

### 3.0 CONSULTATION ACTIVITIES

The consultation program for the EA was carried out in accordance with the approved TOR. The results of the program and supporting documents, including copies of notices, presentation materials, comments and correspondence are contained in the Consultation Record, which is Volume II of the EASR.

#### 3.1 Overview

Prior to commencing the TOR development process, Taggart Miller developed a list of potentially interested persons, which included identified members of the public, local governments, interest groups, government agencies and Aboriginal communities. As the TOR development process and subsequently the EA progressed, Taggart Miller continually updated the consultation list to reflect additional parties interested in the CRRRC. This consultation list was used to communicate directly with stakeholders throughout the EA process.

In addition, the project website was regularly updated and there have been a number of public open houses, newsletters, workshops, meetings, site tours and tours of Miller facilities in the Greater Toronto Area as part of the TOR/EA consultation process.

#### 3.2 Overview of Consultation during Development of the TOR

During the development of the TOR, consultation with interested parties occurred in a number of ways. A primary mechanism for sharing information was via public open houses of which there were two. The first open house occurred on November 25, 2010 and was organized to discuss the proposed CRRRC and the North Russell Road Site, the TOR and the EA processes. The second open house had two sessions that were held on June 20 and 25, 2012. The purpose of the open houses was to again provide an overview of the proposed CRRRC and its components, to present the second alternative Site – the Boundary Road Site – to be considered for the CRRRC, and to describe the proposed EA methodology and an overview of the contents of the TOR. Both open houses provided bilingual presentation boards and staff to assist interested persons in the language of their choice.

During development of the TOR a workshop on groundwater was also held on April 9, 2011 to assist residents and interested individuals to learn more about groundwater issues in relation to an integrated waste management facility at the North Russell Road Site. French speaking presenters were available at the workshop to discuss any of the concepts or materials in French as required (there was no request for French assistance during the workshop). The workshop material was subsequently posted on the CRRRC website in English and French.

In addition to these more formal events there were also tours of Miller diversion facilities in the Toronto area for interested parties, meetings with MOECC technical reviewers and others and release of draft workplans and project description for Government Review Team (GRT) and public comment, all of which are documented in more detail in the TOR (Appendix A).

### 3.3 Overview of Consultation during EA Studies

A variety of consultation events and activities were used during the EA study process. The consultation program for the EA was presented in the approved TOR. All Open Houses were fully bilingual. French speaking staff were also on hand during the groundwater workshop. An overview of the consultation program used during the EA is as follows:

- **Open House #3** was held in both Russell and Notre Dames des Champs. A more detailed description of the proposed CRRRC diversion and landfill components was presented as well as the results of the comparative evaluation of the alternative Sites and the rationale for identification of the preferred Site for the CRRRC;
- **Open House #4** was held in Carlsbad Springs only and presented the existing environmental conditions and preliminary findings for select disciplines at the Boundary Site and the alternative Site development concepts to be considered for this Site;
- **Open House #5** was held in Carlsbad Springs only and presented information on the assessment of environmental effects associated with the preferred Site development concept together with proposed mitigation measures, monitoring and contingency measures; the results of the alternative haul routes/Site access assessment; the results of the leachate treatment assessment; the results of the cumulative impact assessment; an outline of the proposed EA/EPA documentation package; and an overview of the proposed schedule for submissions and the MOECC decision making process. Participants at this Open House were also informed of the plans regarding distribution of the draft EA for review;
- **Open House #6** was held during the GRT and public review period for the draft EA. An overview of the draft EA was provided for public feedback;
- **A meeting and Site tour was** held with the Carlsbad Springs Community Association executive;
- **A Workshop/Technical Session** was held to discuss groundwater and groundwater protection in relation to the Boundary Road Site. The public was made aware of the upcoming workshop by soliciting interest at Open House #4 and via advertisements in the local papers;
- **Project Website** ([www.crrrc.ca](http://www.crrrc.ca)) was maintained to inform the public on the EA process and public consultation activities. Taggart Miller made materials available on the website at key EA milestones; and
- **The Draft EA** was made available for GRT and public comment prior to finalization and submission to the MOECC. There was a seven week review period provided for the draft EA.

### 3.4 Aboriginal Communities

A list of potentially affected Aboriginal groups/organizations was identified in consultation with the MOECC, Ontario Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs and Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada. The following Aboriginal groups/organizations were consulted during the progress of the EA as further discussed below:

- Métis Nation of Ontario
- Ottawa Métis Nation Council
- Algonquins of Ontario Consultation Office
- Algonquins of Ottawa
- Algonquins of Pikwakanagan First Nation
- Mohawks of Akwesasne

The Algonquins of Ottawa were added to the list during Open House #3; otherwise the list of groups/organizations consulted remains the same as during development of the TOR.

### 3.5 Government Review Team

The following federal, provincial, municipal and local government departments/ministries/agencies, health units, school boards and private corporations comprise the GRT for this EA. All of them received notice of the public consultation events during the EA. In addition, consultation occurred with several of these departments/ministries/agencies on specific items during the progress of the EA studies.

