

**AGENDA**  
**A meeting of the Council of the Corporation**  
**of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands**  
**to be held on Tuesday, October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2020**  
**Electronic Format at 7:00 p.m.**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Approval of Agenda**
- 3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest & General Nature Thereof**
- 4. Minutes of Previous Meeting**
  - i. Confirming By-Law 2020-45
- 5. Manager Reports**
- 6. Old Business**
- 7. New Business**
  - i. 2019 Landfill Monitoring Report
  - ii. Gary Green – Concerns with Waterfront and Marina operations
  - iii. Lions Club request – Haweater weekend
- 8. Correspondence**
- 9. Minutes and Other Reports**
  - i. Mayors update
  - ii. Manor Minutes – September 17, 2020
- 10. Adjournment**

**THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF  
NORTHEASTERN MANITOULIN AND THE ISLANDS**

**BY-LAW NO. 2020-45**

Being a by-law of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands to adopt the minutes of Council for the term commencing December 4, 2018 and authorizing the taking of any action authorized therein and thereby.

WHEREAS the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001, c. 25, s. 5 (3) requires a Municipal Council to exercise its powers by by-law, except where otherwise provided;

AND WHEREAS in many cases, action which is taken or authorized to be taken by a Council or a Committee of Council does not lend itself to an individual by-law;

NOW THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF NORTHEASTERN MANITOULIN AND THE ISLANDS ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. THAT the minutes of the meetings of the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands for the term commencing December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018 and held on:  

October 20, 2020

  
are hereby adopted.
2. THAT the taking of any action authorized in or by the minutes mentioned in Section 1 hereof and the exercise of any powers by the Council or Committees by the said minutes are hereby ratified, authorized and confirmed.
3. THAT, where no individual by-law has been or is passed with respect to the taking of any action authorized in or by the minutes mentioned in Section 1 hereof or with respect to the exercise of any powers by the Council or Committees in the above-mentioned minutes, then this by-law shall be deemed for all purposes to be the by-law required for approving and authorizing the taking of any action authorized therein or thereby or required for the exercise of any power therein by the Council or Committees.
4. THAT the Mayor and proper Officers of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands are hereby authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to the recommendations, motions, resolutions, reports, action and other decisions of the Council or Committees as evidenced by the above-mentioned minutes in Section 1 and the Mayor and Clerk are hereby authorized and directed to execute all necessary documents in the name of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands and to affix the seal of the Corporation thereto.

READ A FIRST, SECOND AND THIRD TIME AND FINALLY PASSED THIS  
27<sup>th</sup> day of October 2020.

Al MacNevin

Mayor

Pam Cress

Clerk

**The Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands**  
**Minutes of meeting held Tuesday, October 20th, 2020**  
**Electronic Format at 7:00p.m.**

**PRESENT:** Mayor Al MacNevin. Councillors: Barb Baker, Al Boyd, Laurie Cook, Mike Erskine, William Koehler, Bruce Wood. Jim Ferguson and Dawn Orr

**STAFF PRESENT:** David Williamson, CAO  
Pam Cress, Clerk  
Duane Deschamps, Fire Chief  
Gary May, Manager of Public Works  
Reid Taylor, Manager of Community Services

Mayor MacNevin called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**Resolution No. 275-10-2020**

Moved by: J. Ferguson

Seconded by: B. Wood

RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands approves the agenda as presented.

Carried

**Resolution No. 276-10-2020**

Moved by: A. Boyd

Seconded by: J. Ferguson

RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands reads a first, second and third time and finally passes by-law 2020-44, being a by-law to adopt the minutes of Council for the term commencing December 4, 2018 and authorizing the taking of any action authorized therein and thereby.

Carried

**Resolution No. 277-10-2020**

Moved by: M. Erskine

Seconded by: B. Wood

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands authorizes Dave and Dan Love to remove trees and do work on the shoreline road allowance located in front of their property described as Sheguiandah Con 13, Lot 16 under the direction of the Manager of Public Works.

Carried

**Resolution No. 278-10-2020**

Moved by: B. Wood

Seconded by: J. Ferguson

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands proceeds In Camera in order to address a matter pertaining to personal matters about an identifiable individual, including municipal or local employees and litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the municipality or local board.

Carried

**Resolution No. 279-10-2020**

Moved by: M. Erskine

Seconded by: B. Koehler

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands does now Rise and Report.

Carried

**Resolution No. 280-10-2020**

Moved by: D. Orr

Seconded By: B. Wood

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Council of the Corporation of the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands does now adjourn at 7:40 pm.

Carried

Al MacNevin Mayor

Pam Cress Clerk

Prepared By:



---

## Town of Northeastern Manitoulin And The Islands (NEMI)

### Annual Monitoring & Operations Report (2019) NEMI Waste Disposal Site MECP Certificate of Approval No. A612014

GMBP File: M-1594

May 2020

---



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. GENERAL SITE OPERATIONS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3. SITE LIFE EXPECTANCY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. RECYCLING/WASTE REDUCTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. SUMMARY OF GEOLOGIC SETTING .....</b>	<b>5</b>
5.1 Topography .....	5
5.2 Overburden Soils .....	6
5.3 Bedrock .....	6
<b>6. SUMMARY OF HYDROGEOLOGIC SETTING .....</b>	<b>6</b>
6.1 Shallow Groundwater Flow System .....	7
6.2 Intermediate Groundwater Flow System .....	7
6.3 Deep Groundwater Flow System .....	8
6.4 Vertical Gradients .....	8
6.5 Summary and Implications .....	9
<b>7. MONITORING .....</b>	<b>9</b>
7.1 Sampling Requirements .....	9
7.1.1 Groundwater .....	9
7.1.2 Surface Water .....	10
7.1.3 Leachate Management .....	10
7.2 Sampling Procedures .....	13
7.3 QA/QC .....	13
7.4 Determination of Action Levels .....	14
7.4.1 Background Water Quality .....	14
7.4.2 Calculation of Objective Levels .....	15
<b>8. LEACHATE CHARACTERIZATION .....</b>	<b>15</b>
8.1 Leachate Quality Data .....	16
8.2 Leachate Indicator Parameters .....	16
8.3 Leachate Containment .....	17
8.4 Short-Term Use of Infiltration Trenches .....	17
<b>9. WATER QUALITY RESULTS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
9.1 Water Quality – General Water Chemistry .....	18
9.1.1 Leachate Impact Assessment - Downgradient Monitoring Wells .....	18
9.1.2 RUC Compliance at Property Boundaries .....	19
9.2 Water Quality - Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) .....	22
9.2.1 VOC Leachate Indicator Parameters – Leachate Historical Results .....	22
9.2.2 Detection of VOCs in Groundwater .....	23
9.2.3 VOC Distribution and Concentration Trends in Groundwater .....	23

9.2.4	Potential Source of VOCs along the Eastern Property Boundary .....	24
9.3	Downgradient Bedrock Well – Former Mountainside Homes Property .....	26
9.4	Surface Water Quality.....	26
10.	<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>27</b>
11.	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>28</b>

## TABLES

Table 1	Summary of Monitoring Locations and Well Details
Table 2	Summary of Monitoring Requirements
Table 3	Summary of Duplicated RPD Analysis Results
Table 4	Determination of Reasonable Use Criteria
Table 5A	Summary of Groundwater Quality Results – Shallow Monitoring Wells
Table 5B	Summary of Groundwater Quality Results– Intermediate Monitoring Wells
Table 5C	Summary of Groundwater Quality Results– Deep Monitoring Wells
Table 6	Summary of Volatile Organic Compound (VOC) Detections in Groundwater
Table 7	Summary of Surface Water Quality Results

