

September 2012

**PROPOSED TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE
PROPOSED CAPITAL REGION RESOURCE
RECOVERY CENTRE**

**VOLUME 2
CONSULTATION RECORD**

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS UNITS AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS	ix
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2.0 STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE	2
2.1 Interested Persons.....	2
2.2 Local Government	2
2.3 Government Review Team	2
2.4 Aboriginal Communities.....	3
3.0 CONSULTATION METHODS AND ACTIVITIES	4
3.1 Consultation Methods	4
3.2 Schedule of Events and Milestones.....	4
4.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION PROGRAM.....	6
4.1 Notice of Commencement	6
4.2 Open House #1.....	11
4.2.1 Miller Facilities Tours	12
4.3 Release of Frequently Asked Questions.....	12
4.4 Workshop #1.....	12
4.5 Meetings with MOE Technical Reviewers.....	13
4.6 Release of Draft Key Documents for Comment.....	13
4.7 Notification of a Second Site.....	14
4.8 Open House #2.....	15
4.9 MOE Review of Draft Terms of Reference	17
4.10 Summary of Feedback Received During Consultation	17
4.10.1 Open House #1	17
4.10.2 Workshop #1	21
4.10.3 Release of Draft Key Documents for Comment	21
4.10.4 Open House #2.....	42
4.10.5 MOE Review of Draft Terms of Reference.....	44
4.11 Summary of Comments Received Outside Consultation Events	76
5.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION WITH ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES	77

5.1	Consultation during the Notice of Commencement and Invitation to Open House #1	77
5.2	Consultation during Notice of Second Site	77
5.3	Consultation during Invitation to Open House #2.....	77

TABLES

Table 1: Government Review Team (GRT) Member Responses	7
Table 2: Results of Open House #1 Environmental Component Ranking of Importance	17
Table 3: Comments on Workshop #1 Format.....	21
Table 4: GRT Comments on Draft Key Documents	22
Table 5: Results of Open House #2, Session 1 -Alternative Site Evaluation Component Ranking of Importance	42
Table 6: Results of Open House #2, Session 2 Alternative Site Evaluation Component Ranking of Importance	44
Table 7: MOE Comments on Draft Terms of Reference	45

APPENDIX A -

Government Review Team	A-1
A1 – GRT List	A-2
A1.1 – Original GRT List.....	A-3
A1.2 – Modifications to the GRT List	A-5
A2 – Request for Information from MAA Regarding Aboriginal Interests	A-8
A2.1 – Letter to the Consultation Unit #1.....	A-9
A2.2 – Letter to the Consultation Unit #2.....	A-12
A3 – Request for Information from AANDC (Formerly INAC) Regarding Negotiations	A-15
A3.1 – Letter to the Specific Claims Branch	A-16
A3.2 – Letter to the Litigation Management and Resolution Branch.....	A-19
A3.3 – Letter to the Office of the Federal Interlocutor for Métis and Non-status Indians	A-22
A3.4 – Letter to the Environmental Unit.....	A-25
A3.5 – Letter to the Assessment and Historical Research Directorate	A-28
A3.6 – Letter to the Consultation and Accommodation Unit.....	A-31

APPENDIX B

Terms of Reference Launch Materials	B-1
B1 – Notice of Commencement – November 10, 2010.....	B-2
B1.1 – Notice of Commencement.....	B-3

B1.2 – Detailed Project Description	B-6
B2 – Notice of Commencement Advertisements.....	B-10
B2.1 – Notice of Commencement Newspaper Advertisements	B-11
B2.1a – La Nouvelle	B-12
B2.1b – Ottawa Citizen.....	B-14
B2.1c – Villager.....	B-16
B2.2 – Notice of Commencement Press Release	B-18
B3 – Notification Template Letters	B-21
B3.1 – GRT Template Letter	B-22
B3.2 – GRT with Aboriginal Interest Template Letter.....	B-25
B3.3 – Aboriginal Group Template Letter	B-28
B3.4 – Public Template Letter	B-31
B4 – Response to Notice of Commencement	B-34
B4.1 – Response from the Conseil scolaire de district catholique de l’Est ontarien	B-35
B4.2 – MAH Planning Innovation Section Response	B-37
B4.3 – MTC Tourism Policy Response.....	B-39
B4.4 – MTC East Region Response.....	B-42
B4.5 – INAC Litigation Management and Resolution Branch Response	B-44
B4.6 – MOE Technical Support Section Response.....	B-49
B4.7 – MAA Consultation Unit Response	B-52
B4.8 – CEAA Response	B-56
B4.9 – MHLTC Response.....	B-59
B4.10 – INAC Specific Claims Branch Response	B-61
B4.11 – MNR Kemptville District Response	B-65
B4.12 – TC Ontario Region Response	B-69
B4.13 – INAC Assessment and Historical Research Directorate Response.....	B-78
B4.14 – Russell Township Response.....	B-80
B4.15 – MTO Eastern Region Response	B-85
B4.16 – IO Professional Services Response.....	B-87
APPENDIX C	
Open House #1 and Miller Facilities Tour	C-1
C1 – Open House #1 Materials	C-2

C1.1 – Display Boards	C-3
C1.1a – English Display Boards	C-4
C1.1b – French Display Boards.....	C-25
C1.2 – Evaluation Criteria.....	C-46
C1.2a – English	C-47
C1.2b – French	C-49
C1.3 – Comment Sheet	C-51
C1.3a – English	C-52
C1.3b – French	C-54
C1.4 – Tour & Workshop Participation Request.....	C-56
C1.4a – English	C-57
C1.4b – French	C-59
C2 – Summary of Responses Received.....	C-61
C2.1 – Summary of Evaluation Criteria Feedback	C-62
C2.2 – Summary of Tour & Workshop Participation Submissions	C-66
C2.3 – Summary Report on Comments Received During Open House #1	C-69
C3 – Miller Facilities Tour	C-108
C3.1 – Site Tour Agenda	C-109
C3.2 – Site Tour Summary	C-111
C3.3 – Second Tour Advertisements.....	C-113
C3.3a – La Nouvelle	C-114
C3.3b – Villager	C-116
APPENDIX D	
Release of Frequently Asked Questions	D-1
D1 – Media Releases	D-2
D1.1 – La Nouvelle	D-3
D1.2 – Villager	D-5
D2 – FAQ Release Notifications	D-7
D2.1 – Public Member Template	D-8
D2.2 – GRT Template.....	D-12
D2.3 – Letter to the South Nation Conservation Authority	D-14
D3 – Frequently Asked Questions	D-17

D3.1 – FAQ #1 through 18	D-18
D3.1a – FAQ #1 through 18 – English.....	D-19
D3.1b – FAQ #1 through 18 – French	D-35
D3.2 – FAQ #19.....	D-52
D3.2a – FAQ #19 – English	D-53
D3.2b – FAQ #19 – French	D-57
D3.3 – FAQ #20.....	D-61
D3.3a – FAQ #20 – English.....	D-62
D3.3b – FAQ #20 – French	D-64
 APPENDIX E	
Workshop #1.....	E-1
E1 – Invitation to Workshop #1.....	E-2
E2 – Presentation Materials	E-5
E2.1 – English Presentation	E-6
E2.2 – French Presentation.....	E-63
E2.3 – Comment Sheet	E-120
E3 – Summary Report on Comments Received During Workshop #1	E-122
E3.1 – Comment Sheets.....	E-127
E4 – Workshop #1 Advertisements	E-139
E4.1 – La Nouvelle	E-140
E4.2 – The Villager	E-142
 APPENDIX F	
Draft Key Documents.....	F-1
F1 – GRT Response to Draft Key Document Review	F-2
F1.1 – MOE EAAB Waste Unit Response.....	F-3
F1.2 – MOE Technical Support Air Response	F-6
F1.3 – MOE Technical Support Surface Water Response.....	F-9
F1.4 – OMAFRA Response	F-13
F1.5 – MTCS Response	F-16
F1.6 – MOE EAAB Wastewater, Air, Noise & Vibration Response.....	F-19
F1.7 – South Nation Conservation Authority Response.....	F-23
F1.8 – OMAFRA Food Safety Response	F-27

F1.9 – OPP Response.....	F-30
F1.10 – MNR Response	F-33
F1.11 – MOE Technical Support Groundwater Response	F-35
F1.12 – MOE EAAB EA Services Response.....	F-38
APPENDIX G	
Notification of a Second Site	G-1
G1 – Media Release	G-2
G1.1 – Media Release – English	G-3
G1.2 – Media Release – French.....	G-5
G1.3 – Distribution of Media Release	G-7
G2 – Notification of a Second Site Template Letters/E-Mails	G-9
G2.1 – GRT Template Letter	G-10
G2.2 – Aboriginal Group Template Letter.....	G-13
G2.3 – Public Template Letter.....	G-16
G2.4 – Public E-Mail Distribution.....	G-18
G-3 – Notification of a Second Site Attachments	G-20
G3.1 – Background Information and Consultation Plan	G-21
G3.2 – Location Plan	G-25
APPENDIX H	
Open House #2.....	H-1
H1 – Open House #2 Advertisements	H-2
H1.1 – Le Reflet/The News	H-3
H1.2 – Orleans Star	H-5
H1.3 – Villager	H-9
H1.4 – L’Express	H-13
H2 – Notification of Open House #2 E-Mails.....	H-17
H2.1 – Template E-Mail.....	H-18
H3 – Open House #2 Materials	H-20
H3.1 – Display Boards.....	H-21
H3.1a – English Display Boards.....	H-22
H3.1b – French Display Boards.....	H-44
H3.2 – Evaluation Criteria.....	H-66

H3.2a – English	H-67
H3.2b – French	H-70
H3.3 – Comment Sheet	H-73
H3.3a – English	H-74
H3.3b – French	H-76
H3.4 – Tour Participation Request	H-78
H3.4a – English	H-79
H3.4b – French	H-81
H4 – Summary of Comments Received	H-83
H4.1 – Summary Report on Comments Received During Open House #2	H-84
APPENDIX I	
Summary of Comments Received Outside Consultation Events	I-1
I1 – Comments Received Following the Notice of Commencement	I-2
I2 – Comments Received Following Open House #1	I-39
I3 – Comments Received Following the Release of the FAQs	I-213
I4 – Comments Received Following Workshop #1	I-246
I5 – Comments Received Following the Release of the Draft Key Documents	I-287
I6 – Comments Received Following the Notification of a Second Site	I-314
I7 – Comments Received Following Open House #2	I-337
APPENDIX J	
Summary of Comment Responses Provided Outside Consultation Events	J-1
J1 – Comment Responses Following the Notice of Commencement	J-2
J2 – Comment Responses Following Open House #1	J-22
J3 – Comment Responses Following the Release of the FAQs	J-102
J4 – Comment Responses Following Workshop #1	J-119
J5 – Comment Responses Following the Release of the Draft Key Documents	J-141
J6 – Comment Responses Following the Notification of a Second Site	J-146
J7 – Comment Responses Following Open House #2	J-152
APPENDIX K	
Review of Draft Terms of Reference	K-1
K1 – MOE Review of Draft Terms of Reference	K-2
K1.1 – MOE EAAB Noise & Vibration Response	K-3
K1.2 – MOE Technical Support Surface Water Response	K-6

K1.3 - MOE EAAB Waste Unit Response	K-11
K1.4 – MOE Technical Support Air Response	K-15
K1.5 – MOE Ottawa and Cornwall District Office Response	K-19
K1.6 – MOE Technical Support Groundwater Response	K-22
K1.7 – MOE EAAB EA Services Response	K-26
APPENDIX L	
Consultation with Aboriginal Groups	L-1
L1 – Response to the Notice of Commencement	L-2
L1.1 – Algonquins of Ontario Response	L-3
L2 – Consultation following Notice of Second Site	L-5
L2.1 – Métis Nation of Ontario	L-6
L2.2 – Algonquins of Ontario	L-8
L2.3 – Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation	L-10
L2.4 – Mohawks of Akwesasne	L-12
L2.5 – Métis Council of Ottawa	L-14

ACRONYMS, UNITS AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Definition of Acronyms	
Acronym	Definition
CAZ	Contaminant Attenuation Zone
C&D	Construction & Demolition
CDD	Conceptual Design Document
CLI	Canada Lands Inventory
C of A	Certificate of Approval
CRRRC	Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre
D&O	Design and Operations (report)
EA	Environmental Assessment
EAA	<i>Environmental Assessment Act</i>
EAC-SC	Environmental Advisory Committee Sub-committee, Twp. of Russell
EASR	Environmental Assessment Study Report
ECA	Environmental Compliance Assessment
EPA	<i>Environmental Protection Act</i>
GRT	Government Review Team
IC&I	Industrial, Commercial & Institutional
MNR	Ministry of Natural Resources
MOE	Ministry of the Environment
MSW	Municipal Solid Waste
O. Reg.	Ontario Regulation
OWRA	<i>Ontario Water Resources Act</i>
SD	Supporting Document
Taggart Miller	Taggart Miller Environmental Services
TOR	Terms of Reference
TSD	Technical Support Document
UCPR	United Counties of Prescott Russell
Definition of Units	
ha	hectare
km	kilometre
m	metre
m ³	cubic metres

Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
Approval	Permission granted by an authorized individual or organization for an undertaking to proceed.
Buffer area	That part of a landfill site that is not a waste fill area.
Certificate of Approval (Waste)	An approval issued by the Ministry of the Environment for the establishment and operation of a waste management site/facility. Now referred to as an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA).
Design and operations (D&O) plan	A document required for obtaining an Environmental Compliance Approval, which describes in detail the function, elements or features of the landfill site/facility, and how a landfill site/facility would function including its monitoring and control/management systems.
Design capacity (Total Disposal Volume)	The maximum total volume of air space available for disposal of waste at a landfill site for a particular design (typically in m ³).
Diversion Facilities	Processing of incoming waste streams to recover or convert materials for subsequent use or re-use and thereby divert them from disposal.
Environment	As defined by the <i>Environmental Assessment Act</i> , environment means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) air, land or water, (b) plant and animal life, including human life, (c) the social, economic and cultural conditions that influence the life of humans or a community, (d) any building, structure, machine or other device or thing made by humans, (e) any solid, liquid, gas, odour, heat, sound, vibration or radiation resulting directly or indirectly from human activities, or (f) any part or combination of the foregoing and the interrelationships between any two or more of them (ecosystem approach).
Environmental Compliance Approval	An approval issued by the Ministry of the Environment for the establishment and operation of a waste management site/facility.
Evaluation criteria	Evaluation criteria are considerations or factors taken into account in assessing the advantages and disadvantages of various alternatives being considered.
Haul route	Private and/or public roadway(s) used by vehicles transporting waste to and from a waste management facility, usually excluding a highway.
Indicators	Indicators are specific characteristics of the evaluation criteria that can be measured or determined in some way.
Landfill site	An approved site/facility used for the final disposal of waste.
Leachate	Liquid that drains from solid waste in a landfill and which contains dissolved, suspended and/or microbial contaminants from the breakdown of this waste.
Natural Environment	The air, land and water, or any combination or part thereof, of the Province of Ontario.
Non-putrescible	Waste material not containing significant quantities of organic or other decomposable material.

