

MEETING MINUTES



MEETING City of Guelph Waste Resource Innovation Centre Public Liaison Committee Meeting #26

DATE Thursday June 29, 2017

LOCATION Administration Boardroom, Waste Resource Innovation Centre 110 Dunlop Drive, Guelph, Ontario

TIME 6.35 p.m. to 8.16 p.m.

PRESENT Committee Members:
Donna Sunter, (City of Guelph resident), Ken Spira, (City of Guelph resident),
Elected Chair Michael Fortin, (City of Guelph resident),

City of Guelph: Catherine McCausland, David Gordon,

Matt Weissman (Wellington Organix)

Jackie Lamport (MOECC)

REGRETS/
ABSENT Mark Jared (Wellington Organix), Karyn Hogan, (MWA and City of Guelph resident), Bassim Abbassi (University of Guelph), Bill Mullin (City of Guelph resident), Larry Conrad, (City of Guelph resident)

DISCUSSION ITEMS

ITEM # DESCRIPTION	
1	Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest: No disclosures of Pecuniary Interest. David Gordon informed the committee that Bill Mullin had resigned from the committee with immediate effect. The committee thanked him for his effort.
2	Approval of Agenda There were no objections to the agenda from committee members present. No quorum.
3	Approval of March 30 2017 minutes

	There were no objections to the minutes from committee members present. No quorum.
4	<p>Review of Action Items from Previous Meeting:</p> <p>Members of the plc. Did provide comments on the ECA air amendment to the City within the agreed timeframes.</p> <p>2015 annual report questions were discussed. Answers attached to these minutes</p> <p>Plc members did provide the City with ideas about work to be done to the exterior of the subbor building.</p> <p>The City will provide a report to the Clerks department in order to comply with the City "Advisory Committee meeting procedures" dated September 30th 2013. It was discussed that for the future, the committees work would be summarized in the annual report and then a summary of the council term from these reports would go forward to the Clerks Dept.</p> <p>For the current term, David Gordon said he would go through the last few years and pick out some highlights and summarize and bring to the next meeting for committee comment.</p>
5	<p>Delegations wishing to be heard regarding matters on the agenda:</p> <p>None</p>
6	<p>Matters arising from the Delegations:</p> <p>None</p>
7	<p>New Business:</p> <p>a) Organics Facility update on operations.</p> <p>From Monday 27th March 2017 until Friday the 23rd June 2017 the plant has processed 8456.99 tonnes of Source Separated organics.</p> <p>The facility has shipped out 1264.38 tonnes of finished compost in this time.</p> <p>The amount of screening waste from the plastics bin leaving the facility in this time frame is as follows:</p> <p>Screening waste- plastics bin- 117.57 tonnes</p> <p>Screening waste plastics bin as a percentage of incoming source separated organics is 1.39%.</p> <p>There have been zero rejected loads in this time period. Contaminated with blue box material</p>

	<p>Facility has been running taking waste from the City of Guelph and the Region of Waterloo in this 3 month timeframe.</p> <p>b) Overview of odour complaints since March 30 2017 meeting</p> <p>There has been 10 odour complaints on 7 days since the last plc meeting</p> <p>Total incoming material to site</p> <p>The total incoming material to the site in the time period 27th March 2017 to the 24th June was 35804.48 tonnes, the outbound material from the site was 24442.24 tonnes. Taken from Geoware on the 26th June 2017.</p> <p>Spills on site</p> <p>No spills or fires on site in the last 3 months.</p>
8.	<p>Update on bofilter works</p> <p>The City had completed the duct extensions and mist eliminator installation and the Ecolo unit which has been in a temporary position was due to be fully installed on the 30th June 2017.</p> <p>The Ecolo system will work on wind direction.</p> <p>It is hoped these works will correct the acid carry over into the biofilter beds.</p>
9.	<p>Items from Ken Spira</p> <p>Grading of the west side of the east entrance.</p> <p>This was discussed and the plc was informed it was part of some ongoing site maintenance.</p> <p>Shredding machine</p> <p>There was discussion around the shredding machine, Ken thinks it's a great idea but it needs modifying, the City is working on making the operation easier for residents to use and cut down on the bridging.</p> <p>Brush & Yard waste removal requirements from 2 locations.</p> <p>Both piles, at the organics plant and the new pdo area are being cleaned up 2 times per week.</p> <p>Written responses to 2015 annual report questions.</p> <p>Some discussion around these responses, they will be added to the minutes below.</p>