## FIGURES

Figure 1	Site Location Plan
Figure 2	Existing Features Plan
Figure 3	Groundwater Contour Plan (Spring 2019) – Shallow Unit
Figure 4	Groundwater Contour Plan (Spring 2019) – Intermediate Unit
Figure 5	Groundwater Contour Plan (Spring 2019) – Deep Unit
Figure 6	Landfill Base Contours and Cell Development Sequence
Figure 7	Proposed Final Contour Plan
Figure 8	Summary of 2019 and Historical BTEX Concentrations in Groundwater

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL NO. A612014 & AMENDMENTS

APPENDIX B: CORRESPONDENCE

APPENDIX C: CROSS-SECTIONS

APPENDIX D: HISTORICAL GROUNDWATER ELEVATION DATA

APPENDIX E: HISTORICAL GROUNDWATER QUALITY ANALYTICAL RESULTS (TABLES & GRAPHS)

APPENDIX F: HISTORICAL SURFACE WATER QUALITY ANALYTICAL RESULTS (TABLES & GRAPHS)

APPENDIX G: HISTORICAL LEACHATE QUALITY RESULTS

### ENCLOSED INFORMATION DISC:

Borehole logs

Laboratory Analytical Results

- Groundwater
- Surface Water
- Leachate

---

**ANNUAL MONITORING & OPERATIONS REPORT (2019)**  
**TOWN OF NORTHEASTERN MANITOULIN AND THE ISLANDS (NEMI)**

**MAY 2020**

**GMBP FILE: M-1594**

---

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The NEMI waste disposal site is located at 9571 Highway 6, approximately two kilometres south of the community of Little Current. It is situated on Part of Lots 13 and 14, Concession XI, in the former Township of Howland in the Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands (NEMI), District of Manitoulin (herein referred to as 'the Town'), as shown in Figure 1. The waste disposal site is owned and operated by the Town. Operations are conducted under the Ministry of the Environment Conservation and Parks (MECP) Provisional Certificate of Approval (C of A) for a Waste Disposal Site No. A612014 issued January 6, 2000 and amended in August 2001, October 2004, September 2006, and October 2007. Copies of the C of A for the site and the amendments are provided in Appendix A.

The MECP has approved a useable area of approximately 6.1 hectares (15 acres) for landfilling within the 54.6 ha (135 acre) waste disposal site. The remaining area is devoted to buffer area, waste receiving, and the stormwater collection and management system. Landfilling at the site was initiated on October 24, 2002. The approved capacity of the site, as described in the Plan of Development and Operations (PDO), is 364,500 m<sup>3</sup> for waste and daily cover material (prior to final cover).

In 2014, the Town obtained the east adjacent property, formerly known as the Mountainside Homes property, which is identified as Parts 1 to 3 on Plan 31R-2185 and Plan 31R-2424. The additional municipally owned lands comprise a total site area of 6.3 hectares (15.47 acres) and represent additional downgradient lands that extend in an easterly direction to the right-of-way for Highway 6. Due to the acquisition of this additional downgradient property, the former Mountainside Homes well, which was previously considered to be in a downgradient offsite location, is no longer a potential receptor. Since there is no longer a downgradient offsite receptor immediately adjacent to the landfill property, it is our understanding that the Town is currently evaluating their on-going operations for the waste disposal site pertaining to the future progression of development. **To further evaluate the progression of development and the attenuation capacity of the Site, it is recommended that the additional downgradient lands (i.e., former Mountainside Homes property) be registered to the landfill property as buffer lands and that the existing Environmental Compliance Approval be amended to recognize the additional landfill buffer lands.**

Condition 47 of the C of A requires that an operations and monitoring report be submitted by June 1st of each year to summarize the previous year's operations, waste quantities, and monitoring results. This report is submitted to meet the annual monitoring and operations reporting requirements specified under Condition 47 of the C of A for the NEMI Waste Disposal Site. Condition 47 (c) to (g) specify that the annual reports should include the following:

- (c) a drawing(s) indicating all groundwater, surface water and gas monitoring locations;
- (d) tables outlining monitor locations, analytical parameters sampled, and sampling frequency;
- (e) an analysis and interpretation of the surface water, groundwater, leachate and gas monitoring data; a review of the adequacy of the monitoring programmes; conclusions of the monitoring data; and recommendations for any changes in monitoring programmes that may be necessary;

In December 2016, a hydrogeological assessment was conducted by GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. (GMBP) in support of a transition of the current waste disposal site to a natural attenuation site. From comments received as

part of MECP correspondence dated January 30, 2017, the MECP agreed that the Site conditions are considered suitable for operation as a natural attenuation Site. See correspondence provided in Appendix B. As such, this report is also being submitted to provide additional details required to facilitate the transition to an approved natural attenuation Site.

Based on the MECP correspondence and hydrogeological review, a primary component of the natural attenuation site will be to establish new background monitoring wells, new compliance wells, and re-calculate the Reasonable Use Criteria (RUC) for the Site based on the updated background conditions. These requirements have been completed and are presented herein. Additionally, an updated Design and Operations Report was prepared and submitted for MECP approval to support the application for an amendment to the existing Environmental Compliance Approval (A612014) for the Site. At this time, the updated Hydrogeological Assessment, Design and Operations Plan are pending MECP approval.

## 2. GENERAL SITE OPERATIONS

Landfilling at the NEMI waste disposal site began in October 2002, subsequent to the closure of the Town's Howland (i.e. Green Bay) and Little Current Waste Disposal Sites. The NEMI landfill and recycling facility services the Town, including the First Nation lands contained within the geographic boundaries of the Town. The waste approved to be received at the site for disposal is restricted to Municipal Waste, which includes solid non-hazardous wastes and dewatered sewage sludge.

The Municipality provides waste collection services to the residents of Ward Two (Little Current) on a weekly basis and bi-weekly curb side blue box pick-up of recyclables. All other residents within the Town are required to drop off their garbage and recyclables at the landfill site.

The operating hours at the site are Tuesday and Saturday from 9am to 3pm. Between the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sunday in May and the 3<sup>rd</sup> Sunday in October, the landfill is open Sunday from 2 pm to 6 pm. A site attendant is present during operating hours. The current site hours are within the limits outlined under Condition 10 of the C of A.

Activities that currently occur at the NEMI waste disposal site include: waste disposal, collection of recyclable materials and white goods, and stockpiling of scrap metals, tires, brush, and construction materials. The landfill collects waste on-site in the domestic waste reception area (2 bins) and holding area (6 bins). There are 6 additional bins in the recycling reception and holding area. An Existing Features Plan is provided in Figure 2.

### 3. SITE LIFE EXPECTANCY

Based on a review of municipal information provided by the Town, the following table provides a general summary of the estimated volumes of waste received at the Site on a monthly basis:

Month	Estimated Volume Received (m <sup>3</sup> )
January	307*
February	307*
March	307*
April	307*
May	307*
June	307*
July	307*
August	307*
September	307*
October	307*
November	307*
December	307*
<b>Annual Total:</b>	<b>3,684 m<sup>3</sup></b>

The above noted monthly averaged estimates provided by the Town are based on the number of loads of waste received at the Site and the permissible volume of each load. The above noted total represents the estimated volume of waste received and does not account for the placement of daily and/or final cover.

