drain. The draft TOR provides limited detail on intended evaluation of leachate treatment within the EA. The proponent must ensure that adequate detail is provided within the EA to demonstrate that the proposed wastewater treatment system will achieve acceptable effluent quality and have the hydraulic capacity to manage and treat landfill leachate from the proposed new waste disposal area. Treatment for major ions is required, particularly for nitrate as no assimilative capacity exists within the receiver for that parameter, as discussed above.	Section 6.2 of the ToR notes that alternative methods for treating landfill leachate will be identified and assessed, as appropriate, during the environmental assessment. At this time, it is premature to identify specific alternatives given the on-going monitoring and assessment being undertaken around this issue. GFL anticipates that sufficient data and analysis will be completed and available during the environmental assessment to inform the identification of alternative methods for leachate treatment.
The EOWHF owner must ensure that the design of the leachate treatment facility is such that it can achieve acceptable effluent quality and will provide the required hydraulic capacity to manage and treat leachate from the proposed new waste disposal area, such that effluent does not pose adverse impact to the receiving surface water regime to be protected.	Comment acknowledged. Leachate management requirements over the life of the project will be established. Alternative methods to manage and treat the effluent will be identified and the potential effects on the environment assessed, including mitigation measures as appropriate. A preferred alternative will be identified as part of the environmental assessment.
<b>Stormwater Management</b>	
The stormwater management works to be employed must effectively treat contaminants of concern such that the quantity and quality of stormwater runoff from the site does not pose adverse impact to the receiving surface water regime to be protected.	Comment acknowledged. The stormwater management system will be designed to minimize the potential effects on the environment in a manner consistent with the requirements of MECP. GFL will continue to consult with MECP during the EA process.
<b>Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) – Nancy Orpana – July 23, 2020</b>	
<b>Air Quality</b>	
7.2.1.1 Atmospheric Environment – Air Quality This section describes the area surrounding the site comprising of mostly agricultural lands as well as portions of the Trans-Canada Highway (Highway 417) and Highway 138 and several businesses. There are 7 residents within the off-site study area that should have been included in this section.	The description of the Air Quality environment in the ToR has been updated to identify the presence of 7 residences within the off-site study area.
<b>Odour</b>	
7.2.1.1 Atmospheric Environment – Odour Frequency of Exceedance of Odour-Based Contaminants This section states that based on previous studies, the odour impacts within the on-site and off- site study areas are expected to meet the relevant air quality standards for all odour-based contaminants of concern for all but a minimal 0.6% of the time; therefore, the EOWHF meets the relevant air quality standards for all odour-based contaminants of concern approximately 99.4% of the time. This percentage of exceedances of odour-based standards should be given some context with ministry guidance on acceptable frequency. The ministry's Technical Bulletin Methodology for Modelling Assessments of Contaminants with 10-minute Average Standards and Guidelines for Odour under O. Reg. 418/05 states the following: <i>'For a facility that emits a contaminant with a 10-minute odour-based standard or guideline, and for assessment purposes only, it is considered acceptable if the modelling shows that at a location of a human receptor the standard or guideline is exceeded less than 0.5% of the time, which corresponds to approximately 44 hours per year. This means that 99.5% of the time in any given year, the 10-minute odour-based standards and guidelines will be met, assuming that the emission scenario used in the modelling is accurate.'</i>	The wording in Section 7.2.1.1 of the ToR has been revised to provide greater clarity. The previous study assessed contaminants with 10-minute average, odour-based air standards or guidelines, and found concentrations of all such contaminants were below the applicable standards or guidelines, i.e., for the contaminants to which the Technical Bulletin applies, there were no exceedances. However, modelled concentrations of odour were predicted to exceed 1 OU/m <sup>3</sup> about 0.6% of the time.  The environmental assessment will include studies to document existing conditions and the potential effects of the undertaking. In each case, if modelled odour concentrations exceed 1 OU/m <sup>3</sup> , statistical analysis will be provided, including frequency of exceedance and/or the 99.5th percentile. This will provide context for comparison to the guideline limit.