#### Federal Government

- National Capital Commission (NCC)
- Transport Canada
- Environment Canada

#### Provincial Government

- Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA)
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)
- Ministry of Energy
- Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care
- Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH)
- South Nation Conservation (SNC)
- Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF)
- MOECC

- Ministry of Transportation (MTO)
- Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM)
- Ontario Provincial Police

### Other

- Catholic District School Board of Eastern Ontario
- Conseil des écoles publiques de l'Est de l'Ontario
- Upper Canada District School Board
- Ottawa-Carleton District School Board
- Conseil des écoles catholiques du Centre-Est
- Eastern Ontario Health Unit Russell Fire Department
- Ottawa Public Health
- Ottawa Fire Services
- City of Ottawa

Health Canada, Ministry of Citizenship, Immigration, Tourism, Culture and Sport, Ministry of Industry and Energy and Ministry of Health and Long Term Care were removed from further consultation during the Notice of Commencement or following distribution of key draft documents as documented in the TOR. The Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Conseil scolaire de district catholique de l'Est ontarien indicated they had no comments on the TOR and did not require any further involvement with this proposal. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans was removed from further consultation following submission of the TOR as they requested a self-assessment be completed and the proposed CRRRC did not fall within their mandate. The Ministry of Education was removed from further consultation following approval of the TOR as the project is not directly related to schools or school boards and all appropriate school boards have been contacted.

## 3.6 Summary of Consultation Events

The following is a summary of the principal consultation events that occurred during the EA study process. Note that Appendices referred to in Section 3.6 refer to Volume II of this EASR – the Consultation Record.

### 3.6.1 Open House #3 – February 25 and 27, 2013

Commencement of EA Study Process and Consultation materials relating to Open House #3 are contained in Volume II, Appendix A. On February 7, 2013 Taggart Miller issued a bilingual media release announcing the commencement of the EA study process and upcoming Open House #3 (Volume II, Appendix A-1). This media release also included a brief overview of the CRRRC, information on the proponent, the location of the undertaking, the purpose of Open House #3, upcoming consultation events and how to contact the proponent with comments and questions.

Notification of the preferred Site and Open House #3 was published by paid advertisements between February 11 and February 14, 2013 in the following newspapers:

- Le Reflet/The News (French) (Volume II, Appendix A-2);
- The Villager (English) (Volume II, Appendix A-3);
- Le Droit (French) (Volume II, Appendix A-4); and
- Ottawa Citizen (English) (Volume II, Appendix A-5).

The notice was also posted in English and French on the CRRRC website and the Carlsbad Springs Community Association website and facebook page on February 7, 2013 and February 11, 2013, respectively. In addition, a bilingual e-mail was sent to approximately 430 stakeholders on the project mailing list on February 8, 2013 (Volume II, Appendix A-6). The notice was also mailed on February 7, 2013 to eight addresses for members of the community who only provided their mailing address. The representatives of the Aboriginal communities identified in Section 3.4 were contacted by e-mail and by phone on February 7, 2013 (emails and record of telephone conversations are provided in Volume II, Appendix A-7). Additional e-mails were also sent to local politicians, municipal staff and local media on February 7, 2013. On February 7, 2013 emails were also sent to all members of the GRT with e-mail addresses (Volume II, Appendix A-8). Those members of the GRT who had not provided an e-mail address were mailed a bilingual hard copy of the e-mailed information on February 8, 2013.

Open House #3 was organized into two identical sessions. The first session of Open House #3 occurred on February 25, 2013 from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m., at the Carlsbad Springs Community Centre in the City of Ottawa. The second session of Open House #3 occurred on February 27, 2013 from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m., at the Russell Arena in the Village of Russell.

The purpose of Open House #3 was to announce the preferred Site and provide information about the rationale for selection of the preferred Site, the proposed CRRRC facility and the next steps in the environmental assessment process.

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

Seven representatives of Taggart Miller and 17 consultants attended Open House #3 on February 25, of which nine were fluently bilingual and wore clear identification that they were available for discussions in French. Seven representatives of Taggart Miller and 14 consultants attended Open House #3 on February 27, of whom nine were fluently bilingual.

A total of 28 display boards in English and French were featured at Open House #3 (Volume II, Appendix A-9). A bilingual comment sheet was provided requesting feedback on the comparative evaluation of the two Sites (Volume II, Appendix A-10). In addition to the comment sheet, attendees were provided with a copy of the Summary Report of the Comparative Evaluation of Alternative Sites in English or French (Volume II, Appendix A-11). The Summary Report, display boards and comment sheets were posted on the CRRRC project website in advance of the Open House sessions. Attendees could complete the comment sheet at the Open House or send it back via regular mail or e-mail.

The Dump this Dump 2 opposition group advised attendees not to fill in comment sheets or to sign in. However the bilingual front desk staff was instructed to keep a count of attendees.

A total of approximately 245 people were in attendance at the first session of Open House #3 on February 25, 2013 in Carlsbad Springs. A total of 26 comment sheets were completed at the first session of Open House #3 (Volume II, Appendix A-12).

A total of approximately 61 people were in attendance at the second session of Open House #3 on February 27, 2013 in Russell. A total of two comment sheets were completed at the second session of Open House #3 (Volume II, Appendix A-13).

The comments are discussed in Section 3.7.1 of this EASR.

### **3.6.2 Open House #4 – June 5, 2013**

Open House #4 occurred on June 5, 2013 from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m., at the Carlsbad Springs Community Centre in the City of Ottawa.

Consultation materials relating to Open House #4 are contained in Volume II, Appendix B of this EASR.

Bilingual advertising and notification for Open House #4 occurred between May 21 and May 23, 2013 in the following newspapers:

- Le Reflet/The News (French) (Volume II, Appendix B-1);
- The Villager (English) (Volume II, Appendix B-2);
- Le Droit (French) (Volume II, Appendix B-3); and
- Ottawa Citizen (English) (Volume II, Appendix B-4).

The advertising included a brief overview of the CRRRC, information on the proponent, the location of the undertaking, the EA process, the purpose of Open House #4, upcoming consultation events and how to contact the CRRRC with comments and questions.