10.	Any other business. Donna Sunter asked about the Detroit contract. Ken gave her the council reports to read.
11.	Next meeting date's Thursday 28th September 2017 at 630pm.
12.	Adjournment Accepted by the committee members present. No quorum Meeting adjourned at 8.16 p.m.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM #	ASSIGNED TO	DUE DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	City of Guelph	Next meeting	To provide a summary of the work of the committee for the current council term (2014-) and bring to the committee for comment.
2			
3			
4			

Re: 2015 Annual Report-Solid Waste Resource Innovation Centre ECA No. A170128

Questions and Comments by Ken Spira-PLC Member July 7, 2016 Q1....

Responses received from Bill Shields September 8, 2016 (In Red)

Follow up on responses September 14, 2016 (In Green), Follow-up from City June 19, 2017. Ken follow up June 20, 2017 (In Blue), One added question June 25/17 Follow-up from City June 28, 2017

Can you please respond to the following questions, concerns and requests to Aecom and the MOECC if applicable so they can be addressed at the next appropriate PLC Meeting?

Q0: Executive summary - Page ii Item 63(8) (j) indicates that a total of 31 odour complaints were received from 39 complainants. Can it be explained how there were more complainants than complaints?

A0: There were 31 odour complaint reports submitted to the MOECC, some of those reports had more than one complainant, the number of complainants was documented in each report.

Can you please respond to the following questions, concerns and requests to Aecom and the MOECC if applicable so they can be addressed at the next appropriate PLC Meeting?

Q 1: Executive summary - Page i Item 63(8)(a): A total of 874 tonnes in 2015, 566 tonnes in 2014, 500 tonnes in 2013 and 257 tonnes in 2012 of waste from the composting process were shipped to landfill. The explanation of the increase from 2012 to 2013 was an accumulation of over's (waste) that was carried into the 2013 year as part of the normal production process. The response regarding 2012 was the plant ran at reduced capacity due to the restart and this accounted for the smaller amount of residue. I was told that 2013 and 2014 were regular operating years which is why they are more consistent.

Can you provide additional details as to why or what is believed to be the cause for the increase in 2015 based on the incoming material going up only 263.45 tonnes (.14%) and the outgoing waste (not including finished compost) going up from 565.96 to 874.34 tonnes, an increase of 308.39 tonnes (54%)? (2013 waste to landfill was 95% higher than 2012, 2014 was 120% higher than 2013 and now 2015 that is up another 54% higher than 2014).

A1: The reason for the residual increase in 2015 was due to the increased efficiencies of our screening process due to the new compost regulations that were implemented in July of 2015.

Follow-up: If I understand your answer correctly, less finished compost is now produced per tonne of incoming organics and a larger percentage is shipped to landfill due to compost regulations by the Province? Can we get a copy of the regulation that is referred to? Has or will the new regulation affected the contract between the operator and the City financially where it will cost the City more money to process its organics to completion including tipping fees at landfill or other final destination of residual waste costs? What are the dates in any contract with the City and the operator of the facility that sets the

rates, are these rates subject to change throughout the contract and if so, what factors trigger the rate change?

A1 follow-up. Discussed to satisfaction of PLC at September 2016 meeting.

June 20, 2017 Ken: Please respond to the following question in writing “*Can we get a copy of the regulation that is referred to? Has or will the new regulation affected the contract between the operator and the City financially where it will cost the City more money to process its organics to completion including tipping fees at landfill or other final destination of residual waste costs? What are the dates in any contract with the City and the operator of the facility that sets the rates, are these rates subject to change throughout the contract and if so, what factors trigger the rate change?*”

A1 explanation from PLC meeting September 2016: The Ontario Compost Quality Standards, dated July 25 2012 (An on-line version of this document can be found at www.ene.gov.on.ca). came into effect on July 1st 2015. These regulations are more stringent in terms of the amount of foreign matter and sharp foreign matter you are allowed in the finished compost. The operator has been duly diligent in removing potential contamination from the system, hence why the residue has increased. The operator pays for the residue as part of the operating contract. There are no dates specific to residual waste costs.