<p><b>Primary Odour Sources</b>                  The TOR states that in previous studies, the primary odour sources at the EOWHF were identified as the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landfill leachate ponds;</li> <li>• Landfill working face and completed areas with a permeable cap;</li> <li>• Composting facility biofilter;</li> <li>• Enclosed LFG flares; and</li> <li>• LFG utilization facility combustion stacks.</li> </ul> <p>The previous studies were listed as Supporting Document 1-2 – Odour Existing Conditions Report dated May 16, 2018. However, this report appears to be outdated in its list of primary odour sources, since a report titled Technology Benchmarking Report Assessment of Methods to Reduce Odour Impacts from the Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility dated March 24, 2020 lists the following odour sources as negligible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South leachate aeration ponds;</li> <li>• Leachate treatment facility;</li> <li>• Treated effluent holding ponds;</li> <li>• Auxiliary wetland ponds;</li> <li>• Landfill gas utilization facility (which includes the flares); and</li> <li>• Finished compost storage and screening.</li> </ul> <p>The Technology Benchmarking Report lists the following odour sources are the primary odour contributors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landfill gas – 70%;</li> <li>• Tipping – 9%;</li> <li>• Compost fugitives – 8%;</li> <li>• Leaf and yard waste storage – 4%; and</li> <li>• Biofilter.</li> </ul>	<p>The description of primary odour sources at the EOWHF in Section 7.2.1.1 of the ToR has been updated to reflect the more recent work completed at the site and documented in the Technology Benchmarking Report.</p>
<p><b>Odour Complaints</b>                  The TOR states that in 2017 through 2018 a total of 12 odour-related complaints were received, and no odour complaints were received in 2019. According to ministry records there were 19 odour-related complaints in 2018 through 2018. There have been 3 odour-related complaints in 2019 and one to-date in 2020.</p>	<p>The ToR identified all odour complaints that GFL has received, which includes no complaints in 2019 or 2020 to-date. GFL would be pleased to receive any information from the MECP regarding complaints that have not been previously provided to GFL directly.</p>
<p><b>Ministry of Economic Development, Job Creation and Trade (MEDJCT) – Michael Helfinger – July 27, 2020</b></p>	
<p>MEDJCT staff have reviewed and have no comments.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p><b>Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) – Kimberly Livingstone – July 31, 2020</b></p>	
<p><b>Archaeological Resources</b></p>	
<p>Section 7.2.3.1 Archaeological Resources                  This section states that the expansion was subject to a 2020 Stage 1 archaeological assessment (AA). Please provide the Heritage Unit with the Project Information Form Number for the Stage 1 AA, so that these files can be linked and the assessment can be confirmed to have been reviewed and entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.</p>	<p>The Project Information Form (PIF) Number for the Stage 1 archaeological assessment that has been completed is P383-0205-2020. The report is in the process of being submitted to the MHSTCI for review.</p>
<p><b>Cultural Heritage Resources</b></p>	
<p>Section 7.2.3.2 Cultural Heritage Resources                  It is not clear how the four cultural heritage resources were identified within the off-site study area. Please confirm if a new study was undertaken for this identification or if this identification was based on a previous report. MHSTCI may have further comments regarding this section.</p>	<p>A new study was undertaken to identify cultural heritage resources to inform the environmental assessment. This report will be circulated for review and comments as part of the environmental assessment process. It is noted that the new study identifies three cultural heritage resources within the off-site study area. The ToR has been revised to reflect this information.</p>
<p>A map should be included in this section that identifies the four cultural heritage resources in relation to the proposed expansion.</p>	<p>The Cultural Heritage Resources study, to be completed in 2020 to support the description of existing conditions, including all figures, will be circulated for review during the environmental assessment.</p>
<p>Table B-1. Proposed Evaluation Criteria, Indicators and Data Sources for the Environmental Assessment                  The Cultural Environment section in Table B-1 should be updated so the language is aligned with MHSTCI's current framework.</p>	<p>The Cultural Heritage Resources rationale, indicators and data sources language in Table B-1 of the ToR has been updated to address the MHSTCI's current framework.</p>
<p><b>Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) – Ross Kircher – July 31, 2020</b></p>	
<p><b>Air Quality</b></p>	
<p>LFG is of particular concern for sites without a bottom liner, with permeable soil or nearby residential properties. It is recommended the proponent include plans to address concerns of LFG migration and atmospheric emissions in the EA.</p>	<p>The potential for landfill gas (LFG) migration and atmospheric emissions will be assessed as part of the environmental assessment. LFG migration is not anticipated to be a concern as the facility is located within low permeability silty clay soils. It is noted that the existing landfill has LFG detection wells installed around the perimeter of the site to confirm that LFG migration is not occurring.</p>



Regulation 232/98 requires the mandatory collection of landfill gas for new or expanding sites with a total waste disposal capacity greater than 1.5 million cubic metres, or smaller sites under certain circumstances. The proponent should include in the EA an approach to evaluate LFG collection, and if required, develop a plan to do so.	The existing EOWHF includes an LFG collection and management system. The expanded landfill will include LFG collection and this has been clarified in Section 6.2 of the ToR. As noted in this section, the existing LFG-to-energy facility will continue to be utilized, and alternative methods for managing LFG will also be identified and assessed, as appropriate, during the environmental assessment.