The bilingual notification of Open House #4 was also posted on the CRRRC website and the Carlsbad Springs Community Association website. In addition, a bilingual e-mail was sent to approximately 430 members of the community on May 21, 2013 (Volume II, Appendix B-5). The notice was also mailed to eight addresses for members of the community who only provided their mailing address on May 22, 2013. The representatives of the Aboriginal communities identified in Section 3.4 were contacted by e-mail and/or by phone on May 28, 2013 (Volume II, Appendix B-6). On May 24, 2013 emails were also sent to all members of the GRT with e-mail addresses (Volume II, Appendix B-7). Those members of the GRT who had not provided an e-mail address were mailed a bilingual hard copy of the e-mailed information on May 24, 2013. Additional e-mails were also sent to local politicians and municipal staff on May 21, 2013.

The purpose of Open House #4 was to present and obtain comments from the public on possible alternative Site development concepts and to provide an update on assessment work related to the geology, hydrogeology & geotechnical, visual (socio-economic) and traffic disciplines at the Boundary Road Site, which had been identified as the preferred Site for the project at Open House #3.



This event was designed to provide opportunities for attendees to speak directly with Taggart Miller representatives 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. A French area was designated and identified at the entrance to the venue to provide information in French by a bilingual member of the project team, and to provide additional background material and insight about the project and the Open House to Francophone residents. Project team members at the Open House who were bilingual were clearly identified with different name badges.

Eight representatives of Taggart Miller and 15 consultants attended Open House #4 on June 5, of which eight were fluently bilingual and wore clear identification that they were available for discussions in English or French.

A total of 27 display boards in English and French were featured at Open House #4 (Volume II, Appendix B-8). A bilingual comment sheet was provided requesting feedback on the alternative Site development concepts (Volume II, Appendix B-9). In addition to the comment sheet requesting comments on the alternative Site development concepts, attendees were provided with a bilingual groundwater workshop registration sheet asking for interest in a workshop to be held on June 22, and a bilingual backgrounder on a proposed Property Value Protection Plan (PVPP) (Volume II, Appendices B-10 and B-11, respectively). The handouts, display boards and comment sheets were posted on the CRRRC project website in advance of the Open House. Attendees could complete the comment sheet at the Open House or send it back via regular mail or e-mail.

The bilingual front desk staff was instructed to keep a count of attendees. A total of approximately 52 people were in attendance at Open House #4. As people passed by the alternative Site development concept presentation boards, they were asked if they had a preference and why. Only one comment sheet was completed on the alternative Site development concepts at Open House #4 (Volume II, Appendix B-12). A total of six workshop registration forms were completed and submitted at the Open House indicating an interest in attending the June 22, 2013 workshop on groundwater. Approximately four to five dozen people attended a presentation by the Capital Region Citizens' Coalition for Protection of the Environment (Dump the Dump2 group) in the parking lot during the Open House.

Comments received are discussed in Section 3.7.2 of this EASR.

Further comments on the alternative Site development concepts were solicited from the MOECC and the Aboriginal communities and are discussed in Sections 3.6.6 and 3.6.7 of this EASR, respectively.

### **3.6.3 Workshop #2 – June 22, 2013**

During Open House #4, held on June 5, 2013, attendees were asked to indicate their interest in attending a groundwater workshop. In addition to the registration forms available at Open House #4, forms were also available on the EA website. A bilingual e-mail encouraging participation at the workshop was sent on June 12, 2013 to approximately 430 individuals from Taggart Miller's project mailing list (Volume II, Appendix C-1). In total, 19 individuals registered for the event.

The groundwater workshop was held at the Carlsbad Springs Community Centre in the City of Ottawa on June 22, 2013 between 1 p.m. and 5 p.m. Thirteen people attended the session. The workshop was led by Professor Kerry Rowe from Queen's University, with assistance from Golder Associates Ltd. Professor Rowe is a world-recognized expert in groundwater protection in relation to waste management facilities. Participants

were seated in a classroom fashion to allow all participants to easily see the PowerPoint presentation prepared and presented by Golder Associates Ltd. and Dr. Kerry Rowe. Each attendee was given a hard copy of the presentation material and was encouraged to comment and ask questions throughout the presentation. A copy of the presentation material is provided in English and French in Volume II, Appendix C-2.

Prior to starting the workshop, a bilingual hydrogeologist from Golder Associates Ltd. spoke to the attendees in French to let them know that any part of the presentation could be translated into French to ensure that everyone clearly understood the topic.

There were five EA consultants in attendance at the groundwater workshop as well as Dr. Rowe. One of the consultants was fully bilingual.

The workshop material was posted on the CRRRC project website approximately one week following the workshop.

The representatives of the Aboriginal communities identified in Section 3.4 were contacted by e-mail on July 8 and 9, 2013 and provided the workshop material and invited to meet to discuss the material (Volume II, Appendix C-3). Additional e-mails were also sent to local politicians and municipal staff on June 28, 2013 advising them that the workshop occurred and providing the workshop material.

#### **3.6.4 Newsletter – October 31, 2013**

In the fall of 2013 Taggart Miller prepared a bilingual newsletter for distribution to the Carlsbad Springs and Edwards areas (Volume II, Appendix D). The newsletter outlined possible community benefits such as a community fund and property value protection, and provided information on the proposed facility and the EA process. Approximately 650 copies of the newsletter were dropped off at Canada Post locations on October 31, 2013 for distribution within mailboxes in these locations. The bilingual newsletter was posted on the project website on October 31, 2013.