Q 2: Executive summary - Page i Item 63(8)(e): Note that no loads of contaminated organics were rejected in 2012, however there were 25 tonnes of rejected loads in 2013 and 6.7 tonnes in 2014. The answer as to why there was such a big increase in 2013 was “With the cart program introduced to two thirds of the City in 2013, there was an increase in materials that were rejected due to increased contamination”. The final third of the City received their carts in the fall of 2014 and the rejected loads in 2015 went up from 6.7 tonnes to 14.44 tonnes which is a 216% increase or 7.74 tonnes!

Note that the rejected material is localized in only 5 months of the year, May, June, August, September and October. Are there any known reasons for this increase surrounding those months and if so is there an action plan to reduce the waste to landfill? This should be discussed at the PLC as there is a possible link that can be targeted in order to reduce the contaminated loads.

A2: *There are no known reasons for the increase in those months and there are no action plans to reduce this waste as this amount of residual waste is very small in the context of the operation.*

Follow-up: The rejected loads more than doubled in one year and I would say that's significant and that 7.74 tonnes of extra waste being shipped to landfill is not only costly, it is not being very sensitive towards the environment. Not only is the increased contaminated organics being dumped in the landfill but the impact on the environment by the trucks heading to landfill that is much farther away than where the finished compost is being shipped will also have an impact. In reality, is it not the City of Guelph taxpayers that are paying the additional cost to ship the rejected loads of contaminated organics to landfill?

A2 follow-up. Discussed to satisfaction of PLC at September 2016 meeting.

June 20, 2017 Ken: Please respond to the following question in writing “is it not the City of Guelph taxpayers that are paying the additional cost to ship the rejected loads of contaminated organics to landfill?”

A2 explanation from PLC meeting September 2016: No, the operator is not paid a processing fee for rejected loads. There is no additional cost.

Q 3: In 2015, 307.88 additional tonnes (up 54.35% from 2014) of outgoing mixed waste (not including finished compost) including 7.74 additional tonnes of organics rejected material (up 216% from 2014) were removed to the transfer facility for final disposal to landfill. Since I assume that the transfer facility does not have the same odour controls as the composting facility, is it not possible that the increase in public odour complaints from 2 in 2014 to 39 in 2015 could be attributed to the increased volume of material from the composting facility being shipped to the transfer facility?

A3: No

Follow-up: Please explain how this is not possible.

A3 follow-up. Discussed to satisfaction of PLC at September 2016 meeting.

June 20, 2017 Ken: The verbal response at the September 2016 PLC meeting was that the rejected material was removed from the transfer facility on a priority basis, however this was subject to timing and availability of trucking. As long as this material receives top priority to be removed from the transfer facility, and the MOECC is satisfied with what is stored in the transfer facility, the amount and for how long, I have no further questions.

Q4: Executive summary - Page i Item 63(8)(e) makes reference to the rejected loads that were received at the compost building, usually contaminated with recyclable material, however there is no reference of how many rejected loads or tonnes of organic material were unloaded and found at the MRF building. Is the quantity or organics unloaded at the MRF building available and secondly, what is the protocol if bags of organics are found in with the recyclable material?

A4: All material that is received at the Materials Recycling Facility that is not suitable for processing (residual waste) is rejected and sent to the transfer station in bulk for disposal. There are no records kept of the type of residual waste that is rejected. The facility does not receive much source separated organics. If organic residuals are received in the MRF, the sorters pull the material from the line and it is sent to the transfer station for disposal.

Follow-up: Is it not possible to send the organics to the organics facility? Is the entire load of recyclable material rejected or do the sorters deal with it as it goes down the line? If the sorters deal with it, is it not kept separate and then go to the compost building? Since I assume that the MRF building does not have the same odour controls as the composting facility, is it not possible that the increase in public odour complaints from 2 in 2014 to 39 in 2015 could be attributed to an increased volume of organic material in the MRF building?

A4 follow-up. Discussed to satisfaction of PLC at September 2016 meeting.

June 20, 2017 Ken: Please respond to the following question in writing “*Is it not possible to send the organics to the organics facility? Is the entire load of recyclable material rejected or do the sorters deal with it as it goes down the line? If the sorters deal with it, is it not kept separate and then go to the compost building?*”

A4 explanation from PLC meeting September 2016: No, as there is only one residue line for everything. The entire load would not be rejected, the sorters would pull off the bags as required and put them in the residue line. Green bag contamination in the MRF is minimal.