Appendix B – Evaluation Criteria, Indicators and Data Sources I recommend that air quality indicators include all potential contaminants released through operations at the site. For example, LFG has approximately 50 different constituents which may pose impacts to local air quality. Frequency of exceedance(s) should be included as an indicator for both air quality and odour.	The Air Quality indicator in Table B-1 of the ToR has been revised to include concentrations of emitted contaminants of concern.  An additional Air Quality and Odour indicator has been added to Table B-1 of the ToR to address frequency of exceedance.
The draft ToR proposes the evaluation of air quality, noise and odour using acceptable indicators and data sources, with the recommendations and exceptions noted above.	Comment acknowledged.
It is recommended that air quality, odour and noise emissions and impacts be evaluated using approved ministry models and guidance and compared to appropriate criteria. Meteorological and/or background data used for evaluation should be from approved ambient monitoring stations. Cumulative effects should be considered. Net air quality and odour effects of the proposed expansion should be considered relative to the "no build" scenario.	The list of Data Sources included in Table B-1 of the ToR for Air Quality, Odour and Noise indicate that applicable MECP guidelines, technical standards, and models will be used to complete the assessment supporting the evaluation criteria/ indicators.  The list of Data Sources for Air Quality and Odour in Table B-1 of the ToR have been updated to reflect that "approved" meteorological data will be utilized.  As described in Section 8.5 of the ToR, the cumulative effects of the preferred alternative will be considered in the environmental assessment.  The effects assessment of the preferred alternative, as described in Section 8.5 of the ToR, will compare the potential effects of the project to the 'do nothing' alternative.
GFL has suggested that the effects of the proposed expansion on GHG emissions will be assessed in the EA Study. The effects of climate change (such as changes in temperature and precipitation, etc.) on the EOWHF should also be assessed.	Section 8.5 of the ToR has been updated to reflect that the environmental assessment will also consider the effect of climate change on the preferred alternative.
Should an ambient monitoring plan be included in the EA, it may encompass noise, odour, and emissions including, but not limited to LFG collection and ambient air quality.	The existing monitoring programs at the EOWHF include air quality, noise, and odour. Site specific monitoring requirements will be developed as part of the Environmental Compliance Approval process.
The ToR is generally acceptable from air quality perspective, provided the above comments are addressed.	Comment acknowledged.
<b>Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) Environmental Assessment and Permissions Branch – Adam Sanzo – July 31, 2020</b>	
<i>General</i>	
On page 10, there is a reference to the landfill receiving an annual average of less than 450,000 tonnes up until 2016. However, the table below the statement (Table 1) shows that in 2014 the landfill accepted 526,653 tonnes. Possible inconsistency – please explain or confirm and revise.	As shown in Table 1 of the ToR, the annual tonnage managed at the EOWHF was less than 450,000 tonnes prior to 2014 and then exceeded this amount in 2014, 2015, and 2016. The annual average between 2009 to 2016 was approximately 435,000 tonnes. GFL acquired the facility in 2016. This clarification has been included in the ToR.
A work plan must be included in the ToR that lists and explains the studies, tests, surveys, mapping etc. that will be done during the EA to predict impact and further define the environment This is also required to be included in the EA.	In Table B-1 of the ToR, the Data Sources column includes the work to be undertaken during the environmental assessment for each Evaluation Criteria in the form of studies, assessments, models, mapping, etc. The work outlined for each criteria will be used to predict the potential effects of the undertaking on the environment.
<i>Section 3.1 – Preparation of the Terms of Reference</i>	
GFL needs to revise the wording of this section to further explain what is acceptable when proceeding through Section 6(2)(c) and 6.1(3) of the EAA. Consider including the following wording: "GFL intends to proceed under subsections 6(2)(c) and 6.1(3) of the EAA, which will allow the proponent to focus the EA. Specifically, the GFL intends to exclude the 'Alternatives To' assessment during the EA studies because an evaluation of short term and long term waste management alternatives for a 25 year planning horizon was separately carried out in previous studies. The assessment of the 'Alternatives To', including consideration of the do nothing scenario, have been further reassessed during the preparation of this ToR and is presented in Section 6 of this ToR."	Section 3.1 of the ToR has been updated to include text consistent with the suggested wording.