According to the PDO for the site, the approved capacity of 364,500 m<sup>3</sup> (prior to final cover) would provide the Town with a 40-year life-span. Based on the current year's capacity determination survey and volumetric calculations prepared by Keatley Surveying Limited (Keatley), conducted on April 14, 2020, the estimated volume of waste and daily cover landfilled since April 30, 2019 was 5,652 m<sup>3</sup>, which is generally consistent with historically measured volumes at the site and is consistent with the above noted monthly and annual volume of waste received at the Site. A summary of the projected and actual volumes of waste received at the Site since landfilling operations were initiated is provided below:

YEAR	# OF DAYS IN OPERATION	PROJECTED VOLUME (m <sup>3</sup> as per PDO)	ACTUAL VOLUME (m <sup>3</sup> )	% OF PROJECTION
2002	68	1,225	1,114	90.9
2003	365	6,677	5,981	89.6
2004	365	6,784	6,408	94.5
2005	365	6,894	5,094	73.9
2006	365	7,007	4,769	68.1
2007	365	7,124	5,240	73.6

YEAR	# OF DAYS IN OPERATION	PROJECTED VOLUME (m <sup>3</sup> as per PDO)	ACTUAL VOLUME (m <sup>3</sup> )	% OF PROJECTION
2008	365	7,243	4,050	55.9
2009	365	7,362	8,312	112.9
2010	365	7,486	3,764	50.3
2011	365	7,611	5,028	66.1
2012	365	7,739	6,749	87.2
2013	365	7,874	6,083	77.3
2014	365	8,012	5,463	68.2
2015	365	8,153	5,382	66.0
2016	365	8,299	4,260	51.3
2017	365	8,447	4,360	51.6
2018	365	8,599	5,101	59.3
2019	365	8,756	5,652	64.6
<b>TOTAL</b>	--	<b>131,292</b>	<b>94,414</b>	<b>71.9</b>

The above noted totals are based on annual topographic surveys of the active landfilling area and the refuse pile, which are completed by Keatley. It is our understanding that topographic surveys and volumetric determinations have been conducted by Keatley on an annual basis since initiating landfill operations at the Site in 2002. Correspondence provided by Keatley is presented for reference in Appendix "B".

The resultant total volume of waste and cover material deposited at the site since the commencement of operations in 2002 equals 94,414 m<sup>3</sup>. At the present rate of landfilling, it appears that there is reasonable assurance that the anticipated life span will be met or exceeded since the actual rate of waste disposal has consistently been less than the projected rate of waste disposal that was initially estimated in the PDO.

#### 4. RECYCLING/WASTE REDUCTION

Currently, a recycling depot is maintained at the waste disposal site for the collection of paper, corrugated cardboard, boxboard, glass, metal food and beverage containers, and plastics (HDPE and PET). With the exception of glass, the Town contracts with Municipal Waste and Recycling Consultants (MWRC), located in Blind River, to pick up recyclable materials on a weekly basis. Recyclable goods that are not accepted as part of the blue box program, such as scrap metal, tires, used propane tanks, waste electrical and electronic equipment (WEEE), and vehicle batteries are stockpiled and hauled from the landfill site as required. Clean, dry wood waste is also chipped on an as required basis to further reduce the volume of waste entering the landfill.

Based on the municipal records provided by the Town, the following quantities of recyclables were diverted from the landfill during the reporting period:

- Onsite Recycling Program (aluminium, metals, plastic) – 45.91 tonnes
- Corrugated Cardboard and Fibre Collection (newsprint) – 116.04
- Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) - 13.14 tonnes
- Tires – none
- Wood Waste Chipped –none
- Glass – 0.6 tonnes

The above noted totals are generally consistent with previous annual totals. It is important that the Municipality continue to remove stockpiles of recyclable goods on a regular basis to further reduce the volume of waste entering the landfill, to prevent clutter, and to maintain an aesthetically acceptable site.

## 5. SUMMARY OF GEOLOGIC SETTING

The geologic conditions at the NEMI landfill site have been extensively reviewed as part of previous investigations at the Site and surrounding area. The conditions were presented in the hydrogeologic study for the site prepared by Burnside Environmental (January 1999) as part of the supporting documentation for the EPA Part V application for the landfill. The geologic conditions at the NEMI landfill site were further evaluated using geologic mapping (Chapman and Putnam, 1984) and available borehole logs. Geological properties are summarized in the borehole logs prepared by various other consultants, which are provided within the appendices presented on the enclosed data disc.

In previous correspondence from the MECP (January 2012, Appendix B), some clarification was requested with respect to the borehole logs provided. It is noted that clarification of the borehole logs has been provided in Table 1 of the reports. In order to ensure this Table is available upon review of the borehole logs by the reviewer, this table has been added to the borehole logs provided on the enclosed data USB. The monitoring wells at the Site were previously installed by various other consultants, and therefore, the associated borehole logs were also completed by others. As previously noted, although several attempts have been made to obtain a borehole log for well BH5A, a log for this well does not appear to be available at this time. In addition, borehole BH2-05 reportedly represents well BH2 as the original well had been damaged and was replaced by a similar monitoring well in 2005, as noted in Table 1.

Key findings of the geologic setting, as provided in the earlier annual reports prepared by Trow (2006 and 2007) and Terraprobe (2005), are summarized below. A summary of the monitoring well locations and well details is provided in Table 1. Additional investigations with respect to the geology of the area were conducted using information from the Ontario Geological Survey (OGS) Open File Report 6191 – An Updated Guide to the Subsurface Paleozoic Stratigraphy of Southern Ontario.

### 5.1 Topography

Manitoulin Island is part of the Niagara Escarpment and forms a flat tableland area which is primarily characterized by shallow soil cover overlying flat-lying limestone and shale. The southwestern portion of the 54.6 ha waste disposal site is situated on an elevated plateau above the tableland areas of Manitoulin Island. As shown on Figure 2, a steep slope bisects the property from the northwest to southeast corners and slopes downward to the gently sloping tablelands that characterize the northeastern portion of the property. As previously reported, the Town obtained the former Mountainside Homes property in 2014, which is located in the lower tablelands to the east of the Site. The additional municipally owned lands represent an additional 15.47 acres of downgradient property and additional attenuation capacity.

Landfilling at the site occurs on the elevated plateau. Within the landfill footprint, the area is gently sloping to the east and northeast, as shown on the cross-sections provided in Appendix C (prepared by others). Maximum relief across the property is approximately 40 meters. However, maximum relief across the approved landfill footprint is approximately 1 m. A small creek, which flows in an easterly direction, is located approximately 300 metres to the south of the approved landfill footprint. A deeply incised valley is situated in the northwestern portion of the property.

## 5.2 Overburden Soils

Based on previous reports, the overburden soils on the elevated plateau and steep slopes generally consist of silty loam. The overburden below the plateau, associated with the tablelands, is reported to consist of lacustrine silty clay to fine sandy silt deposits from glacial Lake Algonquin.

Subsurface investigations on the property encountered glaciolacustrine clayey silt to silty clay deposits with occasional fractures. In general, coarser grained soils were noted on the western portion of the property grading to finer grained soils on the eastern portion of the property within the tablelands. From west to east across the property, soils were observed to grade from sandy silt overlying silt and clay within the elevated plateau to silty clay and clay within the lower tablelands. The overburden on the elevated plateau was observed to have a thickness of approximately 2 m. The overburden thickness associated with the tablelands was slightly greater, typically within the range of 3 to 5 m.

## 5.3 Bedrock

The overburden at the property is predominantly underlain by bedrock of the Georgian Bay Formation, which is characterized by greenish to bluish grey shale, interbedded with limestone, siltstone and sandstone (OGS Open File Report 6191). The Blue Mountain Formation (previously assigned to the middle and upper members of the Whitby Formation), consisting of blue-grey to grey-brown shales with thin, minor interbeds of limestone and siltstone, is inferred to underlie the overburden on the eastern portion of the property. Both formations consist of shales with variable amounts of limestone, siltstone and sandstone interbeds. The shales are generally non-calcareous, whereas the sandstones and siltstones are commonly calcareous.

Consistent with a review of the geologic mapping, borehole logs from the area indicate that the bedrock on the property is most commonly described as grey shale. The bedrock surface is weathered and fractured. Drilling into the bedrock on the plateau identified that relatively competent bedrock was encountered at depths ranging from 11 to 16 metres below ground surface (bgs).