Q5: As per Q4, is organic material also found as a contaminant in the waste stream and if so, what is the protocol if bags of organics are found in with the non-recyclable waste material? Where is it received, where is it stored, how long is it stored and is it a possible source of odours?

A5: *The material is sent to the transfer for disposal where it is shipped out on a regular basis.*

Follow-up: Where is it received, where is it stored, how long is it stored and is it a possible source of odours?

A5 follow-up. Discussed to satisfaction of PLC at September 2016 meeting.

June 20, 2017 Ken: Please respond to the following question in writing “I assume that if organic material is found in the waste stream, that it was found in the transfer building where it was received and that it is just left in that stream and not separated from the non-recyclable waste material to be shipped on a proprietary basis or separated and sent to the organics facility. Please confirm.

A5 explanation: Correct.

Q6: Is there a volume limitation in the C of A on how much organic material can be received at the transfer and MRF buildings and what safeguards are in place to prevent odours from the organic material in those buildings from escaping?

A6: *The site does not keep records of the different types of waste that are received at the transfer station or the MRF. Any and all odorous material received at the MRF or Transfer Station is transported off site on a priority basis.*

Follow-up: Could you be more specific on what time line we could expect a priority basis to be? Is this daily, weekly? Is it possible that odorous material would sit in either the MRF or Transfer Station over a weekend, some being long weekends? Are the odour complaints mainly on the weekends?

A6 follow-up. Discussed to satisfaction of PLC at September 2016 meeting.

June 20, 2017 Ken: Satisfied with the verbal response that organic material received at the MRF or Transfer Station is shipped off site on a priority basis and that it should not be a source of odours.

Q7: Can the PLC be provided with the first 6 months of the 2016 total tonnage of outgoing mixed waste from the compost facility as detailed on page 5 of the annual report (excluding finished compost) that got shipped to the transfer facility, as well as the total odour complaints for the same 6 months?

A7: Yes, these numbers will be provided to the group at the next PLC meeting.

Q8: 1.1 Annual Reporting Requirements Page 3 indicates that condition 63(8) is dealing with the composting site. Can the MOECC comment on this being changed to the waste disposal site, should 63(8) not include the details of the fire at the public drop off area and confirm if all the reporting requirements of 63(8) are to apply to the entire waste disposal site or just the composting building?

A8: MOECC question Note: All reportable spills as defined in environmental legislation are reported to the MOECC.

Follow-up: Waiting MOECC response. Should 63(8) not include the details of the fire at the public drop off area?

MOECC response: Condition 63(8) in ECA A107128 specifically refers to the Composting Site which is defined as: the Organic Waste Composting Site, which is a part of the waste disposal site located at 110 Dunlop Drive in the City of Guelph,

Reporting for other areas of 110 Dunlop are covered in conditions 51 and 52 of ECA A170128, which refer to the Site as the 29.54 hectare Waste Disposal Site (Processing and Transfer) for the purposes of receipt, storage, processing and transfer of waste by composting, waste transfer and multi-material recovery,

The fire is required to be reported to the ministry's Spills Action Centre under ECA Condition 47 (spill/upset), and records would be kept in accordance with Condition 51(a)(ix).

Q9: 2. Composting, Page 5, Table 1: Paper Fiber Sludge has been added to the list of incoming material in October and November totaling 15.41 Tonnes. Can this product be defined in more detail as to what it is, where it came from and what benefit it is to the compost process?

A9: The paper fiber sludge was from Kimberley Clark and brought in on a trial basis and is no longer being received at the facility. Paper fiber sludge is inert material produced from the paper making process. The benefit is that this material can be diverted from landfill.

Follow-up: If this material is inert and can be diverted from landfill, why is it no longer being received at the facility? Can more details be provided about the thought process of bringing this material in and what was behind the decision to stop?

A9 follow-up. Discussed to satisfaction of PLC at September 2016 meeting.

June 20, 2017 Ken: Please respond to the question in writing.

A9 explanation from PLC meeting September 2016: It was a trial. The company in question did not want to proceed. The thought process about bringing it in was to potentially increase throughput in the plant.