It is also important to provide a brief summary of this previous information and why the 'alternatives to' do not address the current problem and or opportunity.	Section 3.1 of the ToR has been updated to include a brief summary of how 'alternatives to' have been considered.
It will also be important to include a brief environmental rationale for the expansion of the landfill. Considerations such as land ownership and room to expand, compliance with existing environmental approvals, existing site conditions, established haul routes and close to customers and your phased expansion approach may be worthy of note.	Section 3.1 of the ToR has been updated to include a brief environmental rationale for the project.

<p>In accordance with the Codes of Practice for the ToR, the Do Nothing alternative must be carried forward as a base case comparison against the expansion of the landfill.</p>	<p>The effects assessment of the preferred alternative, as described in Section 8.5 of the ToR, will compare the potential effects of the project to the 'do nothing' alternative. This has also been identified in Section 3.1 of the ToR.</p>
<p>In addition, you must also provide a rationale for further focusing of the assessment with the identification of alternative methods that are to be considered in the EA. There needs to be justification in the ToR for the inclusion of only two different locations and designs as well as flexibility in the ToR to consider other locations or designs if it is deemed necessary during the EA.</p>	<p>A brief summary of the rationale to focus the identification of alternative methods has been included in Section 3.1 of the ToR. Section 6.2 of the ToR has been updated to include a rationale for focusing of the identification of alternative methods.</p> <p>Statements are included in Sections 3.2, 6.2 and 11 of the ToR regarding flexibility in the ToR to consider modifications to the proposed alternatives, including identification of additional alternatives if warranted.</p>
<p><b>Section 4 – Purpose of the Undertaking</b></p>	
<p>Wording is required to indicate why specifically this Project is being undertaken at this time. Although it is implied throughout the ToR that this undertaking is for the expansion of the facility once it reaches capacity, it needs to be specifically identified in this section. Consider including wording that states what the current capacity of the facility is, when it will reach capacity and that this ToR/EA is for the future expansion of the facility once the capacity is reached in the year 2025.</p>	<p>Section 4 of the ToR has been updated to indicate why the Project is being undertaken at this time, consistent with the suggested wording.</p>
<p><b>Section 6.2 – Identification of Alternative Methods</b></p>	
<p>A statement is required that explains how Alternative Methods will be assessed in the EA. Consider including the following wording into this section: "GFL will qualitatively predict the effects for each 'Alternative Method' (i.e., including expansion locations and conceptual design and mitigation measures) on the environment. The assessment will be done for each component based on the locations and conceptual designs for each alternative, including mitigation and the existing environmental conditions."</p>	<p>The suggested wording has been included in Section 6.2 of the ToR.</p>
<p>In addition, flexibility must be given to include more alternative methods if necessary. Please include a statement indicating that additional alternative methods could be assessed at the EA stage.</p>	<p>Statements are included in Sections 3.2, 6.2 and 11 of the ToR regarding flexibility in the ToR to consider modifications to the proposed alternatives, including identification of additional alternatives if warranted. The text in Section 6.2 of the ToR has been updated to provide additional clarity.</p>
<p>Furthermore, wording must be included in this section to identify why these alternative methods were considered at this point- namely that the proponent owns the land that these alternatives will be on, that the land is already zoned for that usage, etc. Otherwise, it is also acceptable to not include any description of the Alternative methods at this stage and indicate that the description and assessments of alternative methods will be undertaken in the EA.</p>	<p>Section 6.2 of the ToR has been updated to include a rationale for focusing of the identification of alternative methods. This includes a description of how the soil conditions at the EOWHF cannot support a vertical expansion of the landfill. The limitation on the landfill height due to geotechnical conditions also limits the number of potential options within the on-site study area. Statements are included in Sections 3.2, 6.2 and 11 of the ToR regarding flexibility in the ToR to consider modifications to the proposed alternatives, including identification of additional alternatives if warranted. The text in Section 6.2 of the ToR has been updated to provide additional clarity.</p>
<p><b>Section 7 – Description of Existing Environment and Potential Effects of the Undertaking</b></p>	
