

9. Consultation and Engagement

This section of the EA Study Report provides a summary of the consultation and engagement program undertaken as part of the EA. This includes a description of how the consultation and engagement program influenced or resulted in changes to the proposed project. The detailed information related to the consultation and engagement program is included in **Supporting Document 4 – Record of Consultation and Engagement**.

9.1 Overview of the Consultation and Engagement Process for the EA

In accordance with the MOECC's Code of Practice: Preparing and Reviewing Environmental Assessments in Ontario (January 2014), Code of Practice: Consultation in Ontario's Environmental Assessment Process (January 2014) and as required by Section 5.1 of the OEAA, a consultation and engagement program involving agencies, Indigenous groups, and the public was carried out during the EA process.

The approved ToR included a consultation program to be undertaken for the EA (**Appendix A**). The EA consultation program was developed based on the following principles:

- transparency, accountability and accessibility;
- identification of stakeholder and Indigenous community concerns early in the process and addressing these concerns in the EA;
- multiple points of consultation and engagement throughout the EA using a variety of techniques (in-person, digital, print); and
- documentation of issues, concerns and responses in the EA.

The consultation program outlined the components and activities to be undertaken during the EA. A commitment was also made to continue to engage Indigenous communities and organizations with a potential interest in the project. The following subsections describe how each of these activities was implemented during the course of the EA.

By following the consultation program and consulting with interested people, GFL was able to provide opportunities for input before decisions were finalized and respond by making changes as appropriate. The input and comments received through the EA consultation process will be incorporated into the EA Study Report.

9.2 Participants in the EA Process

A broad group of participants were consulted and engaged in the EA process. This included:

- governmental departments, ministries and agencies with an interest in the project, typically referred to as the GRT;

- local municipalities, including the host Township of North Stormont;
- Indigenous communities in the vicinity of the EOWHF or with an interest in the project; and
- general public including residents, landowners, businesses and other stakeholders with an interest in the outcome of the EA.

A participants list for the EA was prepared based on the consultation and engagement process completed during the ToR. The participants list was updated throughout the EA process, including both the addition and removal of participants as required and when requested. A copy of the complete participants list is included in **Appendix A of Supporting Document 4**.

A list of the GRT members including federal, provincial and municipal agencies consulted during the EA process is provided below:

Government Review Team (GRT)

- Ministry of Indigenous Relations and Reconciliation (formerly Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs)²⁸
- Ministry of Northern Development and Mines
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
- Ministries of Citizenship and Immigration, Tourism, Culture and Sport
- Ministry of Education
- Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services
- Ontario Provincial Police
- Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada
- Transport Canada²⁸
- Environment and Climate Change Canada
- Ministry of Economic Development and Growth
- Ministry of Energy
- Ministry of Long-Term Care
- Ontario Growth Secretariat
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
- Ministry of Transportation
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency²⁸
- Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC)
- Civil Aviation Service Standard²⁸

²⁸ Agency removed from the contact list as requested during the EA Process.

Municipal Agencies

- Corporation of the Nation Municipality
- Eastern Ontario Health Unit
- North Stormont Fire Services
- South Nation Conservation Authority
- United Counties of Prescott-Russell
- United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry
- Township of North Stormont
- Raisin Region Conservation Authority
- Russell Township
- Upper Canada District School Board
- Village of Casselman
- Catholic District School Board of Eastern Ontario

Local residents within the vicinity of the EOWHF and neighbouring property owners were contacted as part of the Notice of Commencement of the project. Additional members of the public were added to the participants list during the course of the EA upon request. Members of the Community Liaison Committee were also included on the participants list.

During the preparation of the ToR, the following Indigenous communities and organizations were identified as having a potential interest in the project. These Indigenous communities and organizations were contacted during the development of the ToR and throughout the EA process.

Indigenous Communities and Organizations

- Mohawk Council of Akwesasne
- Huron Wendat Nation Council
- Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte – Tyendinaga Mohawk Council
- Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office
- Métis Nation of Ontario Council
- Métis Nation of Ontario Ottawa Region Métis Council

9.3 Consultation and Engagement Activities

The following section provides a description of all consultation and engagement activities undertaken with the government and municipal agencies, Indigenous communities and organizations, and the public.

9.3.1 Notice of Commencement

The GRT, Indigenous communities and members of the public, including neighbouring property owners, were notified of the EA by a Notice of Commencement. All participants were sent a copy by mail of the Notice in both English and French languages. A personalized letter and a copy of the Notice were sent by registered mail to each Indigenous community and organization in both English and French (**Appendix D of Supporting Document 4**). All Notices were sent to participants on June 5, 2017.

The EA Notice of Commencement was published in English and French in the Cornwall Standard Freeholder newspaper on June 7, 2017 and in Le Reflet-The News newspaper on June 8, 2017.