Glossary of Terms

Term	Definition
Proponent	A person who: (a) carries out or proposes to carry out an undertaking, or (b) is the owner or person having charge, management or control of an undertaking.
Service Area	The geographical area from which a waste management facility is permitted to receive waste materials for processing and/or disposal.
(the) Site	The property proposed for the CRRRC Project.
(the) Undertaking	The proposed Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre as described in this Terms of Reference and the final environmental assessment documents.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is Volume 2 of the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Environmental Assessment (EA) of the Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre (CRRRC). Volume 2 presents the consultation record for the development of the TOR. The Consultation Record is part of the requirements for approval of the TOR under the Ontario *Environmental Assessment Act* (EAA). This document presents the record of consultation materials that were provided and consultation events that took place during the development of the TOR. It also presents the comments and issues raised by federal, provincial and municipal government officials, interested persons and Aboriginal communities.

This document includes the following sections and appendices:

- Section 1 provides an introduction to the Consultation Record and report structure;
- Section 2 describes who was consulted in the development of the TOR;
- Section 3 describes the consultation methods and activities that were used during the development of the TOR;
- Section 4 summarizes the consultation program that took place during the development of the TOR, including comments made by federal, provincial and municipal government officials, and interested persons;
- Section 5 provides a summary of the consultation with Aboriginal communities;
- Section 6 summarizes the outstanding concerns and commitments made;
- Section 7 provides a list of references for the Consultation Record; and,
- The appendices contain the consultation materials provided for the development of the TOR, and feedback about the proposed undertaking and EA process provided by federal, provincial and municipal government officials, interested persons and Aboriginal communities.

2.0 STAKEHOLDERS CONSULTED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

The consultation program for the TOR was developed by Taggart Miller Environmental Services (Taggart Miller) to encourage participation of stakeholders in the early planning stages of the proposed undertaking. Prior to commencing the EA process, Taggart Miller developed a list of potentially interested persons, which included identified members of the public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities. As the TOR development process progressed, the consultation list was updated to reflect interest in the undertaking. This consultation list will be used to communicate with stakeholders during future EA activities.

2.1 Interested Persons

The public consultation list for the TOR included local residents near the proposed waste management facility, and identified businesses and organizations that could potentially have an interest in the undertaking. Initially when only the North Russell Road Site was being considered for the project, approximately 55 residents, businesses or organizations were included on the public consultation list. However, as consultation events occurred, and with the addition of the Boundary Road Site, this list has increased to about 300. The public consultation list will continue to be updated during the course of the EA with anyone expressing an interest in the undertaking and wishing to be kept up to date with the EA process.

2.2 Local Government

Municipalities that were identified as potentially having an interest in the undertaking included the following:

- Township of Russell; and,
- City of Ottawa.

The mayors, councillors and appropriate senior staff of these municipalities were contacted during the development of the TOR and were kept informed of the TOR process and consultation events. In addition, the Warden and members of County Council of the United Counties of Prescott-Russell were periodically contacted and provided information on the TOR.

2.3 Government Review Team

The Government Review Team (GRT) includes MOE staff as well as other provincial and federal agencies identified as potentially having an interest/responsibility for the TOR process. The GRT was assembled for the undertaking at the outset of the EA process under guidance from the MOE project officer. The GRT is assembled to provide advice during the development of the TOR/EA and will review the TOR/EA from a technical perspective as part of the approval process. The consultation list was updated and revised during the development of the TOR with changes in contact information for members of the GRT. Appendix A1 contains the GRT list at the beginning of the consultation period on the TOR (A1.1), as well as an update on how the GRT list has changed over time (A1.2).

In addition to the GRT list provided in Appendix A1.1, the Township of Russell and the City of Ottawa were considered interested municipal departments.

The GRT documented in Appendix A1.1 and the interested municipal departments were introduced to the undertaking and EA process with the Notice of Commencement and invitation to Open House #1. Select GRT with a known area of expertise received the draft key documents in December 2011 and January 2012, prior to submission of the final TOR, to provide advice and comments on the content of the key components of the TOR. Subsequently, the GRT was sent notice of the second site and the TOR Open House #2.

2.4 Aboriginal Communities

Initially, Taggart Miller worked with the MOE project officer to identify all potentially affected Aboriginal communities, including First Nations and Métis communities. The following agencies were contacted for information on potentially affected Aboriginal communities:

- Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) now known as Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada (AANDC); and,
- Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA).

Copies of the letters sent to MAA and INAC are provided in Appendices A2 and A3, respectively.

Correspondence with INAC and MAA provided feedback on potentially affected Aboriginal communities that should be engaged in the EA process for the undertaking. Discussion with the MOE project officer concluded that the following list of Aboriginal communities would be consulted:

- Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation;
- Métis Nation of Ontario;
- Mohawks of Akwesasne;
- Métis Council of Ottawa; and,
- Algonquin Consultation Office.

A summary of Aboriginal engagement is provided in Section 5.

3.0 CONSULTATION METHODS AND ACTIVITIES

Consultation activities were designed to accommodate the needs of potentially interested persons and agencies, including adjacent residents, the community, government officials and Aboriginal communities.

3.1 Consultation Methods

Consultation methods used during the development of the TOR were as follows:

- Letter and e-mail correspondence distributed to the public and community organizations, government officials, GRT and Aboriginal communities;
- Notices published in local newspapers;
- Notices on EA website (<http://www.crrrc.ca>);
- Video on EA website (<http://www.crrrc.ca>);
- Open Houses in the community;
- A workshop for the public to learn about and discuss groundwater issues, a component of high importance;
- A presentation to the Township of Russell Environmental Advisory Committee on the EA process;
- A presentation to the Chamber of Commerce ESTIC (Embrun St. Isidore Casselman);
- Draft key documents posted on the EA website and provided to GRT and available to all members of the public;
- Media release;
- Site visit by some members of the Township of Russell at the North Russell Road Site, and by the Carlsbad Springs Community Association at the Boundary Road Site;
- Meetings and telephone calls between the Taggart Miller, the EA consultants, and the MOE; and,
- Informal meetings, telephone calls and discussions with local politicians, business owners, community organizations and neighbours in advance of commencement of the EA and throughout the TOR development period.

3.2 Schedule of Events and Milestones

The principal consultation events that took place during the development of the TOR included:

- Notice of Commencement of the EA – November 10, 2010;
- Open House #1 – November 25, 2010;
- Release of Frequently Asked Questions – Posted on the EA website December 6-8, 2010 with periodic updates;
- Workshop #1 (Hydrogeology) – April 9, 2011;
- Miller Facilities Tour – April 30, 2011;

- Release of Draft Key Documents for Comment – December – January, 2012;
- Notification of Second Site – May 29, 2012; and,
- Open House #2 – June 20 and 25, 2012.

These consultation events are described in the following sections.

4.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION PROGRAM

This section provides a description of the specific consultation events held throughout the development of the TOR for the EA.

A database was established to store and manage consultation input received and responses during the development of the TOR. The database provides a record demonstrating how each comment, question and/or issue was responded to.

Comments received at individual consultation events are included in the summary for those events (and the associated appendices) and comments received outside formal events are captured in section 4.11 and Appendix I.

4.1 Notice of Commencement

Taggart Miller initiated the environmental assessment (EA) process by publishing a Notice of Commencement (Appendix B1) on November 10, 2010 as required under the Ontario *Environmental Assessment Act*. The Notice of Commencement was prepared following guidance from the *Code of Practice for Preparing and Reviewing Terms of Reference for Environmental Assessments in Ontario* (MOE, 2009¹). The Notice of Commencement provided a brief overview of the proposed undertaking, including a description of the proposed facility and information on the proponent, the location of the undertaking, the TOR and EA process, upcoming consultation events and how to contact Taggart Miller and the EA consultants with comments and questions. It should be noted that at the time of the Notice of Commencement, Taggart Miller was only considering the North Russell Road Site for the project.

The newspaper advertisement is shown in Appendix B2. The Notice of Commencement advertisement was published in the following local newspapers:

- Ottawa Citizen;
- La Nouvelle; and,
- The Villager.

The Notice of Commencement was also posted on the EA website on November 10, 2010 and can be found at: www.crrrc.ca.

The Notice of Commencement, accompanied by a letter of introduction from Taggart Miller about the undertaking and a project description (Appendix B1), was e-mailed and mailed to 37 GRT members, 5 Aboriginal groups, 31 municipal, City and county officials, the MP and MPP, and 5 commerce/construction/rate payer groups. The Notice of Commencement was also hand delivered to approximately 50 neighbours of the North Russell Road Site located within a 0.5 km radius of the project site.

Table 1 summarizes the GRT member responses received to date on the Notice of Commencement, which are included in Appendix B4:

¹ Ministry of the Environment, 2009. *Code of Practice: Preparing and Reviewing Terms of Reference for Environmental Assessments in Ontario*. October 2009.

Table 1: Government Review Team (GRT) Member Responses

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
François Turpin Surintendant de l'éducation	November 10, 2010	Request for the notice of commencement in French.	Taggart Miller provided a French version of the NOC.	B4.1
Lynne Peterson Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing	November 10, 2010	Indicated that she is not a member of the environmental review team.	Removed from the distribution list.	B4.2
Darryl Soshycki Ministry of Tourism and Culture	November 10, 2010	Requested to be removed from the distribution list.	Removed from the distribution list.	B4.3
Valerie Andrews Ministry of Tourism and Culture	November 12, 2010	Confirmed that the Ministry has no comments at this time but wishes to be kept advised and updated on the EA progress.	Taggart Miller will maintain the Ministry on the project distribution list.	B4.4
		Provided a contact for the Ministry of Culture's Cultural Programs Branch, who would be reviewing the EA from a cultural heritage and archaeological perspective.	Taggart Miller added the contact from the Ministry of Culture's Cultural Programs Branch to the distribution list.	
Josée Beauregard Indian and Northern Affairs Canada	November 15, 2010	Acknowledged receipt of the notice.	No further action required.	B4.5
		Provided information that their inventory does not include active litigation in the vicinity of this property. No representations regarding potential or future claims were made. Made note to contact Don Boswell about Specific Claims and Nicole Cheechoo about current Comprehensive Claims. Contact information was provided.	No further action required. Don Boswell and Nicole Cheechoo were already on GRT.	
Penny Stewart Ministry of Environment	November 17, 2010	Acknowledged receipt of the hard copy and electronic notice.	Taggart Miller will maintain the Ministry on the project distribution list.	B4.6
Ashley Johnson Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs	November 22, 2010	Received voice mail and were provided updated contact information.	Taggart Miller updated the distribution list.	B4.7

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
Jim Chan Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency	November 22, 2010	Indicated that the notification was not sufficient to determine whether the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act applies. A project description of the preferred alternative is required.	Taggart Miller maintained CEAA on the distribution list. Ultimately as the TOR is developed it is envisioned that there will be sufficient information available for CEAA to comment if the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act applies.	B4.8
Paul McCue Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care	November 23, 2010	Recommended contacting the local Board of Health as the key contact for the project. Contact details were provided.	Taggart Miller had already contacted the local Board of Health.	B4.9
Don Boswell Indian and Northern Affairs Canada	November 30, 2010	Provided information regarding Aboriginal groups in the vicinity of the project.	Taggart Miller used the references provided to assist in the identification of Aboriginal groups with an interest in the project.	B4.10
Laura Melvin Ministry of Natural Resources	January 14, 2011 (letter says 2010 but was incorrectly dated)	Encouraged an evaluation, such as a compatibility study, of the impact to aggregate resources in the area from the proposed landfill site.	Taggart Miller commits to evaluate the existing aggregate resource at the North Russell Road Site in the TOR.	B4.11
		Identified element occurrence records for Henslow's Sparrow and based on air photo imagery and habitat requirements identified the potential for Bobolink, Whip-poor-will, Chimney Swift and Butternut. Recommended that additional ecological site assessments be carried out at the appropriate times of year to determine the presence/absence of these species.	Taggart Miller commits to evaluate these species in the TOR, Appendix C Biology Work Plan. Further, Taggart Miller will contact the MNR at the time of field investigations to determine if any other species at risk are identified in the area of the Site.	
		If any Butternut trees will be harmed or killed, a Butternut Health Assessor will have to be contacted to assess the health of the tree before proceeding with potential permit application. Provided the contact information for the Ministry Species at Risk Biologist	Taggart Miller acknowledge that if any Butternut trees are harmed or killed, a Butternut Health Assessor will have to be contacted to assess the health of the tree before proceeding with potential permit application.	
Environmental Assessment	January 17, 2011	Provided updated contact information.	Taggart Miller updated the distribution list.	B4.12

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
Coordinator Transport Canada		Highlighted the potential application of the <i>Navigable Waters Protection Act</i> and the potential need for the incorporation of CEEA requirements into the EA.	As there are no Navigable Waters at the North Russell Road Site nor the Boundary Road Site, no further action was required. Removed from the distribution list.	
Consultation and Accommodations Unit Indian and Northern Affairs Canada	January 20, 2011	Provided updated contact information.	Taggart Miller updated the distribution list.	B4.13
Jean-Paul St-Pierre, Mayor of Russell Township	February 22, 2011	Recommended alternatives to the project to be considered.	Taggart Miller considered Alternatives to the Project in Volume 3, Supporting Document #1.	B4.14
		Recommended that the study areas be delineated large enough to undertake reasonable and appropriate assessments of the environmental costs and benefits of the proposal beyond the vicinity of the site.	Environmental components will each individually consider the Site-vicinity necessary for their individual studies as described in the TOR Appendix C, Work Plans.	
		Recommended that the criteria include accidental emissions into the air, water and terrestrial ecosystems during operation.	The potential effects are assessed using predictive models. The assessments of various components us conservative assumptions with on-going feedback from the GRT (in the instance of air, water and terrestrial ecosystems the GRT members would be the MOE and MNR.) With respect to water, accidental emission is considered by failing engineered containment systems prematurely as part of the predictive analyses. In addition, the site D&O plan will contain contingency measures if the facilities do not perform as designed, or in the event of accidental releases.	

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		Recommended an open and transparent assessment process, which includes the participation of the Environmental Advisory Committee.	Taggart Miller has worked to include and consider the Township of Russell's Environmental Advisory Committee Sub-Committee and its consultant (XCG) in the consultation and development of the TOR.	
Mike Gibbs Ministry of Transportation	August 11, 2011	Indicated that the Ministry does not need to be further involved in the project.	Taggart Miller considered removal from the distribution list; however with the addition of the Boundary Road Site, the Ministry of Transportation was again engaged.	B4.15
Lisa Myslicki Infrastructure Ontario	September 13, 2011	Indicated that the department does not need to be further involved in the project.	Removed from the distribution list.	B4.16

Immediately following the Notice of Commencement an opposition group in Russell Township known as Citizens' Environmental Stewardship Association, East of Ottawa (Dump the Dump Now) formed and they were included in the community group for future notifications and consultation.