Q10: 2.2 page 5 indicates that there were no spills in 2015, however there was a fire in a public drop off bin. I thought it was discussed at a PLC meeting with Kevin Noll from the MOECC and that he requested that fires be reported as a spill?

A10: *All spills that are required to be reported are in fact reported.*

Follow-up: Could the MOECC confirm if or if not, fires such as the one in the public drop off bin are to be reported as a spill?

A10 follow-up. Discussed with MOECC and will report all fires as spills to the PLC at each meeting going forward.

Q11: 2.3 on Page 6: Can copies of all letters sent to the complainants be given to the PLC and in the future, can the letters be emailed to all PLC members shortly after being delivered to the complainant? (these can be edited so that the complainants names or addresses are not listed)

A11: *No, a summary of all complaints received are documented in the annual report.*

Follow-up: The summary of all complaints in the annual report provides very little information and more information would help the PLC contribute to be a part of a solution instead of being in the dark! Could the summary be expanded with additional information that would assist the PLC?

A11 follow-up. More information will be provided at the PLC meetings. There are issues around privacy for what personal information can be released, this was discussed at the September 2016 PLC meeting.

Q12: 4.1 page 11 indicates that the floor drain in the loading ramp is pumped & cleaned every three weeks. How and where is this material disposed of?

A12: *The material and liquid is sucked up by a vacuum truck. The solids are disposed of through the transfer station and the liquid is disposed of in the sanitary sewer system. The liquid collected in the oil/water separator is disposed of at a licensed facility (Safety-Kleen).*

Follow-up: Could the MOECC comment on the disposal of the solids through the transfer facility as it relates to a possibility of odours.

A12 follow-up. Question for the MOECC.

MOECC response: You would manage this waste in the same manner as any other solid waste, with any applicable odour management measures. The ECA speaks to odour management in several conditions, including Condition 14 – Site Operations, Condition 21 – Odour, or Condition 46 - Complaints. If odours are caused by the management of solids, the City would have to address the problem.

Q13: 5.2 Summary of wastes..... page 19: Is the reference to table 6 supposed to be to table 4?

A13: *Correct it should be Table 4 not Table 6.*

Q13B: Also stated is that tonnages will not be equal as some mass is lost through evaporation and processing and that the compost facility would be excluded due to heavy moisture content. Could this be explained in more detail such as are the outbound scales repaired? How does this impact the diversion rates since 2012 compared to what was documented in the annual reports?

A13B: *The outbound scales have been repaired.*

Compost materials accepted at the site consists mainly of mixed organics (household/kitchen organic waste such as fruit and vegetables, teabags, coffee grounds, leftovers, etc.) as well as brush, mulch and paper fiber sludge. These organic materials will generally have a higher moisture content when they are accepted at the site. With holding time and processing, the organics will lose moisture through evaporation. The incoming moisture content and moisture loss cannot be calculated as it will be quite variable. As such, we have re-calculated the mass balance from 2012 (when the compost operation was commissioned) to-date that excludes the compost facility.

As for the diversion rate, it should not be affected as the compost facility has not historically been included in the calculation of diversion. 100% of the compost facility inbound materials are diverted since all accepted mixed organic materials are converted to finished compost. The diversion rate is calculated by:

Diversion rate (excluding yard waste) = Incoming for Transfer Station and WRIC (128,292 tonnes) – Outgoing MSW from Transfer Station (65,080 tonnes)/Incoming (128,292 tonnes) x 100 = 49.3%.

Incoming from Transfer Station from Table 2 = Overall Site Total (136,226 tonnes)

Minus Transfer Station yard waste from Table 2 (12.49 tonnes)

Minus Transfer Station brush from Table 2 (2.03 tonnes)

Minus WRIC brush from Table 2 (1892.44 tonnes)

Minus WRIC leaves from Table 2 (2226.29 tonnes)

Minus WRIC yard waste from Table 2 (3800.85 tonnes)

Therefore, Incoming for Transfer Station and WRIC (128,292 tonnes) Minus Outgoing MSW from Transfer Station, the Yearly Total from Table 3 (65,080 tonnes)

Results in a diversion rate of 49.3%, as presented in the 2015 Report.