Both the English and French versions of the EA Notice of Commencement were posted on the project website (www.leic.com/about/projects) on June 7, 2017.

Copies of the Notice of Commencement and newspaper notices are included in **Appendix B of Supporting Document 4**.

Comments were received from the Huron-Wendat Nation following the Notice of Commencement. A summary of the comments is provided below and a detailed copy of the correspondence is included in **Appendix D of Supporting Document 4**. Comments were also received from the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines. A summary of the comments is provided in **Table 9-1** and a detailed copy of the correspondence is included in **Appendix E of Supporting Document 4**.

Table 9-1. Comments Received Following the Notice of Commencement

Date	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
<i>Huron-Wendat Nation</i>		
June 8, 2017 Email	<p>Any further correspondence should be addressed to Grand Chief Konrad Sioui.</p> <p>We would like to know if any archaeological assessments have been done on this project or if any are anticipated in the future?</p>	<p>The participants list for the project was updated to reflect this request.</p> <p>A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the entire 189 hectare landfill site property was completed as part of the original EA, approved in 1999. The Stage 1 assessment determined that there is no archaeological potential within the boundaries of the existing facility, including the proposed expansion areas. Subsequently the Provincial interest in archaeology for the property was signed off on in a letter dated November 2, 1999. No further archaeological assessment is planned for this project as a result.</p>
June 12, 2017 Email	<p>Thanks for clarifying the situation on archaeology.</p> <p>The Huron-Wendat Nation would like to stay informed if any update on archaeology occurred.</p>	Comment acknowledged.
<i>Ministry of Northern Development and Mines</i>		
July 11, 2017 Email and Letter	<p>MINING LANDS: No concerns with respect to mining lands in the area.</p> <p>ABANDONED MINES REHABILITATION PROGRAM: No concerns from the Abandoned Mines Rehabilitation Program. There are some sites in close proximity to the project area. This site is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry's (MNRF)</p> <p>Aggregate Resources Act (ARA). The Ministry of Northern Development and Mines recommends contacting the MNRF for further information of these sites.</p>	Comments acknowledged.

Table 9-1. Comments Received Following the Notice of Commencement

Date	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
	<p>RESIDENT GEOLOGIST PROGRAM: The Resident Geologist Program (RGP) of the Ontario Geologist Survey has completed the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. According to the Ministry's Mineral Deposit Inventory (MDI) for mineral occurrences: There are no known mineral occurrences within 1 kilometre of the site. 2. The Ministry's Assessment File Report Inventory (AFRI) database to determine whether past mineral exploration activity has been reported for the proposed area: there are no assessment files for this area; 3. The GIS-based "Metallic Mineral Potential Estimation Tool" to get an estimation of the mineral potential of the proposed project area: medium - low metallic mineral potential is estimated for the area (maximum value of 47.5). 4. The Groundwater Study 5, Karst of Southern Ontario and Manitoulin Island for identified karst hazard: no known karst in this area. 5. Reviewed the Terms of Reference for the EA to assess the potential environmental considerations identified. 	

9.3.2 Public Open Houses

The EA consultation program outlined in the approved ToR identified that one open house (Public Open House #2) would be held during the EA. It was intended that the open house be held following the comparative evaluation of the alternative methods and identification of the Preferred Alternative. Given the period of time that had elapsed between submission of the final ToR (July 2015) and the approval of the ToR (May 2017), GFL considered it appropriate to host an additional open house. The purpose of this additional event was to update the community on the project, present information on the existing environmental conditions, and provide additional details on the development of the two alternative methods being assessed in the EA. The second EA open house (Public Open House #3) would then present the results of the assessment. Details of the two open houses are provided in the following sections.

9.3.2.1 Public Open House #2

Public Open House #2 took place on Wednesday June 21, 2017 at the EOWHF Administrative Office, 17125 Lafleche Road, Moose Creek, Ontario from 16:00 to 20:00. The open house was organized to allow attendees to circulate around the room, review the information on the poster boards and ask questions of GFL staff and consultants.

Based on the completed sign-in sheet the open house was attended by 17 people in addition to GFL and consulting staff.

Notification of the open house was provided in advance to agencies, Indigenous communities and organizations and the public as part of the Notice of Commencement as described in **Section 9.3.1**.

The purpose of the open house was to provide attendees with an update on the project, the EA process, and information on the existing conditions within the on-site and off-site study areas, the proposed landfill expansion alternative methods, and the consultation process that will be followed during the development of the EA. The open house was organized in an information session format with poster boards displayed around the periphery of the room. GFL staff and consultants were available to discuss the information panels, receive comments and answer questions. As members of the public arrived, they were asked to sign-in and were then given a comment form which included questions regarding the information presented. The members of the public were given the option of filling out the forms on-site or providing their comments via mail, email or fax to the project team.