4.2 Open House #1

The first open house occurred on November 25, 2010, from 2 p.m. – 9 p.m., at the Russell Arena in the Village of Russell, Ontario. The Notice of Commencement advertisements and letters also provided notice of Open House #1. This open house provided a general overview of the proposed project and the TOR and EA approval process. The purpose of Open House #1 was to announce the project and inform the community, agencies, and Aboriginal groups of the project and to invite them to participate in the development of the Terms of Reference for the EA.

This event was designed to provide opportunities for attendees to speak directly with Taggart Miller and their EA consulting team. Attendees were asked to sign in at the entrance and were encouraged to fill out comment sheets in order to provide feedback and recommendations.

Representatives from Taggart Miller and their EA consultants in attendance at Open House #1 included:

- Blair McArthur, Miller Group;
- Nigel Guilford, Miller Group;
- Derek Cathcart, Miller Group;
- Mike Kopansky, Miller Group;
- Steve Moote, Miller Group;
- Ian Taggart, Taggart Construction;
- Michelle Taggart, Taggart Construction;
- Jeff Parkes, Taggart Construction;
- Paul Smolkin, Golder Associates Ltd.;
- Trish Edmond, Golder Associates Ltd.;
- Mike Snow, Golder Associates Ltd.;
- Doug Thomson, McCarthy Tétrault;
- Hubert Bourque, Taggart Miller;
- Howard Williamson, Williamson Consulting Inc.;
- Kim Kelly, Williamson Consulting Inc.; and,
- Claire McQuinn, Williamson Consulting Inc.

A total of 26 display boards in English and French were featured at Open House #1. The following additional materials were also made available at the sign-in table in both English and French (Appendix C1).

- Copies of the Open House #1 display boards;
- Evaluation Criteria comment sheets;
- Open House #1 comment sheets; and,
- Tour and Workshop surveys.

A total of approximately 609 people were in attendance at Open House #1. A total of 156 Evaluation Criteria comment sheets were compiled (142 during Open House #1 and 14 after Open House #1 via mail or e-mail). A total of 144 comment sheets were completed (137 during Open House #1 and 17 after Open House #1 via mail or

e-mail). A total of 101 Tour and Workshop surveys were completed. Summaries of the outcome of the Evaluation Criteria and Tour and Workshop comments are provided in Appendix C2 and in Section 4.10 of this report.

4.2.1 Miller Facilities Tours

As described, 101 attendees at Open House #1 completed their Tour and Workshop survey. 45 of the survey response indicated interest in participating in tours of other Miller facilities located in southern Ontario. A tour was organized for April 30, 2011. All of the community members who indicated an interest in the tour were sent invitations to the April 30, 2011 event. On April 30, approximately 10 people participated in the tour, an agenda of the day's activities is provided in Appendix C3.1. In addition to the 10 people who participated in the formal tour, several others from the community have toured the Miller facilities individually when in the area of these facilities.

Taggart Miller continues to be available to provide tours to the community as and when required. On June 8, 2011 Taggart Miller placed advertisements in La Nouvelle and The Villager to solicit interest in another tour. A copy of these advertisements is provided in Appendix C3. No calls or e-mails were received regarding interest in these tours.

4.3 Release of Frequently Asked Questions

Following Open House #1 Taggart Miller received numerous e-mails and letters from the community about the project. These communications are summarized and discussed in Section 4.11 of this report and Appendices I and J. As many of the comments being made were repetitive in nature, Taggart Miller and its consultant group prepared a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document. The original FAQ document consisted of 17 questions and answers and was posted on the EA website between December 6 and 8, 2010. The Township of Russell was made aware of these FAQ on December 7, 2010.

A newspaper advertisement is shown in Appendix D1. The FAQ release was published in the following local newspapers on December 8, 2010:

- La Nouvelle; and,
- The Villager.

On January 26, 2011 the first revision to the FAQ was made. Question 5 was updated with additional information that was obtained from the Ontario Geological Survey and Question 18 was added. On February 9 e-mails were sent to 260 members of the community who had provided e-mail addresses at Open House #1. A copy of this e-mail is provided in Appendix D2.1 and it basically reminded and informed the public of the existence of the FAQs.

Between February 23, 2011 and April 11, 2011 some members of the GRT who had been circulated on comments from the community as well as municipal and provincial government representatives received notification of the FAQs. A copy of the notification is provided in Appendices D2.2 and D2.3.

The FAQs have been subsequently amended with the addition of Questions 19 and 20 on August 9, 2011 and June 18, 2012, respectively. When these updates occur, the content on the EA website is updated.

4.4 Workshop #1

During Open House #1, held on November 25, 2010, the 600 plus attendees were asked to indicate their interest in attending workshops on specific topics, and to identify potential topics of interest. In addition to the forms at

Open House #1, forms were also available on the EA website. Based on this feedback from these forms, groundwater (hydrogeology) was identified as a main topic of interest. E-mails or letters were sent on March 14, 2011 to the 55 community members who indicated an interest in attending workshops. Follow up e-mails and individual phone calls were also undertaken to encourage attendance.

Between the time of the invite to Workshop #1, March 14, 2011, and the workshop itself, April 9, 2011, several individuals contacted Taggart Miller requesting that they be allowed to attend the workshop. All individuals were placed on a waiting list and fortunately all were accommodated at the workshops on April 9, 2011.

There were two, three and a half hour workshops on hydrogeology held on April 9, 2011. Sixteen people attended the morning session, while 13 people attended the afternoon session. Taggart Miller's consultant team, Golder Associates Ltd., presented the content of the workshop to participants who were seated in a horseshoe format. Participants were provided a copy of the workshop presentation material and an evaluation sheet and were encouraged to comment and ask questions throughout the presentation.

The evaluation sheets submitted by participants at the end of the workshop are provided in Appendix E3. In addition, two individuals submitted comments via e-mail following the workshop. These e-mails are discussed and included in Section 4.11 of this report. A summary of the evaluation sheets is provided in Section 4.10 of this report.

A newspaper advertisement was posted on May 4, 2011 to advise those who had not expressed interest in workshops that the material content was available on the EA website. The ads were published in the following local newspapers and are provided in Appendix E4:

- La Nouvelle; and,
- The Villager.

4.5 Meetings with MOE Technical Reviewers

Taggart Miller's consultants met with the MOE technical reviewers in Kingston, Ontario on two separate occasions, October 11, 2011 and July 11, 2012. Reviewers from EAAB in Toronto and District staff joined the meetings via teleconference. The purpose of these meetings was to provide background information on the proposed CRRRC and the existing environment in the area of the proposed site(s).

The MOE were able to ask questions about the proposed project, how the process was being followed, and provided suggestions on how the TOR should be developed.

4.6 Release of Draft Key Documents for Comment

Prior to conducting the second open house, Taggart Miller prepared and provided for comment the following draft key documents:

- A description of the waste diversion components proposed for the project;
- The proposed Assessment Criteria to be used to evaluate alternative approaches to haul route/site access location, site development and leachate treatment;
- The proposed methodology to be followed in conducting the Environmental Assessment; and,

- The proposed work plans for the North Russell Road Site for each of the environmental components to be studied during the Environmental Assessment.

These documents were provided to the GRT review team known to have an area of interest between December 16, 2011 and January 12, 2012 for comment and review. The GRT who received the draft key documents were as follows:

- Ministry of the Environment
- Ministry of Culture
- Ministry of Agriculture, Food & Rural Affairs
- Ministries of Citizenship and Immigration, Tourism and Culture, and Health Promotion
- Ministry of Natural Resources
- Ministry of Transportation
- Ontario Provincial Police
- South Nation Conservation Authority

The documents were posted on the EA website and an e-mail was sent to 266 members of the community directing them to the website on January 24, 2012. In addition, the draft key documents were mailed to 8 members of the community who are not confirmed to be on the e-mail list and/or who do not have internet service.

4.7 Notification of a Second Site

From the time of the Notice of Commencement, Taggart Miller received significant public input through its various consultation activities as well as on-going comments from the community. The public asked what other sites were looked at before deciding on the North Russell Road Site, and indicated that Taggart Miller should be looking at more than one site, including sites closer to major highways, with fewer residential neighbours and in a more industrial setting. As a result of these comments, on May 29, 2012 Taggart Miller announced that it was adding a second site as an alternative for consideration under the EA process for this project. The second site is known as the Boundary Road Site. On May 29 a media release advising that Taggart Miller had secured a second site was sent to 12 media outlets; the release and the outlets are provided in Appendix G1. An e-mail was sent to the GRT distribution list (plus additions in recognition of the new location of the alternative site as described in Appendix A1.2), to the Aboriginal groups and to 291 members of the community, including local politicians and municipal staff, on May 29, 2012. A copy of these letters and e-mails is provided in Appendix G2. The e-mails and letters were accompanied by background information and a consultation plan document and a site location plan. These attachments are provided in Appendix G3.

Information on the second site was provided to the City of Ottawa and Township of Russell, local and provincial politicians, leaders of the opposition group to the North Russell Road Site, the MOE and immediate neighbours of the North Russell Road Site and the Boundary Road Site. Lastly, the notification of the second site was posted on the EA website on May 29, 2012.

4.8 Open House #2

Advertising and notification for Open House #2 occurred between June 6 and June 8, 2012. The newspaper advertisements are shown in Appendix H1 and were published in the following local newspapers:

- Le Reflet/The News;
- The Orleans Star;
- The Villager; and,
- L'Express.

The notification of Open House #2 was also posted on the EA website, the Dump the Dump Now website, the Carlsbad Springs Community Association website and the Vars community website. In addition, an e-mail was sent to 274 members of the community, a copy of which is provided in Appendix H2. Additional e-mails were also sent to local politicians and municipal staff.

As a result of the addition of a second site, Open House #2 was organized into two identical sessions. The first session of Open House #2 occurred on June 20, 2012, from 3 p.m. – 9 p.m., at the Russell Arena in the Village of Russell. The second session of Open House #2 occurred on June 25, 2012, from 3 p.m. – 9 p.m., at Rendez-vous des âinés francophones d'Ottawa in the City of Ottawa. Session 2 of Open House #2 was held at the Rendez-vous des âinés francophones d'Ottawa because it was the closest venue that was identified in the City of Ottawa that could hold at least 300 people that was available on that date. The total number of attendees at the Open House on June 25 was approximately 215, most of who arrived at roughly the same time.

Residents from the Carlsbad Springs area expressed concern that the June 25 session was not held in Carlsbad Springs. The website for the Carlsbad Springs Community Centre facility lists the capacity under 'reservations procedures' as 175. At the June 25 open house this point was discussed with the coordinator of the Carlsbad Springs website, who agreed that was the information on their website. It is now understood this is the seated capacity, however at the time this information was not at all clear.

This open house provided a general overview of the proposed project and the TOR and EA approval process. The purpose of Open House #2 was to announce the second site; inform the community, agencies, and Aboriginal groups of the updated project methodology; to discuss results from Open House #1 and to invite them to participate in the development of the Terms of Reference for the EA.

This event was designed to provide opportunities for attendees to speak directly with Taggart Miller and their EA consulting team. Attendees were asked to sign in at the entrance and were encouraged to fill out comment sheets in order to provide feedback and recommendations.

Representatives from Taggart Miller and their EA consultants in attendance at Open House #2 included:

- Blair McArthur, Miller Group;
- Dennis Goulet;
- Nigel Guilford, Miller Group;
- Derek Cathcart, Miller Group;
- Mike Kopansky, Miller Group (first session only);
- Steve Moote, Miller Group;
- Ian Taggart, Taggart Construction;
- Michelle Taggart, Taggart Construction (first session only);
- Jeff Parkes, Taggart Construction;
- Paul Taggart, Taggart Construction;
- Paul Smolkin, Golder Associates Ltd.;
- Trish Edmond, Golder Associates Ltd.;
- Pamela Russell, Golder Associates Ltd.;
- Kris Marentette, Golder Associates Ltd.;
- Gino Dalla Coletta, Golder Associates Ltd. (first session only);
- Paul Dewaele, Golder Associates Ltd.;
- Joe Tomaselli, Golder Associates Ltd. (first session only);
- Danny Da Silva, Golder Associates Ltd. (second session only);
- Doug Thomson, McCarthy Tétrault;
- Hubert Bourque, Taggart Miller;
- Howard Williamson, Williamson Consulting Inc.;
- Kim Kelly, Williamson Consulting Inc.;
- Claire McQuinn, Williamson Consulting Inc.;
- Debbie Mantha, Williamson Consulting Inc. (first session only); and,
- Lise Dessaint, Williamson Consulting Inc. (second session only).

A total of 21 display boards in English and French were featured at Open House #2. The following additional materials were also made available at the sign-in table in both English and French (Appendix H3).

- Copies of the Open House #2 display boards;
- Evaluation Criteria comment sheets;
- Open House #2 comment sheets; and,
- Tour surveys.

A total of approximately 190 people were in attendance at the first session of Open House #2. The Dump the Dump Now opposition group advised attendees not to fill in comment sheets or to sign in. Approximately 80 people refused to sign-in; however front desk staff was instructed to keep a count. A total of 20 Evaluation Criteria comment sheets were completed. A total of 16 comment sheets were completed (15 of the Open House #2 comment sheets and 1 opponent comment sheet). A total of 7 Tour surveys were completed.

A total of approximately 226 people were in attendance at the second session of Open House #2. A total of 102 Evaluation Criteria comment sheets were completed (96 during Open House #2 and 6 after Open House #2 via mail or e-mail).

A total of 98 comment sheets were completed (90 during Open House #2 and 8 after Open House #2 via mail or e-mail). A total of 60 Tour surveys were completed (56 during Open House #2 and 4 after Open House #2 via mail or e-mail).

Summaries of the outcome of the Evaluation Criteria and Tour comments are provided in Appendix H4 and in Section 4.10 of this report.

4.9 MOE Review of Draft Terms of Reference

Prior to submitting the proposed TOR, Taggart Miller prepared a draft version of the proposed TOR and provided it to the MOE. The MOE received the draft TOR at the end of July 2012.

4.10 Summary of Feedback Received During Consultation

Comments and questions were formally invited from attendees by Taggart Miller during each of the consultation events described in Sections 4.2, 4.4 and 4.8 (Open House #1, Workshop #1 and Open House #2, respectively). In addition comments were received following release of draft documents.