Previous reports calculated the diversion rate using the same methodology. Therefore, the mass balance of incoming and outgoing materials has no impact on the methodology used in calculation of the diversion rates and percent diversion presented in previous reports are unchanged.

Q14: Page 20 top line indicates “table 5”, is this not to be table 3?

A14: *Correct it should be Table 5 not Table 3.*

Q15: There are references to “current surrounding land use” and “former surrounding land use”. Can Aecom please provide a more detailed meaning to these two referenced land uses in laymen’s terms?

Note: In the February 7, 2011 letter to Bill Shields from Lynnette Latulippe of the MOE regarding the 2009 annual report, she says "This site has been out of agricultural activity for at least 15 years and residual contamination from that activity, particularly in stormwater runoff should be negligible." This statement was made in response to the 2009 annual report and five years later, the same comments are being made about former surrounding land use. I would have hoped that no more pointing to former surrounding land use would be made after 2009, however it is and I would like to see that reference removed in the future if it is not relevant. ***Please have the MOECC comment on this item.***

A15: *As discussed at the PLC meeting in January, the MOECC did provide a comment from the Groundwater Technical reviewer on the nitrate found at the site. In their response it was noted that nitrates continue to exist across the site and as such it is now most likely related to the current surrounding land use. Further discussed at the meeting was that former land use was used in the past related to the much higher nitrate concentration observed, however, over the past 10 year these concentration have decreased, in some case significantly, to the concentrations observed today, although they are still elevated. It was agreed at the PLC meeting that the term "Former Land use" would no longer be used and the term "Current Surrounding Land Use" be used as an explanation for the nitrate that continues to persist to day across the site as per the MOECC response. As discussed in the annual reports, nitrate is not considered to be related to operation at the site and is observed in background as well as downgradient of the site.*

Although, the term former land use was corrected for groundwater in the current annual report, it was still referenced in the surface water section. This will be corrected in the next annual report.

MOECC response: Nothing further to add to the above response.

Q16: Page 39, second paragraph: Can the MOECC confirm if the comment regarding the B-7 Guideline being in place to assess groundwater leaving the site for protection of downgradient users and that also goes on to say there are no downgradient well users as the surrounding area is municipally serviced mean that the B-7 Guideline is irrelevant?

I believe that there are downgradient well users and would like to see a map showing all existing wells in the area. Can the MOECC also confirm that there are or are not wells located downgradient of the site? This area is within the wellhead protection area, the Grand River Source Protection area and rated high 8-10 for vulnerability based on the final groundwater and surface water vulnerability report (Aquaresource, 2010) and should mean that the B-7 Guideline would be more than relevant for this site.

A16: *As discussed at The PLC meeting in January, both AECOM and the MOECC confirmed that B-7 Guideline is required to be applied at the downgradient property boundary. This guideline is a trigger in place for the protection of groundwater use downgradient of a landfill or landfill related activities, therefore, if any exceedance deem related to these activities occurs it would require further investigation to determine if remedial measures are required. Should there not be any current downgradient groundwater user in the area, then no immediate environmental threat would be expected. However, should any exceedance related to the site activities continue to persist and show increasing trend, additional investigations would then need to be initiated to again determine if remedial measures are required.*

In the annual report it was stated “There are no downgradient well users as the surrounding area is municipally serviced”, indicating it would be assessed as per the second part of the discussion above. There was no intent to state or infer it was irrelevant.

As for water wells north of the site, there are three identified in the MOECC water well database that would be inferred to be in this area, of which two (6701023 and 6701024) were abandon and sealed in 1962. These are shown on the attached Figure 4, which was included in the 2009 Annual Report. The remaining well (6701016) drilled for the reformatory in 1962, although north of the site, is most likely not downgradient with respect to groundwater, based on the geology of the other two wells, the depth of this well and actual location of the well. Further, based on the observation to the north, it is also most likely that the well is not being used, if it still exists.

Follow-up: I believe that there are downgradient well users and would like to see a map showing all existing wells in the area including private wells.

A16 follow-up. The City does not have a map of all wells that are off the City site.