<p>Within the description of the Environment, GFL must include a description of any work or studies previously completed. The previous EA for the expansion of the EOWHF should be included here as well as a statement that the description of the existing environment (as well as other relevant sections) are consistent with the previous studies. A general overview of the environmental conditions in the study area should be included in this section?</p>	<p>Previously completed work and studies, including the previous environmental assessment for the expansion of the EOWHF, were the basis of the description of the existing environment in the ToR. References to various studies used to describe the existing conditions are included throughout this section, and an explicit reference to the previous environmental assessment has been added in Section 7 of the ToR. Any identified changes in the existing conditions as described in the previous environmental assessment are indicated in this section. A general overview of the environmental conditions in the study area are included in this section of the ToR.</p>
<p>The following wording should be included in this section as well:          "The EAA defines the environment in a broad, general sense that comprises physical, biological and human considerations. In this EA the environment has been separated broadly into environmental and social components"</p>	<p>The suggested wording has been included in Section 7 of the ToR.</p>
<p>GFL must also include a statement that indicates that a more detailed description of the environment will be included in the EA report.</p>	<p>A statement that indicates a more detailed description of the environment will be included in the environmental assessment report was included in the first paragraph of Section 7.2 of the ToR.</p>
<p><b>Section 8.3 – Prediction of Potential Environmental Effects for Each Alternative Method</b></p>	
<p>GFL must include a commitment that the EA will include a description of actions necessary or that may reasonably be expected to be necessary to prevent or mitigate the effects upon or the environment.</p>	<p>Section 8.3 of the ToR has been updated to include a commitment that the EA will include a description of mitigation measures to address any identified potential effects on the environment.</p>
<p>As information was missing or incomplete in your draft ToR, additional review will be required once your revised draft ToR is submitted. Additional comments may be provided at that time.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>



<b>Record of Consultation</b>	
In general, prior to submitting your ToR, please be advised that you are also required to provide a Record of Consultation as per section 6(3) of the (EAA), which should detail consultation on the ToR, any comments recorded, and responses to any comments received from MECP. As opposed to submitting this Record of Consultation as an appendix to the ToR, it should be submitted as a separate supporting document.	A Record of Consultation and Engagement supporting document was prepared in conjunction with the draft ToR and a copy was provided for review on the project website ( <a href="http://www.gflenv.com/moose-creek-eowhf">www.gflenv.com/moose-creek-eowhf</a> ). The Record of Consultation and Engagement has been updated to include any comments received on the draft ToR and GFL's responses, along with any additional consultation and engagement activities carried out after the draft ToR was circulated.
If any other agencies provided comments (i.e. Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, Ministry of Tourism, Conservation and Sport, Conservation Authorities, etc.), please provide them as well in the Record of Consultation.	All comments received during the preparation and review of the ToR are included in the Record of Consultation and Engagement.
<b>Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) – Robert Holland – August 12, 2020</b>	
<b>Groundwater Impacts</b>	
The size of the study area and methods proposed to address groundwater impacts are adequate.	Comment acknowledged.
Increased onsite buffer areas may be required beyond the minimum regulated requirements set out in Ont. Reg 232 for the proposed expansion to address shallow groundwater impacts being observed at the approved site that were not anticipated in the original site design and approval. The attached document outlines current work that is being done by the owner at the existing site to confirm Ministry Guideline B-7 conformance.	Conceptual designs for the alternative methods (i.e., two landfill configurations) identified in the ToR will be developed at a sufficient level of detail for the assessment of potential effects on the environment. Mitigation measures will be incorporated into the design and operating plan for each concept to meet regulatory requirements and minimize effects, as appropriate. This will include consideration of the appropriate on-site buffer distance.

**Responses to Municipal Comments on the Draft Terms of Reference**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>Township of North Stormont – Craig Calder – July 23, 2020</b>	
Upon review the township has no comments to offer at this time.	Comment acknowledged.
<b>South Nation Conservation Authority – James Holland – August 7, 2020</b>	
Figure 6 – Study Area does not depict all watercourses - Roxborough-Plantagenet Boundary Municipal Drain flows along the northern boundary of the study site - An unnamed watercourse flows along the southern boundary along Lafleche Road	Figure 6 of the ToR has been updated to depict the location of these two watercourses within the Study Area.
Appendix B – Evaluation Criteria - Surface water quantity criteria must consider design capacities outlined in the municipal drain Engineers Reports. The Engineer’s Reports should be listed as a data source.	Table B-1 of the ToR has been updated to include municipal drain Engineer's Reports as a data source for the Surface Water Quantity criteria.