4.10.1 Open House #1

142 environmental component ranking comment sheets were received at Open House #1 on November 25, 2010. Three could not be tabulated because their intentions were not clear. Seven sheets were completed in French. An additional 14 sheets were received following the open house for a total of 156 completed sheets. The results of the environmental component ranking are provided in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Results of Open House #1 Environmental Component Ranking of Importance

Environmental Component	Sub-components	Ranking		
		Very Important	Important	Less Important
1) Atmospheric Environment	Air quality	145	1	0
	Odour	142	6	0
	Noise	123	17	3
2) Geology & Hydrogeology	Groundwater quality and groundwater flow	146	0	0
3) Surface Water Resources	Surface water quantity and surface water quality	135	10	1
4) Biology	Terrestrial ecosystems and aquatic ecosystems	115	21	4
5) Cultural & Archaeology Heritage Resources	Cultural landscape, built heritage and archaeological resources	66	57	15
6) Transportation	Effects from truck transportation along access roads	125	18	4

Environmental Component	Sub-components	Ranking		
		Very Important	Important	Less Important
7) Land Use	Effects on current and planned future land uses	111	23	7
8) Agriculture	Effects on agricultural land and agricultural operations	122	18	6
9) Socio-economic	Effects on cost of service to customers	54	33	48
	Employment and economics	45	38	54
	Visual aesthetics	76	50	15
10) Aboriginal	Potential effects on aboriginal communities	44	31	49
11) Site Design & Operations	Site design and operational characteristics	76	36	24

Below the environmental component ranking portion of the sheets, Taggart Miller asked if there were any more environment components or considerations. The headings of the constructive comments which were received are listed below, from most common to least common. The term “common issue” has been used when 10 or more responses were received, “less common” when 5 to 9 responses were received, and “occasional” when less than 5 responses were received.

- **Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical** – A common issue raised on the Open House #1 environmental component ranking sheets related to protection of groundwater resources in the Site-vicinity or beyond the Site-vicinity. Under the same heading were issues regarding faults in or around the North Russell Road Site, the potential movement of faults and the potential widening of fractures as a result of historical blasting at the North Russell Road Site.
- **Biology** – A common issue raised on the Open House #1 environmental component ranking sheets related to protection of the natural environment, including the protection of the water in the quarry at the North Russell Road Site.
- **Property Value Protection** – A less common issue raised on the Open House #1 ranking sheets related to property value protection and the desire to have the details that would normally be related to a formal plan.
- **Land Use & Socio-economic** – A less common issue raised on Open House #1 ranking sheets related to protection of the community and its social identity. Under the same heading, issues regarding the zoning of the North Russell Road Site were identified, and issues related to negative effects on nearby agricultural operations.
- **Location** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 ranking sheets was the North Russell Road Site location. Of the comments received on the ranking sheets, the community members identified that the Site was unsuitable and many suggested that another more suitable Site should be found.

- **Traffic** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 ranking sheets related to traffic associated with the CRRRC project.
- **Long Term Safety and Responsibility** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 ranking sheets related to who would be responsible for the Site in the future and who would ensure the Site’s safety in the future.
- **Atmosphere** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 ranking sheets related to protection of air quality, odours, noise, and occasionally blasting.
- **Human Health** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 ranking sheets related to protection of human health.
- **Agriculture** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 ranking sheets related to the existing agricultural land located at the North Russell Road Site.

The full comments have been transcribed in the summary provided in Appendix C2.1.

Also at Open House #1 a total of 137 general comment sheets were completed. An additional 7 comment sheets were received following the Open House #1 by mail and email and are included in the final report for a total of 144 completed comment sheets.

Each comment sheet had a total of five questions as follows:

- 1) Are you aware that about 200,000 to 250,000 tonnes of commercial waste is currently being shipped per year over the border to the US from the Ottawa area? Do you think this is an issue, and do you think local solutions should be found for that waste stream?
- 2) The province’s objective is to divert 60% of commercial waste from disposal; however there are currently virtually no facilities in the Capital Region to process and recover materials and divert commercial waste from disposal. Do you think this is an issue?
- 3) The open house materials presented today list a number of alternatives to the possible CRRRC facility that have been considered. Are there other alternatives that Taggart and Miller should consider and if so why?
- 4) Do you think the preferred alternative identified by Taggart Miller of combining the recycling and disposal facilities on one site makes sense? If not, why not?
- 5) What are your key concerns, if any, about the possible CRRRC facility?

The full comments have been transcribed in the summary provided in Appendix C2.3. The headings of key concerns identified as a result of question 5) are summarized below, from most common to least common. The Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical heading was two times more common than the next most common heading of Atmosphere. A description of the concerns identified, if not already done so above, is provided with this list. The term “common issue” has been used when 50 or more responses were received, “less common” when 15 to 50 responses received, and “occasional” when less than 15 responses received.

- **Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical** – A common issue.
- **Atmospheric** – A common issue.

- **Traffic** – A common issue.
- **Property values** – A less common issue.
- **Land Use/Socio-economic** – A less common issue.
- **Biology** – A less common issue.
- **Location** – A less common issue.
- **Road maintenance** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to excess wear and tear on the roads as a result of traffic from the proposed site. In addition, the financial responsibility for road maintenance was questioned.
- **Agriculture** – An occasional issue.
- **Human Health** – An occasional issue.
- **Surface Water** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to the protection of surface water resources, including aquatic habitat.
- **Design and Operations** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to the design of engineered systems including liners and leachate collection systems. Specifically, issues about longevity were identified.
- **Long Term Safety and Responsibility** – An occasional issue.
- **Loss of Tax Revenue** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to the loss in tax revenue since the North Russell Road site would not be used for residential development and/or based on concerns would stifle development in the Township.
- **Toxic Waste / Hazardous Waste** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets relate to the receipt of toxic and/or hazardous waste.
- **Vermin** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to the potential for the proposed site to attract vermin.
- **Archaeology/Cultural Heritage** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to the potential destruction of archaeological or cultural heritage significance.
- **Communication/Consultation** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to how and what type of consultation events had occurred, how and what type of consultation events would occur, location of events and how much notice was required for events.
- **The Question of the Need for this Project** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to the need for diversion facilities and more importantly landfills in eastern Ontario.
- **Fire** – An issue occasionally raised on Open House #1 general comment sheets related to the possibility of landfill fires.

4.10.2 Workshop #1

A total of 10 completed evaluation sheets were received. The evaluation sheet asked a series of questions about the session and provided an area for additional comments.

The full comments have been transcribed in the summary provided in Appendix E3 along with the original comment sheets. The table below is a record of the workshop format comments received.

Table 3: Comments on Workshop #1 Format

	Yes	No
Was the length of the workshop about right?	9	0
Was the presentation understandable?	7	1
Were questions answered adequately?	5	5
Are you interested in attending a future workshop?	10	0

Specific comments about the workshop fell into roughly six categories as follows:

- **Dissatisfaction with Workshop** – Five comments were received which indicated that questions related to groundwater were not answered adequately and/or they did not understand the information presented.
- **Satisfaction with Workshop** – Five comments were received which indicated that the material was well presented and participants appreciated receiving information.
- **Questions Un-related to the Workshop** – Four comments were received that were completely unrelated to the groundwater workshop and one comment noted that there was no indication how questions asked during the workshop that had nothing to do with the topic being presented would be answered.
- **Inadequate Disaster Plan** – Two comments were received which indicated that Taggart Miller have not explained or demonstrated a disaster plan of how they will deal with groundwater when it becomes impacted.
- **Presentation Duration** – Two comments were received that indicated there was a lot of material to cover in the time allotted or that there was too much material and not enough opportunity for questions.
- **Against the Project** – One comment indicated that the participant was against the project but still willing to listen to both sides.

4.10.3 Release of Draft Key Documents for Comment

The community and Municipal government generally decided to wait for the final submission of these key documents prior to issuing comments. The comments received from the GRT are provided in the table below.

Table 4: GRT Comments on Draft Key Documents

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Environmental Approvals Branch	December 22, 2011	<p>I have reviewed the following works plans related to site operations and design submitted by Golder and Associates located in Ottawa, Ontario that have been prepared in support of the proposed Terms of Reference (ToR) for an Environmental Assessment (EA) of the proposed Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre (CRRRC):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Attachment 9 – Site Design and Operations Work Plan – Russell Site (Draft December 2011); ii. Attachment 10 – Haul Route/Access Location Study Plan – Russell Site (Draft December 2011); iii. Proposed CRRRC Diversion Facilities (Draft December 2011); and iv. Proposed Assessment Criteria (Draft Assessment Criteria). <p>Based on my review, I am providing the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In general, the proposed work plans address the collection of type of information in which an EPA approval related to site operations and site design for waste disposal would require. Until the technical information has been collected, there are no technical comments on adequacy of the information for the proposed facility at this time. 2. In the Proposed CRRRC Diversion Facilities document, the consultant indicates that the management of surplus soils from construction projects is governed by Ontario Regulation 153/04 and that the regulation allows only those soils (or rocks) that meet s stringent quality criteria (called “background quality”) to be taken for use at another site, otherwise they are required to be taken to a licensed landfill. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledged, no further action required. 2. This comment regarding O.Reg. 153/04 has been considered. 3. A more detailed characterization of the components of IC&I and C&D waste and what waste can be most readily diverted is provided in Volume 3 of the TOR, SD#1. 4. Acknowledged, no further action required. 5. Within Appendix C, the Design & Operation work plan contains a discussion under data sources has been included to address the potential landfill gas generated rates and options for managing landfill gas. 	F1.1

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>This statement is grossly incorrect. Regulation 153/04 (amended in 2009 as Reg. 511/09) addresses sites that are seeking a Record of Site Condition. Within that regulation, it discusses the soil quality that the RSC site can accept for fill. This report infers that the Regulation addresses all excess soils from construction projects. More specifically it infers that the Regulation is a soils management regulation. This is incorrect. The ministry does not have a soils management regulation. Soils that cannot be used elsewhere without causing an adverse effect require to be managed accordingly. One method used to manage soil is to dispose of the soil at a licensed waste facility. Regulation 153/04 does not require excess soil to be disposed off at a landfill site if it does not meet “background quality”. This section of the report should be amended to accurately reflect Regulation 153/04 and soil management.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Within the Proposed CRRC Diversion Facilities, it discusses the type of waste which typically comprised IC&I and C&D waste. A more detailed waste characterization study could be completed to better break down the potential percentage of materials that could be diverted from final disposal. 4. Should the proponent establish a facility to treat hydrocarbon soils, that facility would require approval within the overall site approval for the appropriate EPA approvals related to air, waste and wastewater. 5. With regard to the proposed Assessment Criteria for Site Design and Operations, a discussion under data sources should include the potential landfill gas generated rates and options for managing landfill gas. 		

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>In general, the documents reviewed related to the works plans related to site operation address the type of information that would need to be collected to address the technical issues related to the proposed waste management operations.</p> <p>In summary, the information provided in the documents at this time is considered preliminary. Additional information and/or scope of any investigation for the proposed alternative(s) should provide enough detail for the Environmental Approvals Branch – Environmental Approvals Service Section it to assess whether the Approval’s mandate and responsibilities can be addressed.</p> <p>If you have any comments or questions about this memorandum, please call me.</p>		
<p>Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Air Quality Analyst, Technical Support Section, Eastern Region</p>	<p>January 6, 2012</p>	<p>I have examined the draft atmospheric work plan documents attached to IDS submission 3672-8PSJPV. The Taggart Group of Companies and the Miller Group have submitted a draft document describing the workplan for the atmospheric components of their proposal. This submission also includes a noise component which I did not review.</p> <p>The submission properly identifies the requirements of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and subsequent air quality related approvals required for this project. The Phase 1-EA components are described on page 1 of the submission. They include identification and assessment of alternatives for the project. The proponent is aware of their EA requirements.</p> <p>The submission documents describe how the air quality impacts of the preferred alternative will be assessed.</p>	<p>Acknowledged, no further action required.</p>	<p>F1.2</p>

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proponent will evaluate the AQ portion of the project with MOE approved models. ▪ The modelling will be executed in accordance with MOE guidance. ▪ The proponent understands the subsequent permitting requirements as they relate to the production of an Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling (ESDM) report to evaluate Ontario Regulation 419/05 air quality compliance. ▪ The ESDM results will be compared to appropriate MOE air quality standards. ▪ The proponent is prepared to develop a Design & Operations Manual for site operations. <p>I am satisfied with the contents of the submission. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>		
<p>Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Surface Water Scientist, Water Resources Group, Eastern Region</p>	<p>January 6, 2012</p>	<p>I have reviewed the following work plans with respect to surface water concerns for conducting an Environmental Assessment of the proposed landfill and waste recovery centre in the Township of Russell:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed Assessment Criteria ▪ Site Design and Operations Work Plan ▪ Surface Water Work Plan ▪ Biology Work Plan <p>Other work plans submitted for review had no surface water quality interests to comment on.</p> <p>Summary Overview</p> <p>Site specific component of the EA is proposed to take place in three phases. Phase 1 will compose of 8 tasks that will provide definition and quantification of the expected waste streams, identify the existing environment and potential impacts of the project to that environment, propose and</p>	<p>These comments and recommendations are acknowledged and no further action is required. Taggart Miller acknowledges that if the North Russell Road Site is preferred, Section 11 of the TOR notes that the closure plan of the quarry at the North Russell Road Site will need to be modified.</p>	<p>F1.3</p>

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>identify other alternative sites for development, evaluate leachate management and cumulative impact assessment. Phase 2 will document the design of the preferred alternative and ensure it meets the regulatory requirements of the EPA and OWRA. Phase 3 will be the final preparation and submission of the EAA.</p> <p>The surface water work plan indicates that all assessments will be carried out using surface water quality and quantity as the two assessment criteria. Surface water features will be identified and flow and water quality data collected to describe existing conditions. Surface water runoff will be modeled using 100 year designed storms as well as other standard storm events.</p> <p>Alternatives will be assessed to evaluate the potential effects to surface water quantity and quality. Assessment of surface water impacts will also be reflected in the biology component for the assessment of potential effects to fish habitat. Based on the conceptual site design surface water runoff, modelling of peak flows through various storm events, potential adverse effects on downstream water courses and potential mitigation measures will be assessed for all alternatives.</p> <p>It has not been determined how leachate generated at the site will be treated. However a comparison of off-site versus on-site treatment options will be made. An OWRA approval may be required depending on the selected option. If it is required then a separate leachate management report will be prepared in support of an OWRA approval.</p> <p>A separate OWRA approval will be required to manage stormwater at the site. This will require consultation with the South Nation Conservation Authority.</p>		