All presentation material at the open house was available in both French and English. Bilingual staff members were also present at the open house. Presentation materials were posted to the project website following the open house.

Completed comment forms were requested by July 7, 2017. One comment form was received at the open house and two additional comment forms were received prior to July 7, 2017. The comments received are included in **Table 9-2**. Verbal comments received at the open house were addressed by staff as they were received.

Table 9-2. Summary of Comments Received from Public Open House #2 Comment Forms

1. My interest in the project is: (please check all that apply)	
3 residential property	3 air quality (dust, noise, odour [x2])
0 business	1 ecology
0 member of interest group	2 groundwater, surface water
0 agency representative	1 land use / visual
0 other: _____	0 transportation
2. Please provide any general comments about the information presented at this Public Open House.	
While I applaud the EOWHF's purpose & end goals, I have serious reservations about the quality of the air that I breathe when mother nature dumps volumes of noxious fumes at my doorstep, when wind directions are optimum. I understand that steps are being taken to lay down new membrane to seal off the escaping gases. When is this going to happen?	
Okay, but the visit (tour + info with slides) with Gabriel Lefebvre was A+. Don't let him go. He is an asset for the company.	
Excellent	
3. After reviewing the information presented at this Public Open House, do you have any additional comments, concerns or recommendations regarding the current operations at the EOWHF and/or the proposed project that have not been addressed today? (Yes/No)	
(No response provided)	
(Yes). Take care of the odor problem.	
(Yes). Are there no new ways to proceed since 1999? [translated]	

Table 9-2. Summary of Comments Received from Public Open House #2 Comment Forms

<p>4. Do you have any specific comments or questions about the EA Process or consultation activities? (Yes/No) (No) (No response provided. EA Process circled with question mark) (Yes). Has an evaluation report been submitted? [translated]</p>
<p>5. Do you have any specific comments, concerns or recommendations regarding the Alternatives as presented? (Yes/No) (No) (Yes). Plan to receive less to maintain the site longer in operation (less from Toronto + far-away places) (Yes). We are getting closer to the 417. Is the odour going to be magnified for us south of the 417? Why not build a basin to hold the surface water? Why not surround the site with trees to reduce odours and noise? [translated]</p>
<p>6. Do you have any specific comments, concerns or recommendations regarding the Evaluation Criteria to be used in the assessment of the Alternatives as presented? (Yes/No) (No) (No response provided) (No response provided)</p>
<p>7. Do you have any specific comments, concerns or recommendations regarding the Existing Conditions as presented? (Yes/No) (No). Provided steps are taken to correct/eliminate/reduce? the strong odours/fumes that are generated by this facility. (Yes). Put pressure on Government to sort glass, plastic, wood and domestic residues. Countries much smaller than Canada have put in place measures. Use the electricity produced (Ont. Hydro). The idea of a dome growing vegetables would be supported by the communities. On the full portions of the site, why not plant vegetation to feed on the waste?</p>

As outlined in the consultation program included in the approved ToR (**Appendix A**), a Public Open House #2 Summary Report was prepared following the event. The Summary Report included a description of all aspects of the open house, a summary of results as well as comments received and responses, as appropriate. A copy of the Public Open House #2 Summary Report is included as **Appendix C of Supporting Document 4**. The Summary Report was posted to the project website.

9.3.2.2 Public Open House #3

Public Open House #3 took place on Wednesday November 22, 2017 at the EOWHF Administrative Office, 17125 Lafleche Road, Moose Creek, Ontario from 16:00 to 20:00. The Open House was organized to allow attendees to circulate around the room, review the information on the poster boards and ask questions of GFL staff and consultants. Based on the completed sign-in sheet the open house was attended by 20 people in addition to GFL and consulting staff.

Agencies and members of the public, including neighbouring property owners, were notified of Public Open House # 3 via a Notice of Public Open House (the Notice). Both English and French versions of the Notice were sent via regular mail to agencies, the public and neighbouring property owners on November 6, 2017. One Notice, in both

English and French, was sent via email on November 8, 2017 because a regular mailing address was unavailable.

The Notice was published in both English and French in two local newspapers: the Cornwall Standard-Freeholder on November 8, 2017 and Le Reflet-The News on November 9, 2017.

A copy of the Notice, in both English and French, was uploaded to the project website on November 8, 2017.

Indigenous communities and organizations were notified of Public Open House #3 via the Notice. Letters providing a brief overview of the project and an invitation to Public Open House #3 were addressed to the Indigenous communities and groups and were sent along with English and French versions of the Notice via registered mail on November 6, 2017. Letters were sent in either English and/or French depending on the requirements of the recipient.