#### **3.6.5 Open House #5 – December 5, 2013**

Consultation materials relating to Open House #5 are contained in Volume II, Appendix E.

Bilingual advertising and notification for Open House #5 occurred between November 20 and 21, 2013 in the following newspapers:

- Le Reflet/The News (French) (Volume II, Appendix E-1);
- The Villager (English) (Volume II, Appendix E-2);
- Le Droit (French) (Volume II, Appendix E-3); and
- Ottawa Citizen (English) (Volume II, Appendix E-4).

The advertising included a brief overview of the CRRRC, information on the proponent, the location of the undertaking, the EA process, the purpose of Open House #5, upcoming consultation events and how to contact the CRRRC with comments and questions.



The bilingual notification of Open House #5 was also posted on the CRRRC website and the Vars Community Association website. In addition, a bilingual e-mail was sent to approximately 470 stakeholders on November 21, 2013 (Volume II, Appendix E-5). The notice was also mailed on November 19, 2013 to eight addresses for members of the community who only provided their mailing address. The representatives of the Aboriginal communities identified in Section 3.4 were contacted by e-mail and/or by phone on November 22 and November 26, 2013 (Volume II, Appendix E-6). On November 22, 2013 emails were also sent to all members of the GRT with e-mail addresses (Volume II, Appendix E-7). Those members of the GRT who had not provided an e-mail address were mailed a bilingual hard copy of the e-mailed information on November 20, 2013. Additional e-mails were also sent to local politicians and municipal staff on November 21, 2013.

Open House #5 occurred on December 5, 2013 from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m., at the Carlsbad Springs Community Centre in the City of Ottawa.

The purpose of Open House #5 was to present and obtain comments from the public concerning the preferred Site development concept; the assessment of environmental effects associated with the project together with proposed mitigation measures, monitoring and contingency measures; the results of the leachate treatment, haul route and cumulative impact assessments; an outline of the proposed EA/EPA document package; and an overview of the proposed schedule for submissions and the Ministry decision making process. Participants at this Open House were also informed of the plans regarding distribution of the draft EA for review.

This event was designed to provide opportunities for attendees to speak directly with Taggart Miller representatives 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.

Nine representatives of Taggart Miller and 16 consultants attended Open House #5 on December 5, of which seven were fluently bilingual and wore clear identification that they were available for discussions in English or French.

A total of 41 display boards in English and French were featured at Open House #5 (Volume II, Appendix E-8). A bilingual comment sheet was provided requesting general feedback (Volume II, Appendix E-9). In addition to the comment sheet, attendees were provided with a bilingual handout outlining the EA/EPA study report format (Volume II, Appendix E-10). The handout, display boards and comment sheet were posted on the CRRRC project website in advance of the Open House. Attendees could complete the comment sheet at the Open House or send it back via regular mail or e-mail.

The bilingual front desk staff was instructed to keep a count of attendees. A total of approximately 61 people were in attendance at Open House #5. A total of eight comment sheets were submitted at the Open House and one additional comment sheet was received by email (Volume II, Appendix E-11).

All comments received are discussed in Section 3.7.3 of this EASR.

### 3.6.6 Meetings with GRT Technical Reviewers during the EA

During the course of the EA, the consulting team consulted with and spoke to members of the GRT on several occasions. The more formal of these interactions are summarized below.

On May 23, 2013 the consulting team and a Taggart Miller representative had a pre-consultation meeting with the City of Ottawa and South Nation Conservation to review requirements for official plan and zoning amendments and to identify, where possible, any City requirements or studies needed beyond the EA studies that were already being completed.

On June 19, 2013 the consulting team had a conference call with members of the MOECC regarding alternative Site development concepts (Volume II, Appendix F-1). Specifically the consulting team was seeking some opinion from the MOECC regarding a preference between the two alternative Site development concepts. Overall no opinion on the alternative Site develop concepts was provided other than, a landfill component further from the eastern property boundary was considered preferable that could best be achieved with Alternative Concept A.

During development of the TOR and from July to October of 2013 the consulting team had several discussions with the City of Ottawa to confirm what may be required related to possible approvals under the *Drainage Act* for the CRRRC project on the Boundary Road Site.

Between July 23 and September 12, 2013 the consulting team and a Taggart Miller representative had several meetings and calls with the City of Ottawa to assess City requirements for sending CRRRC wastewater to the City of Ottawa's wastewater treatment facility, the Robert O Pickard Environmental Centre (ROPEC).

During the EA the consulting team had several discussions with the MNRF regarding one recording of little brown myotis on the Boundary Road Site. These discussions occurred between August 27 and October 10, 2013.

The consulting team had a conference call with the MOECC groundwater technical reviewers from Kingston on September 12, 2013 to discuss how the potential impacts on groundwater associated with the CRRRC landfill component would be modelled and what parameters to consider (Volume II, Appendix F-2).

On October 9, 2013 the consulting team had a conference call with the MOECC air quality reviewers from Kingston and Toronto to discuss how landfill gas emissions for the proposed CRRRC landfill component would be estimated.

On April 16, 2014 the consulting team and a Taggart Miller representative met with the NCC to review the project, the perceived interests of the NCC based on comments received on the TOR and the findings of the EA studies related to their identified areas of interest. A record of the meeting is summarized in an e-mail (Volume II, Appendix F-3).