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>Cumulative impacts of ongoing discharge associated with other activities in the area will also be assessed.</p> <p>The biology component of the EA will be assessed based on terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.</p> <p>Ecological Land classification surveys will be carried out at the site. The surveys will include avian, vegetation, mammals, amphibian, reptile, flying insects and species at risk surveys and assessment. The results from the aquatic surveys will be used in conjunction with the surface water quality and quantity assessments to determine the potential of adverse impacts.</p> <p>Reviewer's Comments</p> <p>The proposed site is situated in an area where the pre-dominant land use is agricultural. Aside from the quarry which appears flooded in aerial photographs I looked at, the water features in the immediate area appear to be drainage ditches and drains. The Castor River is located to the south and is likely the ultimate receiver of runoff in the area. The Castor River is a tributary of the South Nation River. The Ministry considers the entire South Nation Watershed as a Policy 2 receiver. This means that water quality in the area cannot be degraded further and all practical measures shall be taken to upgrade water quality in the area. When all reasonable and practical measures to attain PWQO have been undertaken but Policy 2 still cannot be met, a deviation of the policy can be approved by the Regional Director.</p> <p>As indicated a study of water quality and flows will be conducted however it is likely that the result will be that these ditches and drains flow intermittently and therefore would be considered dry ditches. Any discharge to a dry ditch must meet PWQO.</p>		

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>The proponent is correct in stating that a stormwater management system will require an OWRA approval as would a leachate treatment system that discharges off-site. The reviewer would not consider discharge to the quarry as a viable alternative because of exposure to the aquifer unless approved by our groundwater staff.</p> <p>Most quarries have closure plans which usually involve the flooding of the quarry and making it useable for recreation or enhancing it with fish habitat features to encourage the growth of aquatic communities. Therefore the closure plan for this quarry must be taken into account when designing leachate and surface water management features.</p> <p>While the biology work plan will be primarily reviewed by other agencies there is a link between surface water quality and quantity and aquatic ecosystems that may be present in the receiver areas that must be considered by this Ministry.</p> <p>When the proponent is conducting water quality surveys in the existing water bodies the parameter list should include those parameters that are expected to be present in the waste stream being accepted at the proposed CRRRC. The parameter list should be supported by documentation that identifies what parameters can be associated with different types of waste.</p> <p>The Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre proposal has raised concerns for area residents regarding environmental and socio-economic issues. Therefore it is important that the EA addresses these concerns in an informed way so that future decisions can be made in a fair and equitable manner.</p>		

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>Recommendations</p> <p>1. The surface water work plan proposed by the proponent for conducting an EA if conducted properly should meet the requirements that would allow a proper assessment for surface water concerns around this project.</p> <p>If you have any questions regarding the above comments or recommendations I would be pleased to discuss them with you.</p>		
Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs Food Safety and Environmental Policy Branch Environmental Land Use Policy Unit	February 10, 2012	<p>Section 2.0 Assessment Framework, page 1 Taking into account the subject lands are partially designated as Agricultural Resource Policy area and the proposed site lies within an agricultural designate area, we question why as part of Phase 1 alternative sites and the associated review criteria have not been incorporated within the proposed Terms of Reference. It is recommended the process for alternative site selection be incorporated within this document.</p> <p>Section 4.4 Task 6: Compare Alternative Methods and Identify Preferred Site Development Alternative, page 4.</p> <p>Removing Agricultural designated land must be justified as per Section 2.3.5.1 c) of the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). It is recommended “Section 2.3.4.1 c)” be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>Since providing these comments Taggart Miller has secured a second site which is not located on land zoned as Agriculture. It is important to point out as well that only a portion of the North Russell Road Site is designated as part of an Agricultural Resource Policy Area. Should the North Russell Road Site be the preferred Site, the activities described in the Agriculture work plan in Appendix C of the TOR will address the concern and its policy basis in Section 2.3.5.1 c) 3.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that Section 2.3.4.1 c) will be revised to include the justification required for removing Agricultural designated land.</p>	F1.4
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport – Culture Services	February 13, 2012	<p>[I] will be awaiting the necessary assessments for further comment. I did want to know if you have any potential sites for locating the facility and if you can share this with me. It has a bearing mostly with regard to archaeological potential.</p>	<p>Acknowledged, the additional information requested was provided.</p>	F1.5

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
Unit		Additionally, if you have a precis of the Land Use and Design/Operation draft work plans, I'd be interested in receiving those as well.		
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch	February 15, 2012	<p>Here are the MOE comments on the draft workplans that have been submitted for review and comment as part of Taggart-Miller Environmental Services development of a proposed Terms of Reference for an Environmental Assessment of the Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre. Please be advised that this is not a complete set of comments as I am still working on my own review and waiting for final comments from our groundwater reviewer in Eastern Region. These comments will follow shortly.</p> <p>Comments from our Waste Unit, Surface Water reviewer in Eastern Region and Air reviewer in Eastern Region are attached. Comments from the Environmental Approvals Branch are as follows:</p> <p>Approvals – Wastewater</p> <p>“Attachment 3 – Surface Water Work Plan for the Russell Site of CRRRC” dated December 2011 has been reviewed as part of wastewater approvals unit mandate. The work plan is acceptable as presented and no further comments are provided.</p> <p>Approvals – Air</p> <p>Draft documents related to Atmosphere (Air quality and Odour) have been reviewed and the following comments are provided:</p> <p>1. More emphasis should be put on Fugitive Dust and Odour Management Plans for the facility as there are outdoor operations (soil decontamination, stockpiling of uncontaminated soil, composting of leaf and yard waste by</p>	<p>Approvals – Wastewater Acknowledged, no further action required.</p> <p>Approvals – Air</p> <p>1. The Atmosphere work plan in Appendix C of the TOR includes a statement about management plans for odour and dust.</p> <p>2. As described in the Atmosphere work plan, Appendix C of the TOR, air emissions from the preferred Site development concept (including LFG collection and energy production, on-Site and off-Site haul roads, excavation operations, waste processing equipment, composting, etc.) will be estimated.</p> <p>3. An EA does not consider any MOE exemptions – all sources are included as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The preferred Site development concept would include any existing sources on-site as described in the Atmosphere work plan found in Appendix C of the TOR.</p>	F1.6

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>open windrows, etc) and frequent movement of materials within the site.</p> <p>2. Products of combustion from sources such as flares and electricity generating facility at the site should be added to the list of contaminants in the study.</p> <p>3. Potential existence of equipment in the facility that has to be registered in ESAR has to be addressed.</p> <p>Approvals – Noise & Vibration</p> <p>The draft document that provides preliminary/generic information in regards to noise, namely sections 4.4.2 and 4.8.2 of Attachment 1, “Atmospheric Work Plan” has been reviewed. The draft document states that the preferred site development alternative evaluated within the EA studies will meet the noise level limit of the MOE Noise Guideline for Landfills, October 1998, and that an Acoustic Assessment Report will be provided in support of an application for an EPA Approval (Air and Noise).</p> <p>The above noted report, however, did not address any specific noise and vibration environmental impacts. The following noise and vibration study items should be considered when preparing the Environmental Assessment study:</p> <p>Noise Impacts</p> <p>(1) Noise Limits: shall comply with the MOE noise limits in:</p> <p>- Publication NPC-205 “Sound Level Limits for Stationary Sources in Class 1 & 2 Areas (Urban)”, October 1995 as</p>	<p>Approvals – Noise & Vibration</p> <p>The Acoustic Assessment report will be prepared in accordance with NPC-119, NPC-233 and NPC-205 or NPC-232 as appropriate as, described in the Atmospheric work plans in Appendix C of the TOR.</p>	

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>amended.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Publication NPC-232 "Sound Level Limits for Stationary Sources in Class 3 Areas (Rural)", October, 1995 as amended. -Publication "Noise Guidelines for Landfill Sites", October 1998, as amended. <p>PROTOCOL FOR DEALING WITH NOISE CONCERNS DURING THE PREPARATION, REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF PROVINCIAL HIGHWAYS ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENTS, February 1986, as amended.</p> <p>(2) Noise Screening: shall be prepared in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -PRIMARY NOISE SCREENING PROCESS FOR S.9 APPLICATIONS SUPPLEMENT TO APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL, Draft October 13, 2010, as amended. -SECONDARY NOISE SCREENING PROCESS FOR S.9 APPLICATIONS SUPPLEMENT TO APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL, Draft October 13, 2010, as amended. <p>(3) Noise Reports: shall be prepared in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Publication NPC-233, "Information to be Submitted for Approval of Stationary Sources of Sound", October, 1995 as amended. -Guide for the Preparation of an Abbreviated Acoustic Assessment Report (A – AAR). -Supporting Information for the Preparation of an Acoustic Assessment Report. <p>Vibration Impacts</p>		

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>(1) Vibration Limits: shall comply with the MOE vibration limits in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Publication “Impulse Vibration in Residential Buildings”, Draft November 1983, as amended. -Publication NPC-119, “Blasting”, Model Municipal Noise Control By-Law, Final Report, August 1978, as amended. <p>(2) Vibration Reports: shall be prepared in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Publication NPC-233, "Information to be Submitted for Approval of Stationary Sources of Sound", October, 1995 as amended. -Supporting Information for the Preparation of a Vibration Assessment Report. 		
South Nation Conservation – Watershed Planner	February 17, 2012	To date, no formal application regarding the proposed project has been made for the Authority’s input or review. While we are pleased to receive information on the proposed Project, we wish to confirm that we are not in a position to provide input or review on the proposed project at this time.	Acknowledged, no further action required.	F1.7
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport – Culture Services Unit	February 23, 2012	<p>The Ministry contact for this project is Ray Valaitis, Rural Planner in Brighton.</p> <p>I understand that Ray has already provided comments on the draft work plan.</p> <p>Please direct future correspondence to Ray’s attention at:</p> <p>95 Dundas Street Brighton, ON K0K 1H0 (613) 475-4764</p>	Acknowledged and removed from distribution list; correspondence directed to Ray Valaitis.	F1.8
Ontario Provincial Police	February 27, 2012	I do not have any comments to provide at this time but wish to be kept on your mailing list.	Acknowledged, no further action required.	F1.9

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources – Kemptville District	March 9, 2012	We apologize for the delay, the MNR is still reviewing the documents provided; we expect to be able to provide our comments in the coming weeks.	Taggart Miller continues to regularly check with MNR regarding comments.	F1.10
	March 2, 2012	<p>The Taggart Miller Group proposes to establish a “Resource Recovery Centre” known as the “Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre” (CRRRC) in the Township of Russell. As part of the CRRRC operation, Taggart Miller intends to operate a landfill.</p> <p>The proposed site is located in Lots 18 and 19, Concession III and Lot 19, Concession IV, Township of Russell. The primary land use in the general area is agricultural. The primary land use onsite is agricultural and industrial mineral extraction. There is a former quarry operation onsite.</p> <p>As part of the Terms of Reference, numerous work plans related to various disciplines were provided. From a hydrogeological viewpoint, the primary work plan document is “Geology and Hydrogeology Work Plan – Russell Site” (Attachment 2).</p> <p>Taggart Miller state that the geology and hydrogeology component will compare different methods of implementing the undertaking based on two assessment criteria: groundwater quality and groundwater flow. These are the two main components in a groundwater study. This is to be accomplished by a review of existing information (desk top exercise) and a subsurface investigation. The subsurface investigation is to be a combination of: test pits; auger holes; boreholes and monitoring wells. This information will be used to characterize the physical hydrogeological characteristics of the site and existing groundwater conditions. The proposed information review combined with a subsurface investigation is standard protocol to determine</p>	In view of the hydrogeological setting of the North Russell Road Site, an additional step of investigation is included should the North Russell Road Site be selected as the preferred Site location. This is described in the methodology provided in the TOR.	F1.11

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>the physical and chemical hydrogeological characteristics. Additional boreholes/monitoring wells may be required to infill data gaps.</p> <p>The proposed landfill operation is to be located in an area that is not municipally serviced.</p> <p>Therefore the residents rely on the groundwater resource for their domestic water supply including drinking water. The proposed landfill operation is to be engineered with a G2 liner.</p> <p>Ontario Regulation 232/98, “Landfilling Sites”, requires a hydrogeological assessment (Section 8) of a new landfill site. As part of this requirement, an assessment of the geologic and hydrogeologic conditions must be determined and an assessment of the suitability of the site for landfilling must be taken into account.</p> <p>The proposed landfill operation is to be in proximity to the existing on-site quarry. The soils in this area are thin and overlie fractured bedrock (shale). This type of hydrogeological setting is classified as environmentally sensitive and it is my experience that such a setting would be challenging to site a new “green field” landfill from a hydrogeological perspective. The reasons for this is that it is typically difficult to characterize and adequately monitor all potential contaminant pathways in the subsurface in fractured bedrock environments due to the complex fracture networks that can exist. Practicable contingency measures are also typically challenging to implement in a fractured bedrock environment.</p>		

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
<p>Ontario Ministry of the Environment - Environmental Approvals Branch</p>	<p>March 21, 2012</p>	<p>Appendix 1 – Proposed Assessment Criteria for Alternative Haul Routes & Site Access Location. Introduction – it appears that the proposed workplan would first evaluate the alternative haul routes and site access locations and then determine the components of the CRRRC, followed by an evaluation of the preferred methods of leachate treatment. It is unclear why the haul routes are being determined first as it would appear that the more critical evaluation for the EA would be to determine the components of the CRRRC facility and their relative location on the site.</p> <p>Indicators – what about schools and other sensitive land uses? Rather than considering just the quantity of properties that are adjacent to the haul routes, the types of land uses should also be considered.</p> <p>Indicators – what about impacts from a traffic operations perspective?</p> <p>Data Sources – should be adjusted to reflect the above (e.g. consult with Russell Township about existing and future land uses).</p> <p>Appendix 2 – Proposed Assessment Criteria to Compare Alternative Methods Atmospheric, Air Quality, Noise & Odour – specific consideration of existing and future sensitive land uses should be given. Russell Township should be consulted to determine existing and future sensitive land uses. Groundwater Quality – why are predicted effects to groundwater quality only considered on-site? What is the rationale for omitting the consideration of off-site impacts?</p>	<p>Appendix 1 – Proposed Assessment Criteria for Alternative Haul Routes & Site Access Location The haul route(s) and access location(s) are no longer being considered first, as described in the revised methodology in the TOR.</p> <p>The nature of the receptors along the haul route has been considered in the Traffic work plan.</p> <p>Consultation with the Township of Russell and the City of Ottawa has been included in the Traffic work plans in Appendix C.</p> <p>Appendix 2 – Proposed Assessment Criteria to Compare Alternative Methods: Taggart Miller have considered this under the Land Use & Socio-economic component, with the data source being the “Results of technical assessments for other EA components”. Consultation between the Atmosphere component and the Land Use & Socio-economic component has been documented.</p>	<p>F1.12</p>