## 6. SUMMARY OF HYDROGEOLOGIC SETTING

Based on the findings of the Hydrogeologic Studies conducted by Burnside Environmental (January 1999) and GM BluePlan Engineering Limited (GMBP) (December 2016), there are no major aquifer systems in either the overburden or the bedrock in the vicinity of the site. The characteristic glaciolacustrine clayey silt to silty clay soils on the plateau are of low to moderate conductivity. Consistent with these findings, slug tests conducted by Terraprobe determined that the average hydraulic conductivity in the overburden was  $3 \times 10^{-7}$  m/s [9.4 m/yr]. Within the bedrock, the rate of groundwater flow would be variable, depending on fracture size (i.e., aperture) and density. However, based on the slug test(s), an average hydraulic conductivity of  $4 \times 10^{-9}$  m/s [0.13 m/yr] was determined for the bedrock. In general, the hydraulic conductivity decreases with depth. It should be noted that slug test analysis results were obtained from summaries provided in Annual Reports prepared by others. Slug test analysis results conducted on supplemental monitoring wells MW-15, MW-16S, and MW-16D for the purpose of the 2016 Hydrogeological Study by GMBP are consistent with previously reported hydraulic conductivity values for the intermediate and deep hydrogeological units. Results presented are considered to be consistent with the characteristics of the units described in the borehole logs and publications.

In previous reports, the groundwater flow pattern has been divided into three different systems; shallow, intermediate, and deep. This division was based on an assessment of the borehole depths, screened intervals,

soil descriptions, and historical groundwater quality data. A summary of the monitoring well details, including a division of the wells into each separate flow system, is provided in Table 1. An on-going assessment of the flow pattern and groundwater quality will continue in future annual monitoring reports based on their established designations within these units.

Groundwater level measurements are collected bi-annually in conjunction with the established monitoring program. Groundwater flow maps for each differentiated flow system, provided in Figures 3, 4, and 5, were developed using the spring water level measurements. A review of past groundwater contour plans and the fall groundwater elevation data indicates that the flow patterns depicted using the spring data are representative of the typical groundwater flow directions at the site. A summary of the historical groundwater elevation measurements is provided in Appendix D. Characteristics of each unit and the associated groundwater flow patterns are summarized below. In general, the groundwater flow patterns and vertical and horizontal gradients calculated are consistent with those historically presented.

## 6.1 Shallow Groundwater Flow System

The shallow groundwater system is monitored from a network of monitoring wells typically screened from 0.7 to 4.3 meters below ground surface (mbgs). The screened interval of these wells is typically situated within the overburden, with some screens extending into the shallow weathered bedrock. Review of historical and background groundwater quality indicates that the water quality in this unit is affected by both precipitation and ambient groundwater flow conditions. Constituent concentrations are typically lowest in these wells.

Consistent with historical results, the groundwater within the shallow unit at the site flows somewhat radially to the north, northeast, and east. The horizontal hydraulic gradients range from 0.001 to 0.024 on the plateau in the area of the approved landfill footprint. Along the steep slopes, hydraulic gradients range approximately 0.01 along the southern property limit and to the north between BH8B and BH10.

The shallow groundwater flow system “pinches out” to the east along the tablelands due to the decreasing thickness of the overburden toward the east (i.e., becomes part of the intermediate system).

## 6.2 Intermediate Groundwater Flow System

The intermediate groundwater flow system is monitored from a network of wells screened within the weathered shale and/or limestone, with some of the screened intervals extending upward into the overburden or downward into the competent bedrock. The screened intervals range from 3.5 to 10.8 mbgs. The groundwater flow direction is inferred to be generally to the north and northeast. With the exception of the area around BH5, the horizontal gradients range from approximately 0.001 to 0.02 on the plateau to approximately 0.03 across the steeply sloping area to the east of the landfill footprint.

The intermediate groundwater flow system in the eastern tablelands is considered to extend throughout the weathered shale to the interface of competent shale bedrock.

### 6.3 Deep Groundwater Flow System

The deep groundwater flow system is monitored by a network of 4 monitoring wells screened within the more competent bedrock. The depths of the well screens range from 12.3 to 18.4 mbgs. Groundwater flow appears to be to the east and northeast, with a horizontal gradient of between 0.02 and 0.03 on the elevated plateau and approximately 0.01 across the steeply sloping area.

### 6.4 Vertical Gradients

Vertical hydraulic gradients between the shallow, intermediate and deep wells were calculated for several locations. A Table summarizing the calculated gradients using the water level measurements from the current monitoring year is provided below.

WELL ID	INTERVAL	SPRING 2019	FALL 2019	DIRECTION OF VERTICAL GRADIENT
MW1-98 (S to I)	SI	0.81	NA (S was dry)	Downward
MW1-98 (I to D)	ID	0.90	0.93	Downward
MW5-98 (S to I)	SI	1.27	1.07	Downward
MW5-98 (I to D)	ID	0.88	0.96	Downward
MW6-98 (S to I)	SI	0.33	0.12	Downward
MW6-98 (I to D)	ID	0.32	0.59	Downward
BH4 (B to A)	SI	0.10	0.85	Downward
BH6 (B to A)	SI	0.16	0.53	Downward
BH8 (B to A)	SI	0.03	NA (B not found)	Downward
BH12 (A to B)	SI	0.12	0.02	Upward
BH13 (A to B)	ID	0.53	0.61	Downward
MW-16 (I to D)	ID	0.01	0.003	Upward
MW-19 (S to I)	SI	1.02	NA (S was dry)	Downward
MW-19 (I to D)	ID	0.038	0.10	Downward

In general, the vertical gradients between the overburden (shallow), shallow weathered shale (intermediate), and more competent bedrock (deep) units are best represented by the MW-series, as the screened intervals at these locations have the greatest degree of vertical separation. Historically, the most significant gradients have typically been observed near the steep slope between the elevated plateau and the lower tablelands. Minor and periodic upward gradients have been measured between the shallow and intermediate (SI) units at wells BH-4, BH8, and BH12. These are attributed to the fact that both the shallow and intermediate wells are screened, to some degree, within the weathered shale unit and their location near the base of the slope.

Since the installation of the MW-16 and MW-19 series wells, vertical hydraulic gradients have been measured in these wells. Overall, a relatively high downward hydraulic gradient between the shallow and intermediate units has been observed. However, a minor upward hydraulic (0.02 to 0.05) has been observed between the intermediate and deep bedrock units at each of these locations. Vertical gradients will continue to be monitored in each of the noted wells to verify the recorded gradients and to assess the long-term trends.

## 6.5 Summary and Implications

A detailed review of the groundwater flow characteristics, including the groundwater flow directions, and the vertical and horizontal hydraulic gradients, was conducted to assess the groundwater flow regime at the site. This information can be used to evaluate the various factors influencing groundwater quality within each hydrostratigraphic unit.

Consistent with the low hydraulic conductivities reported for the overburden and bedrock units, high vertical gradients were noted at the majority of the well nests. The implications of the flow regime at the site are that in the overburden, leachate impacts would likely be limited to the vicinity of the landfill due to the low hydraulic conductivity (K) of the overburden soils and the downward gradients. Potential leachate impacts to groundwater in the intermediate and deep units, typically associated with the weathered and fractured bedrock, would likely have a component of horizontal migration through the fractures and bedding planes. Therefore, key monitoring locations are considered to be those wells situated within the overburden in the vicinity of the landfill and within the intermediate and deep hydrostratigraphic units located further downgradient (i.e., to the north and east) of the landfill.

Based on this assessment, the most critical factors affecting natural groundwater quality in each unit are as follows:

Hydrostratigraphic Unit	Groundwater Quality – Influencing Factors
Shallow	Precipitation, surface water run-off, ambient groundwater quality within overburden clays
Intermediate	Ambient groundwater quality within weathered bedrock and downward migration of groundwater from the shallow unit
Deep	Ambient groundwater quality within competent shale bedrock. Increased residence time within this unit. Downward migration of groundwater from the intermediate unit.

The implications of the flow regime on groundwater quality are considered in more detail in Section 9.0 of this report.