The MNRF met with the consulting team on May 13, 2014. During the meeting, time was spent reviewing the history of the project, the TOR and EA process. As described, the EA compared two sites, the Boundary Road Site and the North Russell Road Site. The North Russell Road Site had an active mineral aggregate extraction license, which is an area of interest to the MNRF. As the comparison of the two sites identified that the Boundary Road Site was preferred, and there are no aggregate resources on or in the area of the Boundary Road Site, the issue of aggregate resources is no longer a matter to be addressed for the approval or development of the proposed CRRRC. Detail on the natural environment surveys conducted and how and when MNRF biological staff was engaged during the EA study process was described. It was discussed that the surveys were extensive.

### 3.6.7 Meetings and Liaison with Aboriginal Communities

The following details are provided in chronological order.

The Chief of the Algonquins of Ottawa attended Open House #3 in February 2013 and indicated he was satisfied that the sites were on private land and with the information presented. The Chief has been alerted to all subsequent Open Houses but has not attended.

The consulting team met with the Algonquins of Ontario (AOO) on two separate occasions. The first meeting with the AOO occurred on April 9, 2013. During this meeting the consulting team and the AOO shared information, which is outlined in the meeting summary (Volume II, Appendix G-1). Specifically the consulting team gained an appreciation of who is represented by AOO and their interest in the CRRRC.

The representatives of the Aboriginal communities identified in Section 3.4 were all contacted by e-mail on June 11 and 12, 2013 requesting feedback on the Site development concepts (Volume II, Appendix G-4). No written feedback was received.

The AOO was provided the draft Stage 1 archaeological assessment report, as requested, on July 9, 2013. On February 20, 2014 the AOO provided comments on the draft report (Volume II, Appendix G-3). The edit requested by the AOO was made to the Stage 1 report, the archaeology TSD #6 and the EASR.

The second meeting with the AOO occurred on October 8, 2013 and was requested by the AOO during followup regarding their review of the draft Stage 1 archaeological assessment. During this meeting the AOO indicated that they were working on gathering information on the 200+ properties that may come to the AOO as per their land claim, and prioritizing them in terms of potential development. The CRRRC is in the vicinity of two Boundary Road properties earmarked for the Algonquins; the AOO requested information from Taggart Miller to hand out at an upcoming AOO meeting as a CRRRC project status report update. This information was provided on October 30, 2013 and included the alternative Site development concepts and a summary document (Volume II, Appendix G-2).

At the meeting with the AOO on October 8, 2013 they were again asked for their opinion on the Site development concepts, but they indicated that they did not have a preference for one over the other.

On July 3, 2014 the consulting team and Taggart Miller representatives met with representatives of the Mohawk Council of Akwesasne at the request of the Council following receipt of the draft EA. A brief presentation was provided outlining the proponent, the project and its evolution, presenting the layout and structure of the Draft Environmental Study Report, reviewing some results of the environmental assessment and summarizing aboriginal outreach to date. The meeting was well received and a subsequent meeting to discuss opportunities to work together took place on October 16, 2014.

### 3.6.8 Open House #6 – June 25, 2014

Consultation materials relating to Open House #6 are contained in Volume II, Appendix H.

Bilingual advertising and notification for Open House #6 occurred on June 11, 2014 in the following newspapers:

- Le Reflet/The News (French) (Volume II, Appendix H-1);
- The Villager (English) (Volume II, Appendix H-2);
- Le Droit (French) (Volume II, Appendix H-3); and
- Ottawa Citizen (English) (Volume II, Appendix H-4).

The advertising included a brief overview of the CRRRC, information on the proponent, the location of the undertaking, the EA process, the purpose of Open House #6, information on how and when to review the draft EA and how to contact the CRRRC with comments and questions.

The bilingual notification of Open House #6 was also posted on the CRRRC website, the Carlsbad Springs Community Association website and the Vars Community Association website. In addition, a bilingual e-mail was sent to approximately 470 stakeholders on June 10, 2014 (Volume II, Appendix H-5). The notice was also mailed on June 10, 2014 to one address for a member of the community who only provided their mailing address. The representatives of the Aboriginal communities identified in Section 3.4 were contacted by e-mail and/or by phone on June 16 and 17, 2014 (Volume II, Appendix H-6). On June 16, 2014 emails were also sent to all members of the GRT with e-mail addresses (Volume II, Appendix H-7). Additional e-mails were also sent to local politicians and municipal staff on June 10, 2014.

Open House #6 occurred on June 25, 2014 from 4 p.m. to 9 p.m., at the Carlsbad Springs Community Centre in the City of Ottawa.

The purpose of Open House #6 was to present the draft EA and obtain comments from the public.

This event was designed to provide opportunities for attendees to speak directly with Taggart Miller representatives 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.

Eight representatives of Taggart Miller and 16 consultants attended Open House #6 on June 25, of which six were fluently bilingual and wore clear identification that they were available for discussions in French.

A total of 26 display boards in English and French were featured at Open House #6 (Volume II, Appendix H-8). In addition, 3 hard copies of the complete draft EA were available for reference and review during Open House #6. A bilingual comment sheet was provided requesting general feedback (Volume II, Appendix H-9). The display boards and comment sheet were posted on the CRRRC project website immediately following the Open House. Attendees could complete the comment sheet at the Open House or send it back via regular mail or e-mail.

The bilingual front desk staff was instructed to keep a count of attendees. A total of approximately 275 people were in attendance at Open House #6. A total of five comment sheets were submitted at the Open House (Volume II, Appendix H-10).

All comments received are discussed in Section 3.7.4 of this EASR.

### **3.6.9 Draft Environmental Assessment**

The draft environmental assessment was released on June 11 for public comment to July 31, 2014. The advertisements and notices indicating the availability of the draft environmental assessment for comment were included within the advertisements for Open House #6. Details of how and where notices of the availability of the draft Environmental Assessment was available have been discussed in Section 3.6.8.