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>Biology, Terrestrial Ecosystems – will additional weight be given to potential impacts on species that are protected under provincial and federal statutes? Consider two sets of indicators for impacts to vegetation and wildlife (e.g. impacts to vegetation and wildlife; impacts to protected species of vegetation and wildlife).</p> <p>Biology, Aquatic Ecosystems – same comment as above.</p> <p>Land Use, Indicators – expand list of sensitive uses to include schools, nursing homes, hospitals, etc... or alternatively, specify that the list is not exhaustive</p> <p>Cultural & Heritage Resources, Archaeological Resources – suggest adding Aboriginal communities and organizations as potential data sources.</p> <p>Socioeconomic, employment and economic – consider the negative employment impacts that could result at nearby sensitive commercial land uses.</p> <p>Work Plans - General How is task 1 to be carried out? The characterization of the existing environment should be carried out before any evaluation work is done.</p> <p>Specifically, Task 4 should occur earlier in the workplan (e.g. after the completion of Task 1). In addition, it is unclear what the rationale is for placing as much emphasis on the haul routes and site access locations. Haul routes and site access locations should be considered an alternative method (e.g. part of Task 3) that are evaluated after an inventory of the environment potentially effected has been taken and described. Consideration should also be given to carrying out the assessment of alternative haul routes and site access location after the overall concept of the site has been developed.</p>	<p>Groundwater quality effects are only predicted on-Site because if the design concept cannot be shown to meet the requirements of O.Reg. 2323/98 on-Site, then it is not approvable and will be dropped from consideration. In other words, if it meets O. Reg. 232/98, then the potential impacts off-Site are satisfied.</p> <p>Taggart Miller has not considered weighting since if there are protected species then a permit/mitigation measure needs to be worked out with the regulators. Taggart Miller has considered protected species but with equal weighting as indicated in the Biology work plan in Appendix C of the TOR.</p> <p>Sensitive land uses have been considered in the comparative sites evaluation criteria and indicators, Appendix A of the TOR.</p> <p>Aboriginal communities have been included as a data source in Appendix A of the TOR.</p> <p>The effects on employment, either negative or positive, will be considered as part of the Land</p>	

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>Haul routes and site access locations should be flexible enough to respond to the site specific considerations (e.g. location of quarry, any endangered species, preferred location of residual waste disposal and diversion components, etc...) that guide the development of the site concept, not the other way around. Sequentially, it may be preferable to consider site concept development; including alternative locations for the various waste diversion components and residual waste disposal cells, alternative methods of leachate treatment; alternative site access locations and alternative haul routes.</p> <p>Attachment 1 – Atmospheric Work Plan Section 4.6 – will Task 7 also be completed by the Groundwater Team?</p> <p>Attachment 4 – Geology and Hydrogeology Work Plan Section 4.2.1 – Existing Data Review – considering adding consultation with local community about the species that may be present on the site and adjacent lands.</p> <p>Attachment 5 – Land Use Work Plan Section 4.2 – recommend consulting with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to determine status of PPS review.</p> <p>Section 4.3, first bullet – the impact of nuisance effects on both existing and future land uses should be considered. Section 4.3 - Will shadow impacts on adjacent lands be considered?</p> <p>General – suggest that a planning rationale for the preferred undertaking be included in the Land Use Supporting document.</p> <p>Attachment 6 – Cultural and Heritage Resources Work Plan Section 4.1 – workplan includes the completion of a Stage 2 archaeological and cultural heritage assessment before a comparative evaluation of alternative methods is carried out.</p>	<p>Use & Socio-economic work plan found in Appendix C of the TOR.</p> <p>Work Plans – General Task 1 is no longer the same as was presented in the draft documentation. No further action is required. With the addition of the Alternative Site - the Boundary Road Site - the methodology has changed and the concerns identified regarding the Tasks are no longer present. The haul route(s) and access location(s) are no longer being considered before development of conceptual Site plans and assessment of the preferred Site impacts, as discussed in the revised methodology in the TOR.</p> <p>Attachment 1 – Atmospheric Work Plan. The D&O discipline team will evaluate the leachate treatment options with input from the Surface Water discipline team regarding the effluent discharge limits for discharge to surface water.</p>	

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
		<p>Section 4.1 states that, if necessary, a Stage 3 and 4 assessment may also be undertaken. Clarification should be added to state that the Stage 3 and 4 assessments will only be undertaken once it has been determined that the preferred alternative methods will impact the findings in the Stage 2 assessments (e.g. there is no need to relocate materials if the preferred undertaking identified in Task 6 does not impact the findings).</p> <p>Attachment 9 – Site Design and Operations Work Plan Section 4.1 – in greater detail, how will alternative locations for the footprints and diversion facilities be considered – as part of a comparative evaluations?</p> <p>Summary of CRRRC Diversion Facilities - Organics Processing Facility – if the proposal includes an electrical generation plant, will the electricity generated be used for on-site purposes only, or will a connection to the grid be sought?</p>	<p>Leachate generation and quality estimates will be developed by the Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical discipline team and this has been described in the Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical work plan in Appendix C of the TOR.</p> <p>Attachment 4 – Biology Work Plan Consultation with natural environment clubs about the species that may be present on the site and adjacent lands has been added to the Biology work plan in Appendix C of the TOR.</p> <p>Attachment 5 – Land Use & Socio-economic Work Plan (new name). Consultation with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing regarding the status of the Provincial Policy Statement has been added to the Land Use & Socio-economic work plan in Appendix C of the TOR. Future land uses has been considered separately from existing land uses in the Land Use & Socio-economic work plan in Appendix C of the TOR. Shadow impacts on adjacent lands will not be considered.</p>	

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
			<p>Based on the results of the work completed as described in the Land Use & Socio-economic work plan in Appendix C of the TOR, the requirements for approval under the Planning Act will be identified. The planning rationale will be developed as part of the Planning Act approvals process.</p> <p>Attachment 6 – Cultural and Heritage Resources Work Plan Clarification has been added in the Culture and Heritage Resources work plan, Appendix C of the TOR, to state that the Stage 3 and 4 assessments will only be undertaken once it has been determined that the preferred Site development concept will impact the findings in the Stage 2 assessment.</p> <p>Attachment 8 – Site Design and Operations Work Plan (was changed from attachment 9) The locations for the landfill footprint and diversion facilities will not be considered as part of a comparative evaluation.</p>	

GRT Member	Date	GRT Response	Taggart Miller Action	Appendix
			<p>As described in the D&O work plan, Appendix C of the TOR, the discipline team will apply the various site constraints to identify areas available for facility development, and using the component diversion and disposal capacity requirements prepare area requirements for the components. These will then be arranged on the property to result in the conceptual Site development plans.</p> <p>The Organics Processing Facility will include an electrical generation plant, however it has not been decided if the electricity generated will be used for on-site purposes only, or connection to the grid. This has been described in the TOR.</p>	

4.10.4 Open House #2

Session #1

A total of 15 general comment sheets were completed at Open House #1, Session 1, along with 1 opponent comment sheet. The headings of the constructive comments which were received are listed below, from most common to least common. A description of the concerns identified, if not already done so above, is provided with this list. The term “common issue” has been used when 10 or more responses were received, “less common” when 5 to 9 responses were received, and “occasional” when less than 5 responses were received.

- **Location** – A less common issue.
- **Land Use & Socio-economic** – A less common issue.
- **Traffic** – An occasional issue.
- **The Question of the Need for this Project** – An occasional issue.
- **Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical** – An occasional issue.
- **Atmospheric** – An occasional issue.
- **Property values** – An occasional issue.

20 environmental component ranking comment sheets were received at Open House #2, Session 1 on June 20, 2012. A summary of these comments sheets is provided in Appendix H4. The results of the environmental component ranking are provided in Table 5 below.

**Table 5: Results of Open House #2, Session 1
 Alternative Site Evaluation Component Ranking of Importance**

#	Component	Very Important	Important	Less Important
1)	Atmospheric Environment	19	0	0
2)	Geology & Hydrogeology	17	1	0
3)	Surface Water Resources	17	1	0
4)	Biology (terrestrial and aquatic)	16	2	0
5)	Land Use & Socio-economic	14	1	3
6)	Cultural & Archaeology Heritage Resources	10	4	4
7)	Agriculture	10	5	0
8)	Site Design & Operation	12	1	2
9)	Traffic	13	1	1

Below the environmental component ranking portion of the sheets, Taggart Miller asked if there were any more environment components or considerations. The headings of the constructive comments which were received at Open House #2, Session 1 are listed below, from most common to least common. The term “occasional” has been used because in all instances less than 5 responses were received.

- **Biology** – An occasional issue.
- **Location** – An occasional issue.
- **Property values** – An occasional issue.
- **Traffic** – An occasional issue.
- **Road Maintenance** – An occasional issue.
- **Land Use & Socio-economic** – An occasional issue.
- **The Question of the Need for this Project** – An occasional issue.
- **Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical** – An occasional issue.
- **Atmospheric** – An occasional issue.

Session #2

A total of 90 general comment sheets were completed at the Open House #2, Session 2. Eight additional comment sheets were received via email and regular mail following the event for a total of 98.

The headings of the constructive comments which were received are listed below, from most common to least common. A description of the concerns identified, if not already done so above, is provided with this list. The term “common issue” has been used when 10 or more responses were received, “less common” when 5 to 9 responses were received, and “occasional” when less than 5 responses were received.

- **Location** – A common issue.
- **Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical** – A common issue.
- **The Question of the Need for this Project** – A less common issue.
- **Atmospheric** – A less common issue.
- **Property values** – A less common issue.
- **Land Use & Socio-economic** – A less common issue.
- **Communication/Consultation** – An occasional issue.
- **Traffic** – An occasional issue.
- **Agriculture** – An occasional issue.
- **Biology** – An occasional issue.
- **Surface Water** – An occasional issue.
- **Design and Operations** – An occasional issue.
- **Vermin** – An occasional issue.

Ninety-six component evaluation sheets were received at Open House #2, Session 2. Six additional component evaluation sheets were received via email and regular mail following the event. A summary of these comment sheets is provided in Appendix H4. The results of the environmental component ranking are provided in Table 6 below:

**Table 6: Results of Open House #2,
 Session 2 Alternative Site Evaluation Component Ranking of Importance**

#	Component	Very Important	Important	Less Important
1)	Atmospheric Environment	18	0	0
2)	Geology & Hydrogeology	19	0	0
3)	Surface Water Resources	16	2	0
4)	Biology (terrestrial and aquatic)	13	1	1
5)	Land Use & Socio-economic	16	0	1
6)	Cultural & Archaeology Heritage Resources	13	3	1
7)	Agriculture	14	3	0
8)	Site Design & Operation	12	3	2
9)	Traffic	14	2	2

Below the environmental component ranking portion of the sheets, Taggart Miller asked if there were any more environment components or considerations. The headings of the constructive comments which were received at Open House #2, Session 2 are listed below, from most common to least common. The term “common issue” has been used when 7 or more responses were received, “less common” when 4 to 6 responses were received, and “occasional” when less than 4 responses were received.

- **Location** – A common issue.
- **Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical** – A common issue.
- **Agriculture** – A less common issue.
- **Atmospheric** – A less common issue.
- **Land Use & Socio-economic** – A less common issue.
- **Biology** – An occasional issue.
- **Property values** – An occasional issue.
- **Traffic** – An occasional issue.
- **Surface Water** – An occasional issue.
- **Communication/Consultation** – An occasional issue.
- **Vermin** – An occasional issue.

4.10.5 MOE Review of Draft Terms of Reference

The comments received from the MOE are provided in the table below:

Table 7: MOE Comments on Draft Terms of Reference

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch, Noise	August 21, 2012	<p>This is in response to your e-mail correspondence dated July 31, 2012. We have reviewed the Draft Terms of Reference documents dated August 2012, regarding the proposed Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre in the Capital Region, Ontario.</p> <p>The following are our noise and vibration review comments: <i>Volume 1.- Proposed Terms of Reference</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Missing Consultant Information: The document only indicates the names of the proponent companies, but does not indicate the name(s) of consultant(s)/consulting companies retained to prepare the document. 2. Baseline Noise Levels: Section 7.2 states that the baseline noise is the result of the combination of the adjacent Highway 417 and Boundary Road traffic, the activities of the industrial park immediately to the west, and agricultural operations located in the area of the site. It is to be noted that background noise is essentially made up of the road traffic noise, but it may also include contributions from existing industries or commercial activities adjacent to the site, provided that they are not under consideration for noise abatement by the Municipality or the MOE. 3. Noise Guidelines: Section 4.7.2 of Appendices C-1.1 and C-2.1, and Section 8.4.1 state that the "MOE Noise Guideline for Landfills, October 1998" will be used for noise analysis of the landfill operations of the site. 	<p><i>Volume 1</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In our experience, the name of the consulting company is not included in the TOR. 2. Comment acknowledged. 3. Comment acknowledged; the appropriate Noise Guidelines will be utilized in the EA and EPA assessments. <p><i>Volume 2</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As per response above. 2. As per response above. 	K1.1

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>However, the aforementioned guideline is only applicable for landfill sites that contain only "construction equipment" and "conveyances" as defined in the document. In the case that there are other stationary sources operating at the site, which are indicated in Section 4.3.2 of Appendices C-1 .I and C-2.1, MOE Publications NPC-205 and/or NPC-232 must be used.</p> <p><i>Volume II: Appendix F</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Missing Consultant Information: The document only indicates the names of the proponent companies, but does not indicate the name(s) of consultant(s)/consulting companies retained to prepare the documents. 2. Noise Guidelines: Section 4.8.2 of Appendix F1.1 and section 4.1 of Appendix F1.11 a state that the "MOE Noise Guideline for Landfills, October 1998" will be used for noise analysis of the landfill operations of the site. However, the aforementioned guideline is only applicable for landfill sites that contain only "construction equipment" and "conveyances" as defined in the document. In the case that there are other stationary sources operating at the site, which are indicated in Section 4.4.2 of Appendix F 1.1, MOE Publications NPC-205 and/or NPC-232 must be used. 		
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Surface Water Scientist, Water Resources Group, Eastern Region	August 20, 2012	The Boundary Road Site is 175 ha situated in an area that is comprised mostly of undeveloped land and three parcels with residences owned by the proponent. The site is a mosaic of immature hardwood forest, deciduous thickets with some wet area that have clay soils and poor drainage. The existing surrounding land is agricultural and some commercial use to the west.	Comments acknowledged and will be considered.	K1.2

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>A few drainage ditches run east-west across the site and ultimately drain northeasterly into Shaw's Creek. Shaw's Creek starts at the end of the Simpson Memorial Drain which crosses the site and flows 7 km north to Bear Brook Creek which flows to the South Nation River.</p> <p>The Ministry considers the entire South Nation Watershed as a Policy 2 receiver. This means that water quality in the area cannot be degraded further and all practical measures shall be taken to upgrade water quality in the area. When all reasonable and practical measures to attain Provincial Water Quality Objectives (PWQO) have been undertaken but if Policy 2 still cannot be met, a deviation of the policy can be approved by the Regional Director. The City of Ottawa has published a report (Characterization of Ottawa's Watersheds, 2011 March) detailing water quality and biology issues in its watersheds. Bear Brook watershed is considered one of the worst water sheds for water quality.</p> <p>As indicated, a study of water quality and flows will be conducted however it is likely that the result will be that these ditches and drains flow intermittently and therefore would be considered dry ditches. Any discharge to a dry ditch must meet PWQO. If flows are not intermittent then and discharge criteria will be other than PWQO then an effluent assimilation modeling exercise may be required to ensure no downstream water quality impacts.</p> <p>The proponent is correct in stating that a stormwater management system will require an OWRA approval as would a leachate treatment system that discharges off-site. While the biology work plan will be primarily reviewed by</p>		