## 7. MONITORING

### 7.1 Sampling Requirements

#### 7.1.1 Groundwater

The NEMI Landfill site is monitored by a network of 39 groundwater monitoring wells installed at 23 separate locations throughout the landfill site, as shown on Figure 2. Monitoring wells BH1 through BH10 were installed by Marshall Macklin Monaghan Limited in 1988, monitoring wells/well nests MW1-98 through MW6-98 were installed by Burnside Environmental in 1998, BH2 was re-installed by Terraprobe in 2005, well couplets BH12 and BH13 were installed by Terraprobe in 2006, monitoring wells MW-14, MW-15, MW-16S and MW-16D were installed by London Soil Test Ltd. (LST) in 2016 to support a Hydrogeological Study for the site, and MW-17, MW-18, MW-19S, MW-19I, and MW-19D were installed by LST in 2017 as per requirements outlined in MECF correspondence (January 30, 2017). Monitoring well BH1 was reportedly decommissioned by the Town in 2007.

Currently, groundwater samples are collected from all 39 monitoring wells located on the landfill property. As per Schedule B of the C of A, the monitoring network was sampled three times per year between 2003 and 2007 and bi-annual sampling commenced in 2008 and was to continue until 2012. Starting in 2013, Schedule B of the C of A indicates that groundwater sampling can be reduced to once every two years, odd-numbered years only, for the comprehensive list of parameters. **Although this reduced groundwater sampling frequency is outlined in the C of A, the MECP has recommended that sampling be conducted at a minimum of twice annually in the spring and fall.** A list of the parameters sampled during each sampling event is provided in Table 2. Historical summaries of the groundwater monitoring results and trend graphs are provided in Appendix E.

### 7.1.2 Surface Water

Schedule B of the C of A states that surface water monitoring at the site is to consist of monitoring from a network of five locations (SW-1 through SW-5) twice annually, in the spring and the fall, and during two storm events. The surface water sampling locations, as shown on Figure 2, are as follows:

- SW-1: Beaver Pond – upstream of landfill
- SW-2: Creek adjacent to landfill – flowing east
- SW-3: Stream east of the site beneath bridge on Highway 6 – flowing east
- SW-4: Extended detention wet pond
- SW-5: Pond at main entrance to landfill

Required surface water sampling parameters, as per Schedule E of the C of A, are summarized in Table 2. A summary of the historical surface water sampling results are provided in Appendix F.

Since frequent and/or quick access to the site by a qualified consultant is difficult for many reasons, sampling during storm events is not considered practical. **Based on the limitations imposed by the location of the site, it is recommended that the surface water sampling program be revised from twice annually and during storm events to three times annually in the spring, summer and fall. It is also proposed that the list of parameters be revised to better correlate with those required for groundwater and leachate monitoring. This would include the removal of phenols from the indicator list and barium, cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, zinc and phenol from the comprehensive list (i.e. for SW-4).** Based on MECP correspondence dated January 6, 2012, it is our understanding that this recommendation has been forwarded to the Surface Water Technical Support Section for further review and approval.

### 7.1.3 Leachate Management

Based on a review of the Plan of Development and Operations completed by R.J. Burnside & Associates Limited (Burnside), and the *As Constructed* drawings provided for Cell 1 of the landfill, the Cell was designed by Burnside and constructed in consultation with the MECP. The Cell reportedly consists of a compacted clay base that was designed to provide a sufficient separation distance between the bottom of the cell and the shallow groundwater table. The floor of Cell 1 was reportedly compacted, inspected, and tested throughout the construction period. Additionally, the sidewalls of the Cell were reportedly constructed with a bentonite and clay liner. Based on this design and construction of the Cell, which was inspected and approved at the time of the initial site development, there is considered to be limited hydraulic connectivity between the leachate within Cell 1 and the shallow groundwater flow system. This appears to be further supported by the leachate levels measured at the manhole prior to and after recirculation operations where the leachate level is drawn down during recirculation operations but recovers to a consistent level once pumping has ceased.

Based on information provided by the Town, leachate re-circulation efforts were initiated in April and were completed periodically on an as-required basis until mid-November. The procedure for re-circulation of the leachate was to pump the leachate from the manhole onto the top of the active waste area and permit it to evaporate or infiltrate into the cell. Leachate flows were calculated by documenting the pump times and measuring the flow rate, which was determined to be at approximately 40 gallons per minute. The monthly leachate flow volumes measured by Town staff during the current reporting year indicate that the volume being pumped and recirculated is generally consistent with recent years. Quarterly measured leachate levels in the manhole were not available for review at the time of the issue of the report. The measured totals provided by the Town are summarized in the following Table:

#### **LEACHATE FLOW MEASUREMENTS**

<b>Month Measured</b>	<b>Recirculated Leachate Flow Volumes (Cubic Metres)</b>	<b>Leachate Level (Metres Below Top of Manhole Lid)</b>
January	0	-
February	0	-
March	0	-
April	0	-
May	43.6	0.00
June	50.9	-
July	43.6	-
August	47.3	0.10
September	40.0	-
October	46.4	0.13
November	0	-
December	0	-
<b>Annual Total:</b>	<b>271.8</b>	<b>Average level: N/A</b>

Based on the reported leachate level measurements that have been collected at the leachate collection manhole to date, the average measurement of the leachate within Cell 1 appears to be about 0.99 metres (39") below the top of the manhole. The elevation of the top of the manhole is 228.75, which equates to an approximate leachate elevation of 227.76 within the landfill footprint at the general location of the manhole. Since the measured depth to the leachate within the manhole is commonly much greater, this elevation is considered to represent an estimate of the average seasonal high leachate elevation within the Cell. Based on the measured groundwater elevations in the adjacent shallow monitoring wells (MW6-98S, BH-3, and BH-5A), the elevation of the leachate surface in the refuse pile is approximately 0.75 to 2.2 metres lower hydraulically than the groundwater elevations in the monitoring wells located to the south and west of the refuse pile (i.e., hydraulically upgradient monitoring locations). Therefore, should any leakage, or a component of minor radial flow occur out of the clay and bentonite lined cell, the flow of leachate would be consistent with the direction of the measured groundwater flow (i.e., north and east) and would be measured within the existing network of monitoring wells. Quarterly leachate level measurements will continue to be collected for future monitoring programs to confirm the leachate elevation in the cell.

In addition to the designed clay and bentonite cell floor and walls, a perimeter leachate collection system was constructed in 2002 as part of the landfill design. The system consists of sloped and graded contours that direct leachate within the cell toward granular side slopes, filter fabric, and a leachate collection manhole. At this time, leachate is periodically circulated between the manhole (MH) and the top of the refuse pile. According to the C of A, any monitoring wells situated within the waste filled area are also to be considered as leachate monitors. Currently, there are no monitoring wells installed in the waste filled area. Therefore, leachate sampling is only conducted from the Manhole (designated MH). However, monitoring wells BH-4A/4B and BH-2 are situated immediately adjacent to, and downgradient of, the current landfilled area and the perimeter leachate collection area. Therefore, should there be any radial flow from the constructed Cell, a review of analytical results from these downgradient monitoring locations would provide additional leachate characterization data.

The C of A requires that:

- Leachate samples are to be collected annually from monitors within the waste filled areas and from the collection manhole. These samples should be analyzed for the Comprehensive List of leachate parameters, as outlined in Table 2;
- Leachate samples be collected monthly from the manhole and analyzed for the Indicator List of leachate parameters (Table 2);
- Leachate levels be monitored on a quarterly basis;
- The leachate flow volume be measured during re-circulation between the manhole and the collection pond; and
- The perimeter of the waste area along the side slopes be inspected on a monthly basis after waste fill occurs above ground level.

Based on concurrence from the MECP regarding recommendations made in previous Annual Reports (January 6, 2012 correspondence enclosed in Appendix B), monthly monitoring from the manhole is conducted by trained Township staff unless it can be conducted by a qualified consultant in conjunction with the groundwater and surface water monitoring programs for the site. Therefore, during the current monitoring year, leachate samples were collected by GMBP personnel in May, July, and October. Additionally, the comprehensive sampling event was completed by GMBP staff as per comments provided by the MECP. Historical summaries of the leachate quality sampling results are provided in Appendix G.