**Responses to Public Comments on the Draft Terms of Reference**

Comment	Response
<b>Proximity and Property Value</b>	
<p>I have some concerns regarding this expansion towards hwy 138 I have a house that is right across the road which now will be way too close to your dump When i did a farm expansion i had minimum distances to keep with neighboring houses Which as a result i had to build a cement containment for my manure storage And here we have a mega dump moving beside I wish you would consider compensating my house as before this the smell was or is most of the times unbearable. Just think now even closer the wind won't be the factor anymore i may as well have my house on the dump I m willing to bet none of you owners operators ...would live in my house I m not opposed to your expansion as it would be useless but all i ask is your consideration to compensate my house so we can destroy it and build far away</p>	<p>The purpose of the environmental assessment is to assess any potential effects from the project on the environment, including neighbouring residential properties. Mitigation measures to minimize effects will be identified and incorporated into the project, as appropriate.</p>
<p>My thing is i should not be the one who loses complete house value and the whole community benefits tax \$ and has a cheap place to throw its garbage.                      I hope we can come to an agreement if not i will consider other options The house has lost all possible sale value</p>	<p>GFL will continue to consult with the property owner regarding any potential effects and appropriate mitigation measures.</p>
<b>Alternatives</b>	
<p>A dump is necessary although there are other more expensive but more environmental ways to do this ex go to Switzerland see how it's done.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged. Alternatives to the undertaking have been considered in developing the ToR. These include alternatives that can address the rationale for the project outlined by GFL.</p>
<p>GFL has determined that the future development and ongoing operation of the EOWHF landfill is the only reasonable option for the company, its customers, and the Province of Ontario. The other alternatives do not address GFL's business opportunity to meet long-term customer commitments or avoid business risks, and they are not supportive of the Ontario government priorities of addressing waste diversion and climate change.</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p>
<p>The ToR's dismissal of commercially proven mass burn combustion process demonstrated at the Durham York Energy Centre in Clarington, ON, is short-sighted. There are communities in Eastern Ontario, including the City of Cornwall and several adjacent townships which are (or will be within 10 years) in need of waste management services. Incineration, combined with adjacent commercial enterprises to utilize the heat/electrical energy from waste combustion may be a better way of managing your client's waste, protecting the environment locally, and encouraging business enterprises/ entrepreneurship in the community. If the provincial and local governments were willing to approve this technology (incineration) in Clarington, it should be further analyzed for the Moose Creek facility.</p>	<p>As outlined in the ToR, GFL does not own or operate any thermal treatment facilities and has no related business experience with this type of alternative. Given the significant capital and operating costs associated with this type of alternative, and the lack of long term customer contracts to cover these costs, this type of alternative would present a significant financial risk for GFL.</p>
<p>I would like to draw your attention to the following articles regarding EFT in the Peterborough area. See  <a href="https://www.mykawartha.com/opinion-story/10111093-energy-from-waste-plant-would-reduce-thousands-of-tonnes-of-waste-per-year/">https://www.mykawartha.com/opinion-story/10111093-energy-from-waste-plant-would-reduce-thousands-of-tonnes-of-waste-per-year/</a> and  <a href="https://www.mykawartha.com/news-story/10070691-impact-group-proposes-energy-from-waste-incinerator-in-peterborough/">https://www.mykawartha.com/news-story/10070691-impact-group-proposes-energy-from-waste-incinerator-in-peterborough/</a>                      Why is GFL and HDR not looking at this waste management method ?</p>	
<b>Geology</b>	
<p>Based on the undertaken studies (hydrogeological, or other) confirming the depth of overburden, existing strata, bedrock strike and dip:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there sufficient volume of native silty-clay present on Lot 13 to excavate and construct the required landfill cell berm(s) ?</li> <li>Is there sufficient silty-clay overburden on all, (or most of the proposed 'Alternative Methods' areas) on Lot 13 to adequately protect the underlying limestone bedrock aquifer from leachate impacts?</li> <li>Is there an alternative source of suitable silty-clay that can be locally sourced for the berm construction ?</li> </ol>	<p>The alternative methods for carrying out the undertaking will be confirmed during the environmental assessment. This will include the development of conceptual designs for the two alternatives identified in the ToR, to a sufficient level of detail to assess their potential effects on the environment. The conceptual designs will take into consideration the existing environmental conditions to minimize or mitigate any potential effects. The existing geology and hydrogeology conditions will be considered in the conceptual designs for the alternatives.</p>