Public Open House #3 was held to provide attendees with an update on the project, present the conceptual designs for the alternative methods, present the results of the effects assessment of the alternative methods and the comparative evaluation, and identify the Preferred Alternative. The open house was organized in an information session format with poster boards displayed around the periphery of the room. GFL staff and consultants, including bilingual staff members, were available to discuss the information panels, receive comments and answer questions. As members of the public arrived, they were asked to sign-in and were then given a comment form which included questions regarding the information presented. The members of the public were given the option of filling out the forms on-site or providing their comments via mail, email or fax to the project team.

Presentation material at the open house was available in English. Bilingual staff members were present at the open house. A French version of the presentation material was available following the event. Presentation materials were posted to the project website after the open house.

Completed comment forms were requested by December 6, 2017. Two comment forms were received at the open house and one additional comment form was received prior to December 6, 2017. The comments received are included in **Table 9-3**. Verbal comments received at the open house were addressed by staff as they were received. These comments were focused on current landfill odours associated with the fugitive release of LFG, and truck traffic at the intersection of Highway 138 and Lafleche Road. In response to these comments, GFL provided information to attendees on the work underway at the site to expand and enhance the LFG collection system, along with the schedule for this work to be completed, as part of an overall plan to minimize future off-site odours. With respect to truck traffic, the results of the traffic study completed as part of the EA were discussed along with the recent study completed by the MTO. Both studies have identified no operational concerns associated with the Highway 138 and Lafleche Road intersection.

Table 9-3. Summary of Comments Received from Public Open House #3 Comment Forms

<p>1. My interest in the project is: (please check all that apply)</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>residential property</td> <td>3</td> <td>air quality (dust, noise, odour)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>business</td> <td>1</td> <td>ecology</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>member of interest group</td> <td>1</td> <td>groundwater, surface water</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>agency representative</td> <td>1</td> <td>land use / visual</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>other: Resident of Ontario</td> <td>1</td> <td>transportation</td> </tr> </table>		1	residential property	3	air quality (dust, noise, odour)	1	business	1	ecology	1	member of interest group	1	groundwater, surface water	0	agency representative	1	land use / visual	1	other: Resident of Ontario	1	transportation
1	residential property	3	air quality (dust, noise, odour)																		
1	business	1	ecology																		
1	member of interest group	1	groundwater, surface water																		
0	agency representative	1	land use / visual																		
1	other: Resident of Ontario	1	transportation																		
<p>2. Please provide any general comments about the information presented at this Public Open House.</p> <p>Well informed from the staff. Better idea of what is going on.</p> <p>At the municipality we are getting lots of complaints about odours. It has been increasing. Unlimited electricity (FIT) should be implemented.</p> <p>Factual and up to date. Though Europe has been incinerating garbage for 30 years most of Canada is still back in the Stone Age. Landfills are creatures of the past. Like mercury buried in the St. Lawrence River, this garbage will still be there hundreds of years from now. With most local municipalities running out of landfill space and new sites costing millions to set up local politicians only see the present. 1 properly built incinerator could fix both Ontario and Quebec's disposal problems for decades. With Maxvilles water project ...</p>																					
<p>3. After reviewing the information presented at this Public Open House, do you have any specific comments or questions about the conceptual design of the Alternative Methods for the project? (Yes/No)</p> <p>(No)</p> <p>(No response provided)</p> <p>(No response provided regarding Yes/No). A massive area slated to be filled within 10 years.</p>																					
<p>4. Do you have any specific comments, questions, or recommendations about the Assessment of Alternative Methods? (Yes/No)</p> <p>(No)</p> <p>(No response provided)</p> <p>(No response provided regarding Yes/No). Lots of government red tape.</p>																					
<p>5. Do you have any specific comments, questions, or recommendations about the results of the comparative evaluation of Alternative Methods? (Yes/No)</p> <p>(No)</p> <p>(No response provided)</p> <p>(No response provided regarding Yes/No). Has to be a better way. Probably the best we can expect the way society treats what would be renewable resources.</p>																					
<p>6. Do you have any specific comments, questions, or concerns about the Preferred Alternative identified? (Yes/No)</p> <p>(No)</p> <p>(No response provided)</p> <p>(No response provided regarding Yes/No). Scaled back at a time where the federal liberals have promised 10s of billions in infrastructure projects we continue to realize east Ontario is the rectum of the province. Incineration won't happen because federal and provincial governments have no vision.</p> <p>PS: Picked up 81 bags of garbage on just under 3 mile section of County Road 20 this year. Don't need dumps. The whole province is a massive one.</p>																					

As outlined in the consultation program included in the approved ToR (**Appendix A**), a Public Open House #3 Summary Report was prepared following the event. The Summary Report included a description of all aspects of the open house, a summary of results as well as comments received and responses, as appropriate. A copy of the Public Open House #3 Summary Report is included **Appendix C of Supporting Document 4**. The Summary Report was posted to the project website.