As per MECP correspondence dated January 30, 2017, it was noted that the leachate sampling schedule from the manhole can be decreased from monthly to quarterly according to the recommendations made in previous annual monitoring reports. **In order to maximize the sampling conducted by a qualified consultant, it is recommended that three of the quarterly samples be collected by a qualified consultant in conjunction with the groundwater and surface water monitoring programs, and one sample be collected in January by trained Township staff.** This results in the following leachate sampling/monitoring schedule:

Monitoring Description	Sampling Frequency	Personnel
Leachate Levels	Quarterly: January, April, July, and October	Township Staff
Flow Volumes	Monthly	Township Staff
Leachate Seep Inspections	Monthly	Township Staff
Quarterly Leachate Sampling	January – Indicator List	Township Staff
	Spring – Comprehensive List	GMBP
	Summer and Fall – Indicator List	GMBP

Inspections for leachate seeps were reportedly completed monthly by Town staff as required by the Certificate of Approval. The Town reports that there continues to be no evidence of leachate seepage identified during any of the monthly inspections. In the short-term, the Town plans to continue the re-circulation procedures from the manhole back to the active working face of the landfill. Leachate holding tanks were previously installed at the Site in 2008 by JI Enterprise. The approved holding tanks would be used to store leachate for trucking to an approved treatment facility if a time comes when re-circulation is no longer effective at controlling leachate accumulations.

## 7.2 Sampling Procedures

For the groundwater sampling, the static groundwater level and well depth are measured in each monitoring well. Each monitoring well is then purged of three casing volumes of stagnant water or until dry, whichever is first. After purging, monitoring wells are allowed to recharge with fresh groundwater before sampling occurs. Groundwater purging and sampling is conducted using dedicated Waterra™ tubing and inertial-type pumps. As per the C of A, the pH and conductivity is measured in the field at each sample location.

Surface water samples are collected by submerging the appropriate sample container into the water body and removing the container when a sufficient volume of sample has been collected. During collection, contact with the bottom of the well is avoided to prevent stirring-up sediment. When collecting surface water samples, direct dipping of the sample bottle is completed unless the bottle contains preservative. For those samples requiring preservative, a clean unpreserved bottle is used to obtain the sample at each location, and then it is transferred into the appropriate preserved bottle. Field parameter measurements, such as the temperature, pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, and flow are measured and recorded at the time of sampling.

Leachate samples are collected from the manhole using a dedicated bailer. The bailer is lowered into the manhole and the sample is transferred directly into the laboratory provided containers. Samples collected by the Town for analysis of the selected metals are placed in unpreserved laboratory supplied containers. Filtering and the addition of the lab-preserved occur prior to analysis.

Samples are kept chilled following completion of the sampling program and sent within 24 hours of the sampling event to Maxxam Analytics Inc. (Maxxam) of Mississauga for analysis. The laboratory Certificates of Analysis are included on the appended USB.

## 7.3 QA/QC

The Relative Percent Difference (RPD) was calculated to determine the variance between the actual sample and the replicate sample using the following equation:

$$RPD = \frac{(\text{sample result} - \text{duplicate result}) \times 100}{(\text{sample result} + \text{duplicate result}) \div 2}$$

Values which exceed a RPD of 20% are considered 'unacceptable'. Only one duplicate (BH-5A : COD) was reported to have an "unacceptable" RPD (54.5%) in the fall 2019 sampling event. In the spring sampling, all analytes compared were considered to be within the 'acceptable' range. Since the samples are replicates (i.e., collected in succession), an element of natural variability will exist and the variability observed may be attributable to this sampling methodology as opposed to laboratory controls. Consequently, it is recommended that true duplicate samples be collected to further evaluate the laboratory analysis. A summary table showing the monitoring results for these samples and the associated RPD values is provided as Table 3.

## 7.4 Determination of Action Levels

MECP Guideline B-7 establishes the basis for determining what constitutes the reasonable use of groundwater on properties adjacent to landfill sites. By applying the Reasonable Use Concept (RUC), the potential use of groundwater for domestic consumption will usually provide the lowest allowable concentration limits. MECP Procedure B-7-1 provides technical details for the application of the reasonable use approach. A change in quality of groundwater on an adjacent property, where the reasonable use is determined to be for drinking water, will be acceptable only where:

- i) Quality is not degraded by more than 50% of the difference between background concentrations and the Ontario Drinking Water Standards for non-health related parameters; and,
- ii) Quality is not degraded by more than 25% of the difference between background concentrations and the Ontario Drinking Water Standards for health related parameters.

Background concentrations are considered to be the quality of the groundwater prior to contamination from landfill activities.

### 7.4.1 Background Water Quality

The groundwater quality within each of the three hydrostratigraphic units varies significantly due to the flow regime at the site and the different geochemical characteristics associated with the silt/clay overburden and shale/limestone bedrock. As a result, background groundwater quality within each unit has been evaluated separately. Available historical data, collected from wells MW6-98S, MW6-98I and MW6-98D between 2003 and the spring of 2008, were used to calculate the average groundwater concentrations for leachate indicator parameters. More recent data collected from these monitoring locations is generally consistent with historical data. Background concentrations within each unit are presented in Table 4.

Previously, according to the MECP correspondence (dated January 22, 2008); the nested monitoring wells at MW6-98 were established as the background well for the site at a January 11, 2008 site meeting with MECP personnel. However, as was indicated in the correspondence, if monitoring from these wells indicates that groundwater is flowing towards this well location from the landfill footprint, a new suitable background well will need to be established. Water level measurements continue to indicate that the MW6-98 well nest is situated hydraulically upgradient of the landfill footprint and is representative of background conditions.

As per the MECP correspondence dated January 30, 2017, a new set of background monitoring wells were recommended in the areas of BH-8A/B, BH-9, and BH-10 in order to replace the MW6-98 series wells that have historically been used as background groundwater monitoring wells. This is noted to be due to the proximity of MW6-98 to the proposed landfill footprint. In response to the MECP recommendations, in September 2017, three new background monitoring wells were installed in the overburden, weathered bedrock, and competent bedrock (MW-19S, MW-19I, MW-19D, respectively) near the foot of the slope of the landfill west-northwest of the proposed landfill footprint to be used as the new background groundwater monitoring wells. The locations of the new background wells are presented in Figure 2.

In general, groundwater at the site is very highly mineralized with the concentrations of conductivity, TDS, COD, hardness, chloride, sodium and iron generally increasing with depth. Slight increases with depth in the concentrations of ammonia and TKN were also noted (i.e. from an average of approximately 1 mg/L in the shallow unit to approximately 40 mg/L in the deep unit). Alkalinity concentrations, which were highest in the shallow unit, do not exceed 350 mg/L in the background wells. In general, concentrations of BOD, DOC, and total phosphorus were consistently low in all the background wells.

Background groundwater quality within the deep unit is notably poor. The relatively high sodium, chloride, ammonia, and TDS concentrations are likely caused by natural salt brines associated with the carboniferous-shale bedrock.

The MW6-98 series of monitoring wells were previously used as the background monitoring locations for use in calculating the Reasonable Use Criteria due to the availability of monitoring data from all three units identified. As discussed, moving forward, the newly installed background monitoring wells (MW-19S, MW-19I, and MW-19D) will be used to characterize the background groundwater quality in each of the hydrogeological units and to re-calculate the RUC for the Site. It should be noted that, at this time, there are several other monitoring locations situated upgradient from the active fill area. These wells include BH3, BH5A, BH5B, BH6A, BH6B, and BH7. Due to the variability of the data, these wells are also used as a reference for background groundwater quality in addition to the comparison to the RUC.

Based on a review of the analytical findings available since the late 1990's (and pre-dating the operation of the landfill), it should be noted that a typical leachate plume has lower concentrations of characteristic indicator parameters than seen in each of the geologic units. Given that the purpose of the Reasonable Use Guidelines is to not permit further degradation of the groundwater on adjacent properties, a leachate plume with significant indicator concentrations would be required to further degrade the groundwater quality at the site.