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>other agencies there is a link between surface water quality and quantity and aquatic ecosystems that may be present in the receiver areas that must be considered by this Ministry.</p> <p>When the proponent is conducting water quality surveys in the existing water bodies the parameter list should include those parameters that are expected to be present in the waste stream being accepted at the proposed CRRRC. The parameter list should be supported by documentation that identifies what parameters can be associated with different types of waste.</p> <p>Water quality surveys should include monitoring stations upstream and downstream of discharge locations as well as the discharge outlet.</p> <p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The surface water work plan proposed by the proponent for conducting an EA if conducted properly should meet the requirements that would allow a proper assessment for surface water concerns around this project. 		
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Environmental Approvals Branch, Approval Services Section	August 24, 2012	<p>Based on the document submitted, I have reviewed the submitted report to provide comments from an Environmental Compliance Approval- waste component. The following comments are provided:</p> <p>The information provided is considered in the initial stages of the Environmental Assessment process. Sections 7 through 8 of the main document provide an overview of the process and evaluation criteria to be considered in the process. From a waste perspective, the information provided in these sections are preliminary technical and operational information and do not provide sufficient information for the approvals</p>	<p>Comments 1, 2 and 3 acknowledged.</p> <p>Comments on the draft documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The TOR has been modified to use the term ECA. 2. Understood. The wording in the TOR has been modified to clarify that the EPA/OWRA 	K1.3

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>process. However, the list does identify areas of concerns that are of typical interest during an EAB review process. For the information that was provided in the Terms of Reference that can be used in a Environmental Protection Act review, the following comments are provided to assist the TM in the Environmental Assessment and future Section 27 approval process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TM will need to conduct the studies for technical and operational equally to each site to ensure the preferred site from an environmental impact assessment perspective can be determined. 2. In general, when considering a new landfill or expanding an existing landfill, the City should consult the document entitled "<i>Landfill Standards: A Guideline to the Regulatory and Approval Requirements for New and Expanding Landfills (MOE June 2010)</i>", specifically Section 6, to identify the assessments that are required to be addressed in the supporting documentation should the ToR be approved. These include the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Hydrogeological Assessment; ii. Leachate Assessment; iii. Landfill Gas Assessment; iv. Landfill Capacity Assessment; v. Geotechnical Assessment; vi. Noise Assessment; vii. Contaminated Life Expectancy; and, viii. Contingency Plans 3. TM will have to ensure all operational impacts from the processing facility are considered in the EA. 	<p>application will not be made until after EA approval is received.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. As described in the TOR, Taggart Miller will provide more than one site development concept for the preferred site. The contaminating lifespan will be determined only for the preferred site development concept. 4. Comment acknowledged. 	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>The following are general comments from the document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The document refers to Certificate of Approvals (CofAs). TM should be made aware that the Environmental Protection Act has been amended and approvals are now Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECAs). The document should be updated to reflect the change. 2. TM indicated that an EA/EPA/OWRA submission will be submitted at the same time (Section 8 and Table 8-1). TM has previously been made aware that the EA is a precursor for the EPA application. As part of the EPA application, one of the supporting documentations is the EA approval. In the event the EPA application is submitted in conjunction with the EA submission, the EPA application will be closed immediately for being incomplete. It is recommended that TM not submit the EPA application with the EA submission. 3. For the preferred site, should TM propose more than one landfill footprint configuration, TM will need to provide the preliminary contaminating lifespan calculations and related impacts for each footprint as a comparison for environmental impacts. 4. Section 8.3.5 indicates that leachate will probably be treated and discharged to a natural water body. TM will have to provide the technology and data to support that this can be accomplished. TM will have to apply for an ECA pertaining to sewage to determine whether this may be possible. 		

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>Summary The information provided in the document at this time is considered preliminary for the waste component of the Environmental Protection Act approval. Additional information <i>and/or</i> scope of any investigation for the proposed alternative(s) will need to be provided during the later EA stages.</p>		
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Air Quality Analyst, Technical Support Section, Eastern Region	August 22, 2012	<p>I have examined the draft atmospheric work plan documents attached to IDS submission 3672-8PSJPV. The Taggart Group of Companies and the Miller Group have submitted a draft Terms of Reference (TOR) document describing the workplan for the atmospheric components of their proposal.</p> <p>The document is essentially an expansion of documents previously submitted due to the addition of another nearby possible site. The essential character of the project is unchanged. My earlier comments to you in this regard are attached for completeness.</p> <p>The proponent’s consultant made a presentation here at the Kingston Regional Office last month, to finalize the pre-submission consultations. I was advised at that time that it is their intention to submit an EA package with detail commensurate with a Section 9 EPA approvals submission. It is my understanding that approvals engineers have made some comment on these matters. The submission should demonstrate that proper conditions of approval can be developed, if required. The submission should guide any additional mitigation.</p> <p>I am satisfied with the contents of the submission. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Review acknowledged.	K1.4

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Ottawa District	August 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I have no objections to the proposal and have not heard personally from any concerned citizens. ▪ I'm not familiar with the Organics Process proposed (see p.22) however it seems to be engineered to enhance stabilization and convert odorous compounds to a stable, non odorous form. ▪ Note that I was recently assigned to this file and as such, did not attend any of the consultation meetings and can't provide any further insight. ▪ For the Boundary Road Site, the proponent has engaged Carlsbad Springs Community Association and Vars Community Association. 	Review acknowledged.	K1.5
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Cornwall District	August 2012	<p>Potential Areas of Complaints Re: Adverse Effects from Operations:</p> <p>My own experience with landfill sites and composting facilities has demonstrated that a facility of the magnitude of 1,000 to 1,500 tonnes per day will generate odours which can impact large areas and result in complaints from the public. The North Russell Road site may not be large enough to provide the necessary buffer areas to mitigate odours. The organics processing facility will be equipped with a biofilter and will operate indoors under negative pressure. However the curing portion of the process will take place outside and could be a source of odours. The landfill area will be a source of odours from gas and waste filling. An aggressive gas collection and flaring system will reduce landfill gas odour levels but gas wells are only practical when a particular cell will no longer receive waste. Other sources of potential odour would include leachate treatment facilities, especially aeration and storage ponds, and C & D waste processing operations.</p>	Comments acknowledged. Potential areas of complaints, minimizing of potential effects during and after construction, and development of environmental monitoring programs will be addressed as described in the TOR.	K1.5

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>Noise and dust are also potential sources of complaints especially where there are residential properties in proximity. Truck traffic both on and off the site will cause noise and dust emissions. Equipment operation on site such as shredders, grinders, bulldozers and compactors are potential sources of noise. Landfilling and C & D waste processing operations will create dust emissions. Blowing litter from the landfilling operation requires careful management especially when waste is being placed on higher lifts.</p> <p>Minimizing Impacts During and Beyond Construction: One of the proponent’s challenges will be to mitigate effects such as odour, noise and dust through careful site development in order to minimize impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood. A comprehensive environmental monitoring program will also be required which would include odour, dust, noise, groundwater, surface water, leachate and methane gas assessment.</p>		
Ontario Ministry of the Environment – Hydrogeologist, Technical Support Section, Eastern Region	August 31, 2012	<p>As part of the Terms of Reference, numerous work plans related to various disciplines were provided. From a hydrogeological viewpoint, the primary work plan document is “Geology, Hydrogeology and Geotechnical”. The initial approach is to review existing information (desktop exercise) and collect information (water quality and quantity) from existing water wells in each area. This information will be used to determine which site is preferred for the protection of the groundwater resource. Additional hydrogeological work will be conducted on the preferred site whereas no additional hydrogeological work will be undertaken on the other site. The additional hydrogeological work is to consist of the following tasks:</p>	Review acknowledged.	K1.6

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Complete assessment of existing environment – desktop review, existing water well information and supplemented with a subsurface investigation consisting of a drilling program to characterize the groundwater quality, groundwater quantity and physical hydrogeological characteristics. - Develop site conceptual model. - Assess environmental effects related to the site development conceptual model. - Evaluate leachate management options and identify preferred option. - Evaluate cumulative impact assessment. <p>These tasks should provide the necessary information pertinent to geology and hydrogeology to determine the groundwater quality and groundwater flow in the study area.</p> <p>The proposed landfill operation is to be in proximity to the existing on-site quarry. The soils in this area are thin and overlie fractured bedrock (shale).</p> <p>This type of hydrogeological setting is classified as environmentally sensitive and it is my experience that such a setting would be challenging to site a new green field” landfill from a hydrogeological perspective. The reasons for this is that it is typically difficult to characterize and adequately monitor all potential contaminant pathways in the subsurface in fractured bedrock environments due to the complex fracture networks that can exist. Practicable contingency measures are also typically challenging to implement in a fractured bedrock environment.</p>		