9.3.3 Review of Draft Existing Conditions Reports

The approved ToR included a preliminary description of the existing environmental conditions within the area surrounding the EOWHF landfill, with the commitment that the description would be expanded upon in the EA. Draft existing conditions reports were prepared to address the environmental components listed below.

Environmental Aspect	Environmental Component
Natural Environment	Atmospheric Environment – Air, Odour, Noise
	Geology and Hydrogeology
	Surface Water Environment
	Ecological Environment
Socio-Economic Environment	Economic
	Social
Cultural Environment	Cultural Environment
Built Environment	Transportation
	Current and Planned Future Land Use
	Aggregate Extraction and Agricultural
	Design and Operations

These draft reports were made available to the GRT, Indigenous communities and the public for review and comment. All draft existing conditions reports were posted to the project website on August 2, 2017. Any comments were requested to be provided to GFL by September 1, 2017.

GRT members and agencies were notified of the draft existing conditions reports by email. A link to the project website was provided in order to access all of the draft reports. In some cases, electronic copies of specific draft reports were included in the email where the specific interest in the project or mandate of the agency was known.

Indigenous communities and organizations were notified of the draft existing conditions report review by letter. The letters were addressed directly to the Indigenous communities and groups and provided in either English and/or French depending on the requirements of the recipient. An electronic copy of the draft existing conditions reports was included on a USB drive along with the letters. The letters also included a link to the project website. The letter and USB drive were sent to each recipient by courier on August 2, 2017. A follow-up email was sent to each Indigenous community and organization on August 29, 2017 requesting any comments be provided.

A copy of the notification emails and letters are included in **Supporting Document 4**.

Comments on the draft existing conditions reports were received from:

- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry;
- Ministry of Northern Mines and Development;
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport; and
- South Nation Conservation Authority.

A summary of the comments received and responses provided are included in **Table 9-4**. A copy of the detailed comments received and responses provided are included in **Appendix G of Supporting Document 4**. Comments were also received from the Huron-Wendat Nation and are included in **Appendix D of Supporting Document 4**.

Table 9-4. Summary of Comments Received on Draft Existing Conditions Reports

Date	Topic Area	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
Huron-Wendat Nation			
August 2, 2017 Email	Cultural Heritage / Archaeology	After receiving the various reports and their analysis, we will let you know if we have any comments. Are archaeological reports available for this project? We understand that a Cultural Heritage Existing Conditions Report has been produced, but what about archaeology?	<p>Comment acknowledged.</p> <p>A Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of the entire 189 hectare landfill site property was completed as part of the original EA for the landfill in 1999. A copy of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment report was provided.</p> <p>The Stage 1 assessment determined that there is no archaeological potential within the boundaries of the existing facility including the proposed expansion areas. Provincial interest in archaeology for the property was signed off on in a letter dated November 2, 1999.</p> <p>As part of this current EA process the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) concluded in letters dated February 25, 2015 and July 31, 2015 (copies provided) that the project was within the footprint of the existing property and they had no further concerns regarding archaeology. Consequently, no further archaeological assessments are planned for this project as a result.</p> <p>A description of the results of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment will be included in the EA.</p>

Table 9-4. Summary of Comments Received on Draft Existing Conditions Reports

Date	Topic Area	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
Ministry of Northern Development and Mines			
August 25, 2017 Email	Land Use, Geology and Hydrogeology	<p>The Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM) submitted comments on July 11, 2017 to the Notice of Commencement.</p> <p>The MNDM Mines and Minerals Division has reviewed the technical information available for the study area with respect to the geology and mineral resource potential, mining lands, and abandoned mine hazards. No further comments to provide at this time</p>	Comments acknowledged.
Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry			
September 1, 2017 Email	Natural Environment	<i>General</i>	
		1. It should be noted that we did not review section 3.4.4 (Surface Water Quality) as this does not pertain to our Ministry's Mandate.	Noted. This section is provided for information purposes and a more detailed description of surface water quality is included in a separate report, the Surface Water Quality Existing Conditions Report. The Surface Water Quality Existing Conditions Report has been circulated to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) and the South Nation Conservation Authority.
		2. On page 1, the Study Area Property Description (section 1.2) includes the proposed Stage 3B and Stage 4 expansion areas, but these areas were not identified on Figures 1 or 2. It is assumed that they are located within the existing landfill property, but this should be clarified.	<p>Both of the proposed alternatives are located within the existing property boundary, which is defined as the on-site study area. To clarify, the sentence in the Existing Conditions Report will be revised to read as follows:</p> <p>"The "on-site" study area covers the existing landfill property and "off-site" is the 1 km beyond the property boundaries.</p>
		<i>Survey Timing</i>	
3. Breeding Bird Surveys: the first survey (April 25th) was conducted a bit early, especially with this year's late and wet/cool spring. There is potential that some species may have been missed.	There were three survey dates for breeding birds as noted in Section 2.2.2 of the Existing Conditions Report. The April 25th survey was incidental observations but grackle, robin and woodcock were exhibiting breeding behaviour at that time. The other two surveys were conducted on May 21 and June 2 during the peak breeding period.		