#### 7.4.2 Calculation of Objective Levels

Table 4 identifies the concentrations of groundwater quality indicator parameters used for evaluating the acceptable level of contaminant concentrations at the site boundary. Background concentrations (Cb) are the site-specific values (discussed in the previous section). The Provincial maximum allowable concentrations (Cr) are identified in the Ontario Drinking Water Standards (ODWS). Acceptable concentrations at the site boundary (Cm) are calculated from MECP Procedure B-7-1 using the following formula.

$$C_m = C_b + x(C_r - C_b)$$

Where:

C<sub>m</sub> = Maximum concentration acceptable in groundwater beneath an adjacent property.

C<sub>b</sub> = Background concentration.

C<sub>r</sub> = Maximum concentration that should be present in groundwater for domestic consumption according to the Ontario Drinking Water Standards (ODWS).

x = 0.5 for non-health related parameters (AO and OG) and 0.25 for health related parameters (MAC and IMAC).

AO = Aesthetic Objective

OG = Operational Guideline

MAC = Maximum Acceptable Concentration, Parameters Related to Health

IMAC = Interim Maximum Acceptable Concentration, Parameters Related to Health

To determine if leachate is impacting groundwater, individual indicator parameters were evaluated in conjunction with other indicator parameters and concentration trends. Wells with elevated and stable concentrations of the identified naturally elevated constituents, that show no increases in other leachate indicator parameters, are deemed unimpacted by landfill leachate. Additionally, known leachate impacted groundwater is compared to the groundwater chemistry at locations with naturally elevated concentrations to determine if leachate is contributing to the elevated concentrations that have been measured.

## 8. LEACHATE CHARACTERIZATION

Leachate is produced when surface water percolates down through refuse resulting in impacted water that has the potential to migrate along the surface or in the ground. Landfill derived leachate that enters into the surface water and/or groundwater is often attenuated by natural mechanisms along the water migration pathway. The attenuation of leachate can occur by dilution, biologic activity, and geochemical mechanisms.

## 8.1 Leachate Quality Data

Currently, leachate monitoring is conducted at the manhole (MH). Monthly leachate monitoring is typically conducted by Township staff, however for comparative purposes, sampling is conducted by GMBP personnel three times annually in conjunction with the groundwater and surface water sampling programs. In addition to the monthly leachate sampling, the annual comprehensive leachate sampling event is also conducted by GMBP personnel at the time of the annual sampling programs. As discussed, as per the January 30, 2017 MECP correspondence, the monthly leachate sampling schedule has been reduced to a quarterly sampling schedule. Historical summaries of the leachate quality sampling results are provided in Appendix G.

As noted in previous MECP correspondence, there is a considerable degree of data variability associated with the sample results from the manhole. A discussion regarding the amount of data variability associated with the manhole data was provided in follow-up correspondence (dated April 6, 2010) from GMBP (formerly G&M) to the Town. A summary of the correspondence is provided below.

The manhole provides catchment for (i) leachate generated within the used portion of Cell 1; (ii) stormwater that falls in the unused portion of the active cell; and (iii) stormwater that falls onto waste that has been covered and capped with clayey soils. In the event of significant precipitation, including a thaw/snowmelt event or a storm event, the introduction of non-contact run-off into the system would take place. Should sampling at the manhole be conducted shortly after such an event, the analytical results would logically represent a more dilute form of landfill leachate.

Based on discussion with Town staff and receipt of operational updates regarding the progression of waste placement, it is our understanding that waste placement in Cell 1 is no longer occurring. As a result of the progression of landfill operations to above-grade waste placement operations within the Cell 2, the active area and adjacent refuse pile will be sloped and graded to promote runoff of precipitation and reduce the volume of non-contact surface water that was previously entering the waste Cell.

It is our understanding that the adjacent Cell 2 development and construction has been completed as per the approved Cell 2 design specifications due to the progression of waste placement and the remaining airspace capacity. It is noted that the leachate monitoring program specified in Table C.1 of Schedule "C" of the Certificate of Approval specifies that additional leachate monitors are required to be installed between Cells 1 and 2 as landfilling progresses. To address this requirement, two additional leachate monitoring wells (MW-17 and MW-18) were installed between Cell 1 and Cell 2 in September 2017. The locations of the new leachate monitoring wells are presented in Figure 2.

## 8.2 Leachate Indicator Parameters

As part of the ongoing data review, an analysis of the leachate quality and comparison to the background groundwater quality at the site was conducted. Based on our assessment and in consideration of the MECP correspondence dated January 22, 2008 (Comment 6 and 7) and April 6, 2010 (Comment 2), the list of leachate indicator parameters includes the following:

- Alkalinity, ammonia, total phosphorus, iron, chromium, TKN, BOD, COD, and DOC

### 8.3 Leachate Containment

As previously reported, several provisions with respect to the design, development and operations at the NEMI landfill site have been made to prevent and/or limit leachate migration from the approved 6.1 ha landfill area. Measures that have been taken to limit leachate migration from the landfill area include the following:

- The landfill base and sidewalls are lined with an engineered liner constructed to meet the required base hydraulic conductivity of  $1 \times 10^{-7}$  m/s to  $5 \times 10^{-8}$  m/s for the design of the site. This was completed to prevent leachate migration into the underlying bedrock unit;
- Leachate is further controlled by a designed leachate collection system that directs leachate to a manhole where leachate is recirculated by pumping from the manhole onto Cell 1 to encourage evaporation. In 2008, leachate holding tanks were installed to provide leachate collection and subsequent off-site disposal, so as to prevent leachate from infiltrating into the bedrock unit; and
- Additional operational measures have been taken to minimize leachate production within the active Cell. These include proper sloping, improved daily covering provisions, progressive closure of landfilled areas, and minimization of the size of the active working area. No further waste placement is occurring in Cell 1 and landfill operations have progressed to above-grade landfilling of Cell 2, Phase 1.

As discussed, from comments received as part of MECP correspondence dated January 30, 2017 in response to the December 2016 Hydrogeological Assessment was conducted by GM BluePlan Engineering Ltd. (GMBP) in support of a transition of the current waste disposal site into a natural attenuation site, **the MECP has agreed that the Site conditions are considered suitable for operation as a natural attenuation Site.** Therefore, this report is also being submitted to provide additional details required to facilitate the transition to an approved natural attenuation Site for future phases of landfill development.

### 8.4 Short-Term Use of Infiltration Trenches

According to the Operations and Design report for the landfill, leachate collection and handling/treatment was not expected to be needed until landfilling progressed above grade (which was estimated to be 5 to 10 years after landfilling began) or if recirculation efforts became excessive (i.e. the pumping of leachate from the manhole back into Cell 1). However, based on a review of the 2003 Annual Report, it was indicated that the volume of water in Cell 1 was greater than anticipated.

As a result, temporary infiltration trenches were excavated in the upgradient portion of the site and leachate was circulated from the manhole and Cell 1 into the upgradient infiltration trenches. Reportedly, this practice occurred between the summer of 2003 and early 2005, with no pumping or circulation operations completed during the winter periods. Based on the information available, the historical infiltration trenches that operated for a limited period of time would likely have provided the main source of leachate migration into the subsurface.

## 9. WATER QUALITY RESULTS

To determine the presence or potential impacts from leachate, several indicator parameters are monitored, and a trend analysis is conducted to determine changes in water quality over time. The following sections discuss the potential impacts to groundwater both on-site and leaving the property boundaries and discuss compliance with the Reasonable Use Criteria. To evaluate potential impacts, several different points of reference were used for comparison including:

1. May 1998 – analytical data prior to initiating landfill operations (as available);
2. Comparison to RUC values;
3. Comparison to groundwater quality in all background monitoring wells;
4. Evaluation of long-term analytical trends at each monitoring location; and
5. Comparison of the suite of elevated parameters to the leachate indicator parameters, as established in Section 8.2 of this report.