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
Acronyms, Units and Glossary of Terms				
Ontario Ministry of the Environment - Environmental Approvals Branch, Project Coordination Unit	August 28, 2012	CofA – Certificates of Approval have been replaced with ECAs – Environmental Compliance Approvals	Acknowledged. A definition for Environmental Compliance Approvals has been provided.	K1.7
		Certificate of Approval (Waste) – see comment No. 1	Acknowledged. The definition of Certificate of Approval is still included as some existing waste management facilities have Certificates of Approvals and not ECAs.	
		Suggest specifying that the definition of proponent is 'as defined' by the Environmental Assessment Act (EAA).	Acknowledged; change made.	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
Section 1.0 - Introduction				
		<p>This paragraph indicates that Miller Waste Systems has recently secured collection contracts for a significant portion of Ottawa’s residential waste. Does this include disposal? Would this waste be sent to the proposed CRRRC for disposal? Is this consistent with paragraph 3, which indicates that the proposed CRRRC will be to serve the industrial, commercial and institutional (IC&I) and construction and demolition (C&D) sectors?</p>	<p>A sentence has been added to Volume 1 to clarify that Ottawa’s residential waste goes to the Trail Road waste facility, and will not go to the proposed CRRRC. The Miller Waste Systems contract specified is for the collection of residential waste only.</p>	
Section 2.0 – The EA Process				
		<p>Suggest replacing this last sentence with a short paragraph that discusses what requirements are triggered by the diversion facilities and that notwithstanding, TMES has elected to make the entire proposal subject to the EAA.</p>	<p>A sentence has been added to make this point more clearly.</p>	
		<p>The EA under the EAA is a planning study that considers, among other things, the advantages and disadvantages of an undertaking. Suggest that the wording used be clarified.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Wording has been clarified.</p>	
		<p>This section should provide greater detail about the focussed approach that the EA will be prepared under and what the proposed contents of the EA are? Under section 6.1(3) of the EAA, the ToR may provide that the EA consist of information other than that required by subsection (2). The information</p>	<p>This section has been re-arranged, some information</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		proposed to be included in the EA should be specified in this section of the proposed ToR.	added to better explain the approach of the EA.	
		Typo – no spacing between supporting document no. 1 and alternative 3.	Acknowledged and fixed.	
		The ministry will not accept a combined EAA/EPA submission. While the EA can be prepared to an EPA level of information, the actual application for approval under the EPA cannot be made until a decision about the EA is made.	Acknowledged. Wording of this paragraph has been revised to address this.	
		Suggest specifying that TMES would also document the changes and the rationale for the changes made to the ToR.	A sentence has been added to indicate Taggart Miller will document changes made to the ToR.	
Section 4.0 – Rationale For and Description of the Undertaking				
		What is the source of the City of Ottawa’s recognition (e.g. staff, Committee, Council) that there is a deficiency in the affordable IC&I and C&D diversion facilities?	A reference has been added.	
		What is the source of this information? References should be provided.	All references and the more detailed assessment are provided in Volume 3. A sentence has been added to indicate that references are	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
			available in Volume 3.	
		Suggest that a short paragraph be included that outlines what the estimated waste generation rates during the planning horizon are.	The estimated waste generation rates have been provided.	
		Suggest providing an explanation about what impact increased diversion rates would have on the opportunity be provided.	A sentence explaining what impact the increased diversion rates would have has been added.	
		This paragraph should be reviewed for clarity. Some of the information may be better presented as a footnote (e.g. reference to the impact of Lafleche).	The paragraph has been modified for clarification.	
		Suggest incorporating Figures 3.2-1 and 3.2-1 from Supporting Document No. 1 into this section of the proposed ToR.	Figures have been added to Volume 1.	
		Waste is also exported from the City of Ottawa. Why isn't this mentioned?	Waste export from the City of Ottawa is mentioned in Sentence 2 and some additional clarifying information provided.	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
Section 5.0 – Assessment of Alternatives to the Undertaking				
		Suggest providing an example of a guaranteed waste stream (e.g. a long-term municipal collection and disposal contract).	An example has been added in the advantages and disadvantages discussion of Alternative 5.	
		<p>Consideration of environmental criteria should also be given in the screening of alternatives to the undertaking. The use of proven technology as a criteria for screen the preferred alternative to the undertaking should also be considered.</p> <p>Paragraph 3 states that “it should be possible to achieve 30 – 40 % diversion of IC&I and C&D waste stream.” What factors will impact the ability to achieve the diversion rates indicated?</p> <p>It is unclear how the EA impact studies would consider a range in landfill capacity. The EA impact studies should consider the worst-case scenario</p>	<p>Environmental criteria and proven technology criteria were considered by Taggart Miller; however they would be satisfied by all Alternatives and would not differentiate between the Alternatives. This explanation has been added in the text in Section 5.0</p> <p>Factors have been added to the TOR.</p> <p>Additional sentence</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		(e.g. the capacity for which approval is being sought).	provided to explain what landfill capacity will be evaluated in the EA impact studies.	
Section 6.0 – Conceptual Description of Proposed CRRRC Diversion Facilities				
		The proposed IC&C and C&D diversion components at the CRRRC site will be developed as part of the initial site development, together with the first cell(s) of the disposal component and other infrastructure required to operate the new integrated waste management facility. Does this include the landfill gas to energy facility.	Additional clarification has been provided under the 3 rd bullet in the Organics Processing Facility heading.	
		Typo	Acknowledged and fixed.	
		How will TMES work with potential customers to increase source separation of materials that are targeted for diversion?	Sentence added indicating how Taggart Miller will work with potential customers.	
		What would the treated soils be used on-site for?	Sentence added explaining how treated soils will be used on-site.	
		What is the expected size of the landfill gas to energy facility? Is a connection to the grid feasible? Are there any EA requirements associated with a connection?	This information is a level of detail that will be determined	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
			during the EA, and as such is not described in the TOR.	
Section 7.0 – Existing Environmental Conditions				
		More information about the surface water in the quarry should be made, including what agencies will need to be consulted in terms of any alterations to the quarry proposed.	Information describing the surface water in the quarry has been added. Information regarding approvals required for the alternation of the existing quarry license is not considered appropriate under this Existing Conditions section of the TOR, but is referred to under Section 11.0.	
		Ministry of Culture is now the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sports.	Acknowledged and change made.	
		Same comment as above	Acknowledged and change made.	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
8.0 – Environmental Assessment Methodology				
		Suggest rephrasing the reference to a combined EA/EPA submission to indicate that the level of analysis carried out during the EA will be done to meet requirements under both the EA and EPA and that an application for approval under the EPA will not be made until such time as a decision on the EA has been made.	Acknowledged, the paragraph has been re-written to make it clear that EPA and OWRA applications will not be made until a decision on the EA has been made.	
		See comments regarding proposed consultation.	No action required.	
		It is strongly recommended that a draft EA be prepared and made available for the review of government agencies, the public and Aboriginal communities. Figure 8-1 should be amended accordingly.	Acknowledged, a draft EA will be prepared and made available for comment. Figure 8-1 has been amended.	
		For the step involving 'prepare and submit EA report and EPA/OWRA documents to the MOE,' submission of the EPA/OWRA documents should be omitted from this task. Rather, the task should involve the preparation and submission of the EA report.	Figure 8-1 has been amended.	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>Suggest adding a more explicit explanation about what steps would be taken to proceed with an assessment of the Boundary Road site if the assessment carried out on the North Russell site (note: only to be carried out if it is determined that it is the preferred site) shows that the requirements of O.Reg. 232/98 cannot be met for groundwater protection, monitoring and contingency planning. Would the site selection evaluation be carried out a second time to account for the results of the groundwater assessment of the North Russell site? Consider adding a flow chart to clarify.</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Explanation has been added.</p>	
		<p>Is a specific study area proposed for the cumulative effects assessment? The study area for a CEA is typically larger than the study areas for the EA.</p>	<p>A description of the study area for the CEA is provided in Section 8.3.6.</p>	
		<p>Will government agencies and Aboriginal communities be consulted about the alternative site development concepts.</p>	<p>A sentence has been added to describe that Taggart Miller will consult with the public, Aboriginal communities and the MOE.</p>	
		<p>Identifying alternative methods of leachate treatment for the preferred site should be the first step in Task 5. This should include on-site and off-site treatment. And subsets of each alternative (e.g. on-site evaporators, disposal into sanitary sewage system, trucking) should be generated. Contingency and emergency methods should be considered as well. For the purposes of describing the undertaking, a single method of leachate treatment should be identified as the preferred method. Any future changes to the preferred method of treating leachate could be enabled through the use of amending procedures.</p>	<p>Alternative leachate treatment technologies will be identified both on-site and off-site as described in the first 3 bullets. Wording has been added to</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
			<p>include contingency and emergency measures, to confirm that a single preferred leachate management alternative will be identified, as well as to identify that a future amending procedure will be developed, if necessary, to allow for changes to the identified preferred leachate treatment process.</p>	
		<p>Suggest that existing and future land uses be considered in the CEA as opposed to ‘identified certain and probable projects.’</p>	<p>Existing and certain and probable future projects and activities will be considered in the cumulative impact assessment</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
9.0 – Consultation				
		<p>The results of Open House No. 1 should be described in the section. Questionnaires and comment sheets were distributed at this event. In general, what types of comments were received?</p>	<p>Section 9.0 has been re-arranged such that 9.1 is Summary of Consultation Activities During Development of the TOR, 9.2 is Summary of Stakeholder Feedback During Development of the TOR, and 9.3 is Proposed Consultation Program for EA. Open House #1 is described in Section 9.1 and its results are provided in Section 9.2.</p>	
		<p>Same comment as above for the groundwater workshops. A description of the results of the event should be provided.</p>	<p>Section 9.0 has been re-arranged such that 9.1 is Summary of Consultation Activities During Development of</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
			<p>the TOR, 9.2 is Summary of Stakeholder Feedback During Development of the TOR, and 9.3 is Proposed Consultation Program for EA. The groundwater workshops are described in Section 9.1 and their results are provided in Section 9.2.</p>	
		<p>Meetings with MOE technical reviewers should be noted, perhaps in a separate subsection (e.g. Consultation with Government Agencies); including, the purpose and results of those meetings.</p>	<p>This has been added.</p>	
		<p>The results of Open House No. 2 should be described. What types of comments were generally received?</p>	<p>Section 9.1 now presents the summary of consultation activities and Section 9.2 now presents the results of consultation activities.</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>Open House No. 5 includes a significant volume of material to cover. Suggest addressing some of this material in a 6th open house.</p>	<p>An additional Open House has not been added. We believe the contemplated open houses and other consultation activities are sufficient.</p>	
		<p>A commitment to make a draft EA available to the public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities for review and comment should be made. While not a requirement of the EAA, it is strongly recommended that a draft report be prepared, presented to the public (e.g. Open House No. 6) and that interested persons be provided the opportunity to review and comment before a final EA is submitted to the ministry for review and decision.</p>	<p>The draft EA will be made available to the public, government agencies and Aboriginal communities for review.</p>	
		<p>This section describes how Aboriginal communities will be engaged during the preparation of the EA. Suggest adding another subsection that specifically addresses how Aboriginal communities were engaged during the preparation of the ToR.</p>	<p>Section 9.3 is no longer Aboriginal Engagement. Subsections regarding Aboriginal community engagement have been added to Sections 9.1 and 9.2.</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		Suggest that the summary of stakeholder feedback be incorporated into subsections of 9.1 so that the results of the consultation event are presented with the description of the event itself.	Section 9.1 summarizes the consultation events during the development of the TOR and Section 9.2 now summarizes the stakeholder feedback received during the development of the TOR.	
Section 10.0 – Environmental Assessment Schedule				
		Revise as per earlier comments re: combined EA/EPA submission.	Acknowledged and revised.	
		Revise as per above comment.	Acknowledged and revised.	
		Phrasing presupposes approval, reword appropriately.	Acknowledged and reworded.	
Section 11.0 – Other Approvals				
		Revise as per earlier comments re: combined EA/EPA submission.	Acknowledged and revised.	
		This section should identify that other approvals requirements will be presented in greater detail in the EA, including information pertaining to additional approval requirements if so determined during the EA.	Additional information added as requested.	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
Section 12.0 – Commitments and Monitoring Strategy				
		<p>Suggest that a list of commitments through the use of subheadings be included in this section. Specifically, the following commitments about the following should be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -that a PVP plan will be prepared as during the EA process; -the timing in which the diversion facilities and the LFG to energy facility will be implemented; -that a cumulative effects assessment will be carried out; <p>That a draft EA will be made available for public review and comment before the final EA is submitted.</p>	<p>Acknowledged and completed.</p>	
Appendix B-2 – Proposed Assessment Criteria for Evaluation of Leachate Management Options				
		<p>Environmental criteria (e.g. air quality, groundwater, surface water, etc...) should be included as assessment criteria.</p>	<p>This was considered, however any leachate management option (on-Site or off-Site) would need to meet applicable environmental requirements and hence environmental criteria have not been included as an assessment consideration.</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
Appendix C				
		<p>Given the proximity of the two potential sites, provide rationale for carrying out different works under Appendix C-1.2 and C-2.2.</p>	<p>Although the two sites are in relatively close proximity, they are in different geological and hydrogeological settings as described in Sections 7.1 and 7.2 of the TOR. Although the overall EA methodology is the same at both sites, the proposed investigation programs are different to address the site-specific setting.</p>	
		<p>As per earlier comments, ensure text in C-1 and C-2 about a combined EA/EPA submission is revised.</p>	<p>Revisions made in all work plans in Appendices C-1 and C-2 as requested</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>The Ministry of the Environment’s Guideline D-4 – Land Use On or Near Landfills and Dumps should be referenced as a background source of information. See: http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/stdprodconsume/groups/lr/@ene/@resources/documents/resource/std01_079308.pdf</p>	<p>Reference added to Appendix C-1.5</p>	
		<p>Same comment as above</p>	<p>Reference added to Appendix C-2.5</p>	
Supporting Document #1				
		<p>It is unclear what sustainable benefits means.</p>	<p>In this sentence, reference to sustainable benefits refers to benefits that will be achieved and will continue to be realized over the long term.</p>	
		<p>The statement that “...Taggart Miller is prepared to commit to significant investments in diversion facilities <u>in anticipation of such [government] regulatory changes...</u>” seems inconsistent with other statements in SD#1 such as Page 9, para. 4 which indicates “It is impossible to predict with certainty at this point what measures the City or Province may adopt to promote diversion, the timing of same, or the effect these measures might have on the market.”</p>	<p>Both statements refer to regulatory changes that will drive increased IC&I and C&D diversion. In the first sentence referred to, Taggart Miller anticipates the changes will occur; the</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
			<p>second sentence is intended to demonstrate that the timing and details of these regulatory changes are uncertain. Despite the uncertainties, Taggart Miller is willing to invest in IC&I and C&D diversion facilities at the proposed CRRRC.</p>	
		<p>What is the source of “renewable energy” referred to here?</p>	<p>The source of renewable energy refers to the energy expected to be produced from the proposed CRRRC operations, as described in Section 6.0 of the TOR.</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>What was the basis for determining a minimum 400 acre property was needed? How does this size relate to the type and size of facility being proposed (processing/diversion and landfill), for example as identified on Page 24, para 5?</p>	<p>The basis is from experience on other larger waste management facility projects of similar scale as that proposed at the CRRRC.</p>	
		<p>What was “attractive” about the prior use of the site in Russell Township being a quarry?</p>	<p>The attractiveness was because the site historically had an industrial type use for many years, with the associated site-related traffic including trucks, and it was a relatively large piece of land under single ownership.</p>	
		<p>Should the title of Table 4.2-1 be “<u>Feasibility</u> Screening of Alternatives”, to be consistent with the Table of Contents?</p>	<p>Title of Table 4.2-1 changed.</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
		<p>This section indicates that Alternative 3 is the only reasonable option for Taggart Miller to pursue. Although not mentioned here, presumably the next steps in assessing Alternative 3 include a more detailed and systematic comparison of the alternative sites in the EA itself, using a broad range of criteria reflective of what would be a good site location.</p>	<p>Yes, as described in Section 8.1 of the proposed TOR, the initial step in the EA is the comparative evaluation of the Alternative Sites using the broad range of criteria in Appendix A of the TOR, and identification of the preferred site.</p>	
		<p>The report indicates that “Taggart Miller will <u>assume</u> for purposes of the EA” the facility will accept about 1000 to 1500 tonnes per day of waste, equivalent to about 300,000 to 450,000 tonnes per year of waste. At least for clarity, additional discussion about this assumption, or instead perhaps expectation, should be given, for example the ‘market share’ this represents.</p>	<p>In terms of the opportunity identified in Taggart Miller’s assessment, after about 2025 where the quantity of IC&I and C&D waste from the proposed service area to be managed is estimated to be around 1,000,000</p>	

Group	Date	Comment	Taggart Miller Response / Action	Appendix
			tonnes per year or more, it is proposed that the CRRRC facility will accept about one-third of the estimated quantity.	

4.11 Summary of Comments Received Outside Consultation Events

Comments and questions were received from interested persons by Taggart Miller outside of consultation events through a variety of means, including by mail and e-mail correspondence. Summary tables related to these comments are provided in Appendix I. Within these summary tables the issue/concerns raised is summarized as well as Taggart Miller's action is provided. The tables also contain cross reference information such that the original comment provided by the interested person and any original response from Taggart Miller can be observed within sub-sections of Appendix I and Appendix J, respectively.

The following is a general summary of the most commonly received issues provided in the order of most common to least common. A description of the issue identified, if not already done so above, is provided with this list. The term common issue has been used when 10 or more responses were received, less common 5 to 10 responses were received and occasional is less than 5.

- **Geology, Hydrogeology & Geotechnical** – A common issue.
- **Traffic** – A common issue.
- **Location** – A common issue; community members identified that the North Russell Road Site was unsuitable and many suggested that another more suitable Site should be found.
- **Atmosphere** – A common issue.
- **Communication/Consultation** – A common issue.
- **Property Value Protection** – A common issue.
- **Land Use & Socio-economic** – A common issue.
- **Design and Operation** – A common issue.
- **The question of the need for this project** – A common issue.
- **Biology** – A common issue.
- **Agriculture** – A less common issue.
- **Surface Water** – A less common issue.
- **Human Health** – A less common issue.
- **Landfill Fires** – An occasional issue.
- **Shale Resource** – An issue occasionally raised during the development of the TOR related to the protection of the shale aggregate resource at the North Russell Road Site.

5.0 SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION WITH ABORIGINAL COMMUNITIES

5.1 Consultation during the Notice of Commencement and Invitation to Open House #1

Letters were sent to Aboriginal groups identified by the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch of the Ministry of Environment, in consultation with Golder, Taggart Miller, the Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs and Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada at the time of the Notice of Commencement of the development of the TOR for the EA. The letters explained the EA process, including TOR development, and the proposed project. These letters also outlined Taggart Miller's commitment to consultation. A copy of the Notice of Commencement letter is included in Appendix B3. This "initial contact" is also a part of the formal initiation of the EA process.

The only comment received from the Aboriginal communities was from the Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office requesting to be maintained on the consultation list and to receive copies of archaeological assessments as soon as they are available. A copy of this letter is provided in Appendix L. No comments were received from the other Aboriginal groups contacted and no members of the Aboriginal groups attended Open House #1.

5.2 Consultation during Notice of Second Site

The notice of the second site mailed the last week of May 2012 to President Daniel Gilbeau of the Ottawa Métis Council was returned to the sender. Through follow up phone calls and e-mails, a new mailing and e-mail address was provided. The project update and information about Open House #2 was then e-mailed to President Gilbeau. At this time President Gilbeau indicated he preferred receiving information electronically as indicated in Appendix L2.

As only limited comments had been received from the Aboriginal groups up to and including this point in time, the Métis Nation of Ontario, the Algonquin Consultation Office, the Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation and the Mohawks of Akwesasne were each called after the notice of second site was sent the last week of May 2012 to confirm that they had received the notices and to determine how they would like to receive future information. Each organization provided an e-mail address for future correspondence and indicated that this was their preferred way to receive information as indicated in Appendix L2.

5.3 Consultation during Invitation to Open House #2

The Open House #2 invitation was sent to the Métis Nation of Ontario, the Algonquin Consultation Office and the Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation on June 7, 2012. An additional e-mail was sent to the assistant of Grand Chief Mike Mitchell of the Mohawks of Akwesasne to confirm that she was the best person to receive updates on the project. Only an automatic response was received so the Open House #2 flyer was sent via mail to Grand Chief Mike Mitchell.

No comments were received from the Aboriginal groups contacted and no members of the Aboriginal groups attended Open House #2.