Table 9-4. Summary of Comments Received on Draft Existing Conditions Reports

Date	Topic Area	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
		4. Amphibian Surveys: the first survey (April 25th) was conducted too late for Chorus Frogs. Even though some were identified on site, there is a potential that some individuals or specific habitats may have been missed.	The survey windows in the Ottawa area are later than in other parts of eastern Ontario. The timing for conducting amphibian surveys this year was later this year due to colder conditions. Chorus frogs were recorded during other surveys in the Ottawa area that same week.
		<i>Fisheries</i>	
		5. Fish Community (Section 3.4.2), it is stated that the fish species present in Moose Creek represent a warm water fishery, but this should be revised as the species described are representative of a cool and warm water fishery	Noted. The report text will be updated to indicate that the species described are representative of both a cool and warm water fishery.
		<i>Natural Heritage and Species at Risk</i>	
		6. The following Species At Risk (SAR) and Significant Wildlife Habitat(s) which were confirmed on site will need to be addressed in the next stage of the EA: a. Barn Swallow (seen foraging and potentially nesting on-site); b. Bank Swallow (seen foraging and potentially nesting on-site); and c. Deer Wintering Yard (Confirmed Significant Wildlife Habitat).	These species and habitats will be addressed using the Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) technical guide and <i>Endangered Species Act</i> (ESA)/SAR habitat guidelines as part of the effects assessment stage of the EA. Direct and indirect effects will be addressed at that time including identifying the need for further permitting or mitigation measures including timing windows, if necessary.
		7. The following additional Natural Heritage Features or Species/Habitats (which are or could potentially be considered as Significant) should also be addressed in the next stage of the EA: a. Significant Woodlands; b. Raptor Wintering Area (Confirmed on-site); c. Canada Warbler; d. Wood Thrush; e. Eastern Wood-Pewee; f. Snapping Turtle; and g. Nightjars (Common Nighthawk and Whip-Poor-Will) given that no species specific surveys were conducted and these species could potentially be using adjacent properties in very close proximity to the site.	The SWH criteria in the SWH technical guide will be reviewed as part of the effects assessment stage of the EA. This will include a review of the candidate status and confirmation of each feature. If present, an impact assessment will be completed and recommendations will be made regarding mitigation measures, timing windows and any need for alteration to the project. A response to the SAR inquiry submitted to the MNR (March 9, 2017) did not list whip-poor-will as a possible species; consequently, no surveys were planned. No whip-poor-will were heard during the evening frog surveys. Except for the swamp, the surrounding areas are sod farms and do not provide suitable habitat for the whip-poor-will. There is no nesting habitat on site for the common nighthawk. No common nighthawks were heard during the

Table 9-4. Summary of Comments Received on Draft Existing Conditions Reports

Date	Topic Area	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
			evening frog surveys. The surrounding areas are sod farms and do not provide suitable habitat or foraging.
		8. Given that SAR have been confirmed on the site, the proponent will need to meet obligations under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), 1997. We recommend submitting an Information Gathering Form (IGF) to initiate the ESA review process. The IGF requires information that is similar to that which will be provided in the subsequent EA report (i.e., potential effects assessment)	The found SAR species and the habitat use/behaviour/life stages will be reviewed against the proposed development as part of the effects assessment stage of the EA. As it is early in the EA process, discussions with MNRF will continue, and the results of the net effects assessment of the alternative methods will be provided to the MNRF. At that time, if an IGF is determined to be required, the necessary documentation will be provided in compliance with the ESA.
		9. Regarding Chimney Swifts, it should be confirmed that the chimneys on-site are indeed “active” during the summer months and not only referred to as being industrial. Please confirm.	The types of chimneys, their current use, and that they are being used for emissions in the summer months/active nesting season will be confirmed with the site owner/manager. The Existing Conditions Report will be updated to include this information.
		10. Please provide a detailed description or coordinates for the off-site Barn Swallow nesting location and the off-site Bobolink observation location.	<p>The barn swallows were observed nesting on a high concrete box culvert on Route 700 crossing of Moose Creek; coordinates 45.31575, -75.01992.</p> <p>The bobolink was heard/seen in the field west of Highway 417; coordinates approximately 45.31904, -75.02070.</p>
		11. On page 37, it is stated that MNRF did not provide details on a restricted species at risk identified. Please contact us directly (see coordinates below) for the identification of the species, which will also need to be addressed as part of the EA. Given the very high risk and sensitivity associated with this species, the name is not provided or allowed to be mentioned in print or in any non-verbal communications related to this EA.	The MNRF has been contacted directly by phone to obtain the name of the species. This information will not be mentioned or described in the existing conditions report, only the fact that the species was not found in the on-site or off-site study areas.