Q17: On page 45, it was noted in paragraph one that the majority of the stock piles of soil have been removed from the site. I do not believe this to be a true assessment and would like to see the records of how many tonnes were received at the site compared to how many tones were removed. I also believe that much of that soil was used in the development of the new public drop off area and would like to know how many tonnes were used in that project. This soil was brought in from all over the City and could be the source of unknown sources of detections in the water sampling. Could the PLC discuss the recommendation by AECOM to discontinue the organic groundwater sampling program with the MOECC reviewer?

A17: All of the contaminated material found in soil pile storage area was dug out and transferred to an approved site. No material from that storage area was used at the new public drop off area. Assessment of the inorganic and organic water quality results to date does not indicate this fill material has had an effect on the groundwater beneath the site. As these results clearly indicate there is no impact to the groundwater, there is no reason to continue with the organic groundwater sampling at this location. At this time, the MOECC has not responded to the request to discontinue the organic groundwater sampling program. As to the PLC discussing the City’s request to discontinue organic groundwater sampling at the well near the soil pile with the MOECC, the City would recommend that you table this discussion at a PLC meeting.

Follow-up: We were told at the PLC that a great deal of the soil was going to be used at the new public drop off area and it was one of the factors that would bring the project in on budget. Either way, the comment on page 45 that says “the majority of the stock piles of soil have been removed from the site” should be removed or changed to say that the contaminated soil has been removed from the sight as I still believe that most of the stock piles are still there. The soil may be the source of unknown sources of detections in the water sampling and it is important that the MOECC and other consultants are aware that it is still there.

A17 follow-up. The City has no further comment.

June 20, 2017 Ken: I will revisit this item with my review of the 2016 Annual Report.

Q18: Section 9, Public Liaison (PLC) Activities: Could the PLC provide a list on an annual or meeting to meeting basis of activities that they feel relevant to be included in the annual report?

A18: *The PLC can provide information to the City which would be considered when completing the annual report.*

Q19: 10.2: As requested by the MOECC at a previous PLC meeting, the MOECC would like to be notified of any fires at the WRIC and reported as a spill. Could any plans in place such as the spills handling and reporting procedures, fire safety plan and emergency plan be changed to reflect this request and a copy of the modified plans distributed to the PLC?

A19: *The PLC will be notified of site fires at the quarterly meetings.*

Follow-up: Could any plans in place such as the spills handling and reporting procedures, fire safety plan and emergency plan be changed to reflect this request and a copy of the modified plans distributed to the PLC?

A19 follow-up. The City will not be updating the plans to reflect this request but will continue to report them to the PLC on a quarterly basis.

Q20: 12. Conclusions, page 51 composting site (b): can the wording “and rejected loads” be added to the 2nd sentence?

A20: *Section b on page 51 does not have anything to do with material that has been rejected on the tipping floor (rejected loads). This section is referring to residual waste removed from the screening of the compost from the different stages of the composting process.*

Follow-up: This section is the conclusions of the composting site and since a) is the total tonnage of organic waste received and b) is what was shipped to the transfer station.

Did the rejected loads get included in the 19,584 tonnes that were received?

Did the rejected loads get included in the total 874 shipped to the transfer station?

I would think that they were included in the tonnes received and if they were not included in what was shipped to the transfer station, they should have been and thus the wording should be changed.

A20 follow-up. No, rejected loads do not get included in the amount of tonnes that are processed, rejected loads are not included in the screening waste or the residual compost waste totals either.

Q21: 12. Conclusions, page 51 Operations (a)(b)(c): Were these numbers reflective of the outgoing scales not reading correctly (light) and was the income from outgoing materials affected by the outgoing scale reading light?

A21: *The numbers are reflective of that provided in the tables and reported in Section 5.*

Follow-up: Were these numbers reflective of the outgoing scales not reading correctly (light) and was the income from outgoing materials affected by the outgoing scale reading light?

A21 follow-up. The scales should not be reading light, and are calibrated and certified by measurements Canada on an ongoing basis.

June 20, 2017 Ken: Page 19 states “The City stated that there was recently an issue identified with outbound scales. The weigh scale foundations were “floating” causing misalignment. The scale service company suggested that the scale was weighing lighter on the outbound materials than the inbound materials.” Repeated question: Were these numbers reflective of the outgoing scales not reading correctly (light) and was the income from outgoing materials affected by the outgoing scale reading light? When were the scales fixed?