All members of the GRT and aboriginal communities were contacted in advance of release of the draft Environmental Assessment to confirm their on-going desire to be consulted about the project, confirm their address and determine whether they required hard copies or CD's for their review and how many copies. The draft EA was distributed on June 6 and 9, 2014 following these requirements. The GRT and aboriginal communities were invited to contact Taggart Miller if they had questions or wanted to discuss the draft EA.

Members of the public whom requested copies of the draft EA specifically or previously received a copy of the TOR were sent the draft EA on June 9 or 10, 2014.

Following distribution of the draft EA, the City of Ottawa contacted Taggart Miller on June 17, 2014 and requested a meeting to assist with their review of the draft EA. On June 24, 2014 the consulting team met about 15 individuals from various City departments to go over the project and its evolution, to present the layout and structure of the draft EA, to review some of the results from the EA and to provide an opportunity for questions and answers. A copy of the presentation material is provided in Volume II, Appendix F-4.

A summary of comments received on the draft EA are discussed in Section 3.7.7.

Following receipt of the comments from the MOECC, several conference calls were organized to assist the project team in understanding some of the requests and comments provided. Calls occurred on September 26, 2014 and October 21 and 30, 2014.

## **3.7 Summary of Concerns Raised during Consultation**

Comments and questions were welcomed from attendees by Taggart Miller during each of the consultation events described in Sections 3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.5, 3.6.8 and 3.6.9 (Open House #3, Open House #4, Open House #5, Open House #6 and Submission of Draft EASR , respectively). As is the nature of Open Houses, there were literally hundreds of individual discussions during these Open Houses, which are impossible to fully document.

### **3.7.1 Open House #3 – February 25 and 27, 2013**

Oral comments received during Open House #3 varied widely. Concerns expressed were similar to those at previous consultation events; that is in regard to protection of groundwater, surface water and air quality, nuisance effects such as noise and need for the project. There was also interest in the property value protection plan.

A total of 26 and two comment sheets were completed at the first and second sessions of Open House #3, respectively (Volume II, Appendix A-12 and Appendix A-13, respectively). A summary of the key comments (commenting on specific aspects of the project relevant to the EA) received are listed below in Table 3.7.1-1 along with how they were addressed in the EA. There were also comments which expressed general opposition to the project or a preference for a different location. Note that the comments received do not necessarily address the question asked regarding the comparison of alternative Site development concepts. Further, for convenience some comments have been merged together to cover a particular topic. In general, the attendees

were concerned about the impact of the Site on the area (including the environmental performance of the landfill) and questioned the choice/need of the Site and what would happen to the North Russell Road Site. The concerns were generally addressed within the EA through evaluations and mitigation/engineered controls.

**Table 3.7.1-1: Comments from Open House #3**

Key Comment	Action/Response
<b>Concerned about groundwater contamination. Concerned about liners, their longevity, leak detection and what happens if leaks occur.</b>	A full description of how impact to groundwater was evaluated and its predicted compliance with provincial requirements is provided in Volume III of the EASR. This Volume also considered what engineered controls are proposed to protect groundwater, how long they can reasonably be assumed to last, monitoring and contingency plans.
<b>Concerned about traffic on the north end of Boundary Road. Concerned about traffic from the south. Concerned about traffic in general. Noted that the exit off Highway 417 is already congested.</b>	The complete evaluation of traffic, including its expected distribution, is provided in TSD #9.
<b>Concerned about property values.</b>	A proposed PVPP is generally described in Section 15.0 of the EASR.
<b>Concerned about development on leda clay.</b>	A full description of the geotechnical investigation and analysis is provided in Volume III.
<b>Concerned about odour.</b>	A full description of how odour was evaluated and its predicted compliance with provincial requirements is provided in TSD #3.
<b>Noted that they found it unusual that the Boundary Road Site was found preferable for every component.</b>	The Boundary Road Site was preferable for each component as is documented in Section 7.0 of the EASR.
<b>Noted Taggart Miller should set the standard for diversion achieved.</b>	Section 4.0 of the EASR describes the provincial average for diversion is about 13%. Taggart Miller are predicting ultimate diversion rates significantly above that (>40%) at the CRRRC.
<b>Noted that species at risk were only identified in higher form.</b>	As this was a summary of information at an Open House, it was only possible to list the species at risk in higher form. A complete description of species observed at the Boundary Road Site, including species at risk, is provided in TSD #4.
<b>Expressed dissatisfaction with the format of the Open House rather than a public meeting.</b>	There is no one consultation method that is likely to satisfy all participants. An open house format with display boards, as used throughout the consultation process, allows for more complete sharing of information on multiple topics at the same time and for the most people to have their questions responded to and is typical in EA processes.
<b>Stated that the project is not needed.</b>	Taggart Miller's opportunity assessment for this proposal was provided in Supporting Document #1 to the approved TOR.
<b>Requested that turtles, bats and endangered tree species be studied.</b>	These were considered and results are presented in TSD #4.