Table 9-4. Summary of Comments Received on Draft Existing Conditions Reports

Date	Topic Area	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
<p>October 17, 2017 Email</p>	<p>Natural Environment</p>	<p><i>Breeding Bird Surveys</i></p>	
		<p>It is noted that the first of 3 survey dates of April 25th consisted of recording incidental observations.</p>	<p>Correct</p>
		<p><i>Whip-poor-will</i></p>	
		<p>It should be noted that the MNRF response letter clearly states: "Please note that information regarding species at risk is based on documented occurrences only and does not include an interpretation of potential habitat within or in proximity to the site in question. Although this data represents the MNRF's best current available information, it is important to note that a lack of information for a site does not mean that additional features and values are not present. i.e.: Species at Risk (SAR) or their habitat could still be present at the location or in the immediate area."</p>	<p>Comment acknowledged</p>
<p>Given that no species specific surveys were conducted and that this species could potentially be using adjacent properties in very close proximity to the site, a survey may be required to further inform our review of the next stage (net effects assessment) of this Landfill Expansion EA, unless the proponent chooses to assume species presence and address it accordingly. Your response to our comments mentioned that no Whip-Poor-Wills were heard during the evening of the frog surveys, but upon reviewing the timing and/or environmental conditions encountered during these evenings, it would be unlikely that birds would be expected to be heard (i.e., either too early in the season (April 25); or overcast, windy (19 kph), and 11 days from a full moon (May 21)).</p>	<p>Whip-Poor-Will surveys are typically conducted over three (3) nights in May and June during a full moon cycle; however, as there was no suitable nesting habitat for Whip-Poor-Will on the property itself, targeted surveys were not conducted.</p> <p>For the Ecological Environment net effects assessment, it will be assumed that Whip-Poor-Will are present in the off-site study area and may find habitat in the wetland/woodland community to the southwest. Whip-Poor-Will habitat is very specific in terms of nesting sites and hunting/feeding habitat criteria. Potential changes to Whip-Poor-Will habitat as a result of the proposed expansion and resulting net effects to Whip-Poor-Will will be explored in the Ecological Environment net effects assessment.</p>		

Table 9-4. Summary of Comments Received on Draft Existing Conditions Reports

Date	Topic Area	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
		<p><i>Species at Risk</i></p> <p>As previously stated, given that some Species at Risk are confirmed on site, the proponent will need to meet obligations under the Ontario Endangered Species Act (ESA), and as part of the next stage of this Landfill Expansion EA. The ESA permitting process is proponent driven, and as such, the decision as to when to submit an Information Gathering Form (IGF) to MNR rests with the proponent. That being said, the results of the net effects assessment of the alternative methods may potentially not be reviewed by MNR, as they pertain to ESA species, unless accompanied by a completed IGF.</p>	<p>The Ecological Environment effects assessment will assess whether or not the Preferred Alternative will result in a negative impact to Whip-Poor-Will habitat or other SAR habitat. The General Habitat Descriptions (GHD) and guidelines for Category 3 habitat protection will be used in the assessment.</p> <p>If a project activity is proposed within the habitat or habitat protection zone of a threatened or endangered species, an <i>Endangered Species Act</i> (ESA) permit will be required for the project. The first stage in obtaining an ESA permit is to submit an Information Gathering Form (IGF), which provides the details on the surveys and habitats.</p> <p>If proposed project activities are located outside of the habitat or habitat protection zone of a threatened or endangered species, an IGF form would not be required.</p>
		<p><i>Chimney Swifts</i></p> <p>Re: Chimney Swifts, it should be confirmed that the chimneys on-site are indeed "active" during the summer months, and not only referred to as being industrial. Please confirm.</p>	<p>The EOWHF has an existing LFG flare, a siloxane gas flare and four (4) LFG combustion engines with exhaust stacks. Each of these are for the purpose of managing LFG and operates at temperatures exceeding 500 degrees Celsius. The LFG combustion engines and flares essentially operate continuously. As such there are no chimneys that are useable for chimney swift nesting during the summer breeding period.</p>
Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport (MTCS)			
August 31, 2017 Email	Cultural Environment	<p>The Cultural Heritage Existing Conditions Report identified two cultural heritage resources within or adjacent to the Study Area, including one cultural heritage landscape and one built heritage resource. The conservation recommendations for the identified built heritage resource and cultural heritage landscape features outlined in Section 6.1 of the Report should be considered and implemented as part of this EA project, specifically: Construction activities and staging</p>	Comments acknowledged.