A21 follow-up: If it is noticed there is an issue with the scales, the scale company is called in with 24 hours to correct it. The numbers will be reflective of any scale errors but the error factor will be marginal.

Q22: Surface Water Monitoring pg 53(a): Can we get more details on what o-cresol is, where it could be coming from and if it is a health risk?

A22: O-cresol is commonly found in coal tar. There are no health effects for low levels of cresol which was observed in the background surface water station. The concentration observed was below the Provincial Water Quality Objects of 1 ppb ($\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$) at 0.51 ppb, which is just above the laboratory detection limit of 0.5 ppb.

Follow-up: Was there any o-cresol in any of the contaminated soil that was removed from the soil piles?

A22 follow-up. There are numerous analytical results from soil samples that were obtained from the sites where the fill was obtained and from the actual fill piles at the Stone road location. There were never any results that were reviewed that indicated any O-cresol. In any event, the low levels of O-cresol found in the off-site pond is not downstream from the soil pile and could not have originated from that area.

Questions and Comments by Dona Sunter-PLC Member July 26, 2016

Q1: I see that the reason for elevated nitrates in water samples has changed from former agricultural practices to historic uses when measuring the same test well. Does the city think a highly motile compound applied so that crops then weeds would take up the nitrates for growth would remain in the same spot for 40 years? I see that the report contradicts itself in a number of places by saying elevated nitrates are caused by surrounding land uses. Can you explain this?

A1: See answer to Q15 above for the explanation of the terminology used for presences of nitrate currently observed across the site. Groundwater quality results and results collected at the background surface water station in the pond near the corner of Dunlop and Watson continue to indicate that nitrate is found in the area. As stated in the reports, the current, nor the more elevated nitrates in the past, are considered to be from site operations. The actual source of the historical or the current nitrate is unknown but as stated in the reports is most likely related to either former (historical) land use or from current surrounding land use.

Q2: When this site was being considered for a Wet Dry facility concern was expressed by a number of people about sodium chloride and degreasers from trucks on the site and roads busier because of the site would result in sodium chloride leaking into the environmentally sensitive aquifer. The city replied " this would absolutely not happen". Why is it now accepted that road salt is the reason for increased sodium chloride in test samples?

A2: *We cannot comment on what was stated before the facility was built, but road salt effects are common in urban areas. Currently road salt effects are observed from Stone Road, Dunlop Dr, Watson Parkway and on-site.*

Q3: There is a comment that down gradient well users are only a concern for the city and there are not any in the area. I don't know about well users north and east of the site and the municipal well on the NE corner of Watson and York was closed due to contamination. This comment does not give well users south of Stone and on Skyway Drive confidence when we have been given different "expert" opinions on bedrock water flow and there is surface water, overburden, three aquifers and our water unlike the city water is not tested several times a day. We were also told the city has no interest in the safety of well water users. Is this the reason for this comment?

A3: *With respect to the operation of the WRIC, the City is responsible for potential effect to groundwater downgradient of the site as per MOECC regulations. Groundwater flow at the site was originally interpreted to be in a northerly direction based on the initial hydrogeological assessment completed in 1991. Since 1997, a similar interpretation was assessed using the monitoring network at that time. Based on comments from the MOECC groundwater technical advisor, additional geological drilling and monitor installation were completed in 2001 and 2008 to better assess the groundwater flows across the site to confirm where B-7 Guideline compliance should be applied. As requested by the MOECC, a further hydrogeological assessment was completed in the 2009 Annual Report, using the most up to date information and it was confirmed that the groundwater flow follows the local subsurface geology to the north. This interpretation was accepted by the MOECC and in 2011, a new compliance monitor was installed at the northern property boundary to now apply the B-7 Guideline. It is our understanding that no other studies have been completed at the site proper that have inferred a different groundwater flow direction locally.*

Q4: Dr. Laird told residents in the area the city had agreed to the MOE requirement that the site would operate at less than one odour unit. With 39 odour complaints in 2015, has this commitment been met?

A: Yes

Q5: I do agree with the report that elevated levels of iron, zinc and phenols in water samples should be investigated and believe this is a good project for a site claiming to be innovative in the Guelph Innovative District.

A: *Thank you for your suggestion, however concentration of iron and zinc in the groundwater is still very low in the parts per million (mg/L) range and this would not be feasible.*