Key Comment	Action/Response
<b>Inquired about re-planting after trees are removed from the Site. Requested that any re-planting be done with native species. Inquired about a plan to deal with invasive species once the land is cleared.</b>	Comment noted. A landscape plan will be required as part of City of Ottawa approvals for development of the Boundary Road Site. Taggart Miller will consider using native species. As only land that will be used actively will be cleared as part of this project, invasive species will be removed should they advance following land clearing.
<b>Concerned that risks identified by the Township of Russell Environmental Sub-Committee have not been considered.</b>	Taggart Miller considered the matters identified by the Township of Russell Environmental Sub-Committee and the work plans in the approved TOR considered these matters as deemed appropriate.
<b>Inquired about what will happen to the North Russell Road Site.</b>	Taggart Miller does not need two Sites for the integrated waste management facility. The North Russell Site will be sold, however the timing of that has not been decided. The timing of any sale will depend on interest and market conditions.
<b>Inquired about the health of residents.</b>	The CRRRC will be designed and operated to meet MOECC requirements and standards that are intended to be protective of health and the environment.
<b>Requested a Site plan.</b>	At the time of Open House #3, the project team did not yet have a detailed Site plan. Site development concepts were presented at Open House #4.
<b>Requested the North Russell Road Site should be donated to the conservation authority or Township.</b>	Acknowledged.

### 3.7.2 Open House #4 – June 5, 2013

During Open House #4, concerns similar to those heard previously continued to be expressed regarding protection of groundwater, surface water and air quality, nuisance effects such as noise and the overall need for the project. There was also continued interest in the property value protection plan.

Only one comment sheet was completed at Open House #4 (Volume II, Appendix B-12). The respondent suggested that there was insufficient information to comment on the alternative Site development concepts.

Taggart Miller solicited additional input on which Site development concept was preferred by the public by: 1) asking the public verbally of their preference at Open House #4 and 2) by posting the two concepts on the CRRRC website. Verbally, no attendees at Open House #4 indicated a preference for Alternative B; to the extent feedback was provided it was all in favour of Alternative A.

### 3.7.3 Workshop #2 – June 22, 2013

During the presentations, attendees asked questions generally relating to groundwater flow in the area, potential contaminant migration, and MOECC regulations as they related to landfills. Attendees were also very interested in the interpreted hydrogeological and geological setting of the Site, and asked about groundwater supply from dug wells in the area of the Site.



Following the discussions on groundwater, and both the regional and site-specific hydrogeology and geology, Dr. Kerry Rowe presented landfill design considerations as set out in the Ontario Landfill Standards and O. Reg. 232/98, and a discussion on leachate. Attendees asked about the safety of liners and impacts of earthquakes. Dr. Rowe explained his research (and that of others) to date regarding liner safety and service life, and the contaminating lifespan of various contaminants commonly found in landfill leachate.

There was discussion on seismic considerations and the possibility of an escape of leachate from the landfill associated with a large earthquake. It was explained that earthquake shaking is being considered as part of the study and seismic analysis is required for assessment and design of the CRRRC project as set out in the approved TOR.

At the end of the session, two attendees thanked Taggart Miller for providing a very informative session. They stated that while they did not always agree with the interpretation, they were both satisfied that Golder was investigating important issues of hydrogeology, geological setting and seismic movement on both a regional and project site-specific scale.

One participant complained that the session did not have the information expected and did not answer her questions. This participant however did not arrive at the session until well over half of the presentations had already been made.

### 3.7.4 Open House #5 – December 5, 2013

Oral comments received during this Open House varied widely. Concerns were expressed about groundwater and surface water protection, nuisance effects and need for the project. There was interest in the property value protection plan.

A total of nine comment sheets were received following Open House #5 (Volume II, Appendix E-11). A summary of the comments received are listed below in Table 3.7.4-1 along with how they were addressed in the EA. For convenience some comments have been merged together to cover a particular topic. In general, the commenters were concerned about the impact of the Site on the surrounding area and suggested looking into alternatives to landfills. There were also comments expressing opposition to the project.

**Table 3.7.4-1: Comments from Open House #5**

Key Comment	Action/Response
Requested Taggart Miller look at alternative technologies to landfilling.	Taggart Miller's opportunity assessment for this proposal was provided in Supporting Document #1 to the TOR.
Concerned about noise and odour.	A full description of how noise and odour were evaluated and their predicted compliance with provincial requirements are provided in TSD #2 and TSD #3, respectively.
Concerned about property values.	A proposed PVPP is generally described in Section 15.0 of the EASR.
Concerned about biology assessment and effect of gas release on bees and ultimately crops.	The biology assessment was done in accordance with the approved TOR and is described in TSD #4. There appears to be limited, if any, scientific research on the question asked.
Appreciated that the proposed CRRRC may bring community funds to the area.	Acknowledged. A community benefit fund has been discussed with a local community association and is described in Section 15.0 of the EASR.

### 3.7.5 Open House #6 – June 25, 2014

During Open House #6, a number of attendees indicated they did not want the CRRRC at this location.

A total of five comment sheets were received following Open House #6 (Volume II, Appendix H-10). A summary of the comments received are listed below in Table 3.7.5-1 along with how they were already addressed in the EA. For convenience some comments have been merged together to cover a particular topic. There were also comments expressing opposition to the project.

**Table 3.7.5-1: Comments from Open House #6**

Key Comment	Action/Response
Noted that groundwater protection is most important and as such recommended that a charcoal protective layer be added to the design and that earthquake contingencies are required.	Taggart Miller's engineering and hydrogeology team has considered groundwater protection requirements during the EA. A charcoal protective layer is not required based on the results of the assessment, which indicate the landfill component will meet all MOECC requirements during its contaminating lifespan. The geotechnical engineers have carefully evaluated the potential for ground movement of the landfill associated with earthquakes and included this within the factors of safety for the landfill physical design.
Inquired about how much the project biologist knows about the Site being an important wildlife corridor.	The biology team has considered the potential for the Site to be a wildlife corridor. This was discussed within the EASR in Section 11.5.2.
Noted that it seems the environmental assessments are overly optimistic.	Each discipline has completed the environmental assessment using the appropriate due diligence, conservatism and factors of safety necessary for the individual discipline, and in accordance with the approved TOR.
Noted that from their experience there will be odours, sick carrion birds and contaminated groundwater.	Every waste management site is different. The CRRRC has been designed to meet the MOECC strict groundwater and odour requirements.