Table 9-4. Summary of Comments Received on Draft Existing Conditions Reports

Date	Topic Area	Comment Summary	Response / How Comment was Addressed in the EA
		should be suitably planned and undertaken to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources. Once a Preferred Alternative or detailed designs of the proposed work are available, this report will be updated with a confirmation of impacts of the undertaking on cultural heritage resources identified within and/or adjacent to the study area and will recommend appropriate mitigation measures. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, completing a heritage impact assessment or documentation report, or employing suitable measures such as landscaping, buffering or other forms of mitigation, where appropriate. In this regard, provincial guidelines should be consulted for advice and further heritage assessment work should be undertaken as necessary. Should future work require an expansion of the study area then a qualified heritage consultant should be contacted in order to confirm the impacts of the proposed work on potential heritage resources.	
South Nation Conservation Authority			
August 31, 2017 Email	Natural Environment	South Nation can provide a technical review of the Hydrogeological and Natural Environment studies if you wish, following our fee schedule.	Comment acknowledged.

9.3.4 Project Website

A project specific website (www.leic.com/about/projects) was launched during the ToR and maintained during the EA process. The website was established to provide clear and accurate information to stakeholders and also to provide opportunities for feedback. The website includes up-to-date information about the EA activities and includes access to notices, open house materials and study reports. The website was available in both English and French languages.

9.3.5 Telephone Number and Contact

A Project telephone number (613-538-2776 ext. 226) and GFL staff contact person was established to receive comments and questions from the public. This service allowed interested parties to submit enquiries for information, submit comments and request a call-back. Since the commencement of the EA, no specific comments were received by telephone.

9.3.6 Other Activities

9.3.6.1 EOWHF Site Tour

As a follow up to a request made by attendees at Public Open House #3, GFL conducted a tour of the EOWHF on November 30, 2017 for a group of 12 people from Moose Creek, Nation and Casselman. The group wanted to see the site, discuss the landfill expansion project and obtain additional information on work being completed related to odour control.

The tour included the landfill working areas, LFG utilization facility, composting facility, and LTF, and included open discussions with on-going questions and answers. Participants expressed concerns about current odour releases from the EOWHF. GFL discussed the current odour sources, reasons for odour releases related to LFG, the on-going work being completed at the site to enhance the LFG collection system, future plans, and the proposed implementation schedule.

The group was appreciative of the tour and stated they learned a lot and now have a better understanding of the various activities and processes at the EOWHF and the projects that GFL is undertaking, such as the landfill, composting, LFG co-generation plant, gas well installation, waste diversion (electronics, metals), and the new pollinator garden.

9.3.6.2 Community Liaison Committee

The EOWHF has a well established Community Liaison Committee, which meets quarterly to review and provide feedback on the operations of the EOWHF. During the regularly scheduled meeting on June 30, 2017, GFL staff provided an update on the proposed landfill expansion project and the EA process. General discussion followed amongst the Community Liaison Committee members.

9.3.6.3 General Inquiries

During the course of the EA, EOWHF neighbours and members of the community contacted GFL staff regarding the status of the project and to make general inquiries. No specific comments or concerns about the project were identified.

9.3.6.4 Record of Consultation and Engagement

A Record of Consultation and Engagement has been prepared as part of EA and is included as **Supporting Document 4**. The Record of Consultation and Engagement includes more detailed information for each of the consultation and engagement activities undertaken during the EA and discussed above. This includes information about and received at the open houses, notices, and copies of comments, questions, issues and concerns from agencies, Indigenous communities and members of the public and how those questions, issues and concerns were addressed.

9.3.7 Review of Draft Environmental Assessment Study Report

The Draft EA Study Report (this report) will be provided to the public, agencies and Indigenous communities who are on the participants list for the EA process. Notice of

the draft report availability will be provided by newspaper notice, mail, email and on the project website.

Copies of the Draft EA Study Report will be provided in electronic format and will be available for download on the project website. Printed copies of the report will be available for public viewing at the locations identified in the Notice.

9.4 Commitments for On-going Consultation and Engagement

All comments received within the 30-day review and comment period for the Draft EA Study Report will be tabulated and a response prepared by GFL. Any changes to the Draft EA Study Report will be identified. The final EA Study Report will include details on the draft review, copies of all comments and responses, and describe any changes made to the EA Study Report.

The final EA Study Report will be formally submitted to the MOECC and circulated to agencies, Indigenous communities and the public for review and comment. The Notice of Submission for the final EA Study Report will be posted to the project website.