### 3.7.6 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, phone and e-mail correspondence. For the most part these comments were information inquiries and were responded to directly. Summary tables related to these comments are provided in Volume II, Appendix I. Within these summary tables the issue/concern/question is summarized, and Taggart Miller's response 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 Volume II, Appendix I and Appendix J, respectively.

Table I-1 in Volume II, Appendix I summarizes the comments received at the commencement of the EA studies. Generally, the two individuals who inquired were requesting information about the drilling program and about the timing of decisions related to deciding on a preferred site. The full details of the drilling program are provided in Volume III.

Table I-2 in Volume II, Appendix I summarizes the comments received following the notice of Open House #3. Generally, the seven individuals who commented were mostly concerned with property value around the North Russell Road Site, and potential impacts to the surrounding environment.. A response was provided indicating that the North Russell Road Site cannot be “released” until the EA is completed. With regard to potential impacts to the surrounding environment, the impact assessments completed were documented in Section 11.0 of the EASR Volume I, the TSD’s and Volume III.

Table I-3 in Volume II, Appendix I summarizes the comments received following the notice of Open House #4. Generally, the five individuals who commented noted that the project was not needed/should be discontinued or requested information/ indicated concern related to geological impacts. The opportunity for the project was discussed in Supporting Document #1 to the TOR. Geology, seismicity and groundwater impacts are discussed in Section 11.3 of the EASR Volume I and in Volume III.

Table I-4 in Volume II, Appendix I summarizes the comments received following the notice of Workshop #2. Generally, the seven individuals who commented inquired about the information provided at the workshop, indicated concerns about geology/groundwater or recommended moving the project. Geology, hydrogeology and geotechnical impacts are discussed in Section 11.3 of the EASR Volume I and in Volume III.

Table I-5 in Volume II, Appendix I summarizes the comments received following the distribution of the newsletter, which were about requesting or providing property value protection information. A conceptual property value protection plan is described in Section 15.0 of the EASR Volume I.

Table I-6 in Volume II, Appendix I summarizes the comments received following the notice of Open House #5. Generally, the twelve individuals who commented wanted copies of documents, had questions about the EA process, wanted status updates on the decision of the preferred Site and noted geological concerns. Individuals who requested documents were provided copies. Geology, hydrogeology and geotechnical impacts are discussed in Section 11.3 of the EASR Volume I and in Volume III.

### **3.7.7 Comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment**

Comments and questions on the draft EA were received from members of the public and the GRT. No comments were received from Aboriginal communities or stakeholders. Summary tables related to these comments are provided in Volume II, Appendix K. Within these summary tables the issue/concern/question is summarized and Taggart Miller’s response is provided. The public comment table contains cross reference information such that the original comment provided by the interested person can be observed within sub-sections of Volume II, Appendix K.

Overall, the public asked questions about the EA process and structure of the report, and expressed concerns about the assessments of impacts to biology, visual and groundwater and potential for seismic events. Taggart Miller added a seismic reference to the EA and modified the text in response to these comments to add clarity.

GRT agencies (excluding the MOECC) who provided comments on the draft EA included the MTCS, City of Ottawa, SNC and the Conseil des écoles catholiques du Centre-Est. Comments from the GRT members are summarized as follows:

- The MTCS noted that there are no cultural heritage resources in the vicinity of the Site and accepted the Report.
- The City of Ottawa commented on prioritizing diversion over landfilling, service area for the proposed facility, air quality and noise, hydrogeology and geotechnical, land use, leachate, natural environment, natural systems, public health, transportation, socio-economics and surface water/stormwater. The comments requested clarification on items and provided comments related to future approvals that will be required from the City. Some updates to the draft EASR were provided to ensure clarity around some of the City comments and the groundwater monitoring program was amended.
- SNC requested clarifications and questions geared towards understanding the monitoring program and indicated the need for future permits/plans. The monitoring programs were reviewed and modified to provide clarity and the requirements for future permits/plans were acknowledged.
- Conseil des écoles catholiques du Centre-Est reiterated its concern, as was provided during the review of the TOR, about the potential negative effects (odours, dust, environmental impacts) of the project on one of its schools. As described in Section 11.0 of Volume I, the air quality assessment for the Boundary Road Site confirms that the CRRRC will meet MOECC standards at the Site boundary and nearest residential receptors. As such there would be no adverse air quality impacts at the école élémentaire catholique Saint-Guillaume given its distance from the Boundary Road Site.

The MOECC provided comments from the Technical Support Section (hydrogeologist, air quality analyst and surface water scientist), Environmental Approvals Branch (wastewater engineer, senior review engineer, senior noise engineer and special project officer) and the Ottawa District Office. In addition, NRCan provided comments on behalf of the MOECC on seismic-related matters. The MOECC requested additional details or some reorganization within the draft reports. The MOECC also requested additional technical justification for some of the design decisions and monitoring decisions. Additional air and noise assessments were also requested. The degree of certainty in some of the concluding statements on the seismic-related aspects of the project were questioned. Changes were made to the EA in response to these comments to improve clarity. A leachate detection and secondary containment system (LDSCS), shown on Figure 10.8-2, was added to the landfill design. Monitoring programs were amended in response to some comments. The results of the noise assessment were included in the EA.