The following sections discuss potential impacts to groundwater downgradient of the active landfill area, the potential impacts to groundwater leaving the property boundaries, and compliance with the Reasonable Use Criteria. The analysis for the presence/absence of leachate-derived impacts to groundwater includes an evaluation considering only the general water chemistry, which includes the metals, natural organic, and inorganic analytes, and a separate evaluation regarding the current and historical VOC and petroleum hydrocarbon results. The groundwater quality results (General Water Chemistry only), including a comparison to the RUC, are summarized in Tables 5A, 5B, and 5C for the shallow, intermediate, and deep units, respectively. Historical groundwater sampling results and graphical trends of indicator parameters are included in Appendix E. A summary of the VOC detections and concentrations in groundwater is provided in Table 6.

## 9.1 Water Quality – General Water Chemistry

### 9.1.1 Leachate Impact Assessment - Downgradient Monitoring Wells

Several RUC exceedances were noted in the downgradient groundwater wells that are monitored. However, as previously established by several consultants and acknowledged by the MECP, many of the analytes monitored occur naturally and concentrations of the inorganics and metals have been highly variable in both the upgradient and downgradient monitoring locations.

Based on the groundwater flow direction and the relative location of the landfill area to the wells monitored, it is anticipated that any leachate that was to leak through the landfill liner, or leachate associated with the short-term implementation of the infiltration trenches, would be first observed at monitoring wells MW1-98S, MW1-98I, MW1-98D, BH-4A, BH-4B, and BH2. An evaluation of the groundwater quality at these locations is provided below.

#### Shallow Monitoring Wells

Monitoring wells BH2 and BH-4B are located approximately 1 metre downgradient of the limit of the landfilled area. Therefore, the analytical findings for these wells are expected to provide additional leachate characterization data.

Analytical data from the current reporting period for BH-2 indicate elevated concentrations of nitrate that are not consistent with historical values and the long-term trend. The source of these elevated parameters is currently unknown. However, ongoing monitoring of this well will determine whether these values are anomalous or part of a more long-term trend. The long-term elevated parameters measured in BH-2 suggest that leachate migration in this direction is possible. Relative to other monitoring locations, the analytical findings at BH-2 indicate elevated concentrations of conductivity, chloride, TDS, COD, ammonia, boron, manganese and TKN. These results are indicative of potential minor leachate impacts. However, it is noted that the concentrations are generally decreasing or remaining stable relative to the historical groundwater quality at this location.

Analytical data from the current reporting period for BH-4B indicate elevated concentrations of BOD that are inconsistent with recent values. The source of these elevated parameters is currently unknown. However, ongoing monitoring of this well will determine whether these values are anomalous or part of a more long-term trend. The other analytical results at BH-4B indicate that the general water chemistry was consistent with historical trends at this location. Based on the recent and historical monitoring data, the concentrations of alkalinity, TDS, BOD, COD, and DOC appear to fluctuate somewhat at this location. However, a review of the historical results for this well (Appendix E) indicates that the concentrations for these parameters have become somewhat more consistent in recent monitoring years, as summarized in Table 5A.

A review of the analytical trend graphs for these monitoring locations indicates that the short-term infiltration trenches that operated in the years 2003 and 2004 may have resulted in some increased leachate migration into the shallow groundwater system. This is indicated by the continued decreasing trend in leachate parameter concentrations at well BH-2 and the spike in leachate parameter concentrations noted in 2003/2004 at well BH-4B, followed by a decreasing and subsequent generally stable trend since that time. Continued monitoring will help to further evaluate if the reported concentrations at BH-2 and the relatively elevated concentrations previously measured at BH-4B are related to landfill leachate.

#### Intermediate Monitoring Wells

Monitoring wells BH4A and MW1-98I monitor groundwater quality in the intermediate unit downgradient of the approved footprint of Cell 1. Several RUC exceedances were noted, however, similar exceedances were also measured at some of the upgradient monitoring locations (Table 5B). Comparison of groundwater quality in these wells to the upgradient groundwater quality, as measured in wells BH5B, BH6A, and MW6-98I, indicates that leachate impacts to these downgradient monitoring locations screened within the intermediate unit are not apparent and that concentrations remain within natural background values.

#### Deep Monitoring Wells

Monitoring well MW1-98D monitors groundwater quality in the deep unit directly downgradient of the landfill area. Samples are only obtained from this well periodically due to insufficient groundwater recharge into the well during the sampling periods. A sample was collected in the spring of the current reporting year. The limited data available for this monitoring location indicates that the groundwater chemistry is consistent with upgradient monitoring wells that are screened in the deep unit. Based on the data available, leachate impacts into the competent bedrock unit do not appear to be occurring at this location.

## **9.1.2 RUC Compliance at Property Boundaries**

### NORTH BOUNDARY CONDITION

The north property boundary is located approximately 300 m downgradient from the landfill footprint, as shown on Figure 2. Monitoring wells BH-8A, BH-8B, BH-9, and BH-10 monitor groundwater flowing to the north and northwest from the landfill area, within the shallow and intermediate units. These wells are currently considered to be situated crossgradient to the active landfill area (Cell 2). RUC exceedances for alkalinity have consistently been reported in monitoring wells BH-8A and BH-8B. In addition, alkalinity and sulphate concentrations in well BH-8A, alkalinity and chloride concentrations in BH-8B and alkalinity concentrations in BH-9 exceeded the RUC. However, concentrations are within the historical ranges reported for this well and within the range of concentrations noted in the upgradient wells screened within the intermediate unit. All other parameters at these four monitoring locations met the RUC criteria.

An assessment of the trend graphs indicates relatively stable trends for monitoring wells BH9 and BH10, and to a lesser degree wells BH8A and BH8B. However, it is noted that groundwater quality in monitoring wells BH8A and BH8B has become much less variable since 2008. It is noted that an increasing trend in alkalinity concentrations has been observed in BH8B since 2011 but appears to be stabilizing. This well will continue to be monitored to determine long-term trends. Based on a comparison of the groundwater quality to the north with the upgradient monitoring wells and the historical groundwater quality trends at these locations, only minor potential influence related to landfill leachate is apparent to the north and northwest of the fill area. Monitoring well BH10 is located furthest downgradient. In general, the groundwater quality at BH-10 is similar to the background groundwater quality at the Site.

#### WEST BOUNDARY CONDITION

The western property boundary is considered to be upgradient from the approved fill area along the southern portion of the property and crossgradient to the landfill along the northern portion of the property. It is located approximately 350 meters from the current fill area at its closest point. Based on the established groundwater flow direction, the western property boundary is considered low risk for leachate impact.

Directly west of the fill area, the groundwater quality is monitored at wells BH-5A, BH-5B, BH-6A, BH-6B and BH-7. These wells are considered to be located upgradient of the fill area. Due to the variable nature of groundwater quality at the site, these monitoring wells have been used in conjunction with former background wells MW6-98S, MW6-98I, and MW6-98D, and the MW-19 series of monitoring wells to help assess the range of concentrations that occur naturally in groundwater at the site. As previously reported, the MW-19 well nest is considered to represent background groundwater conditions, which is discussed in more detail in Section 7.4.1. Several exceedances of the RUC were noted at these upgradient locations. Based on the location of these wells relative to the existing fill area, these exceedances are not considered to be attributable to landfill leachate.

Elevated concentrations of alkalinity, DOC (BH-7 only), TDS, boron, sulphate and chloride were reported in BH-5A, BH-6B and BH-7 during the spring and fall analytical data from the current monitoring year. However, the concentrations are generally consistent with historical data. The long-term trend at BH-5A and BH-5B is variable and displays a reduction in indicator parameters since the temporary increase that was measured in 2017. Minor leachate influence may be present within the groundwater at this location which is to be expected as the waste placement continues westerly toward BH-5A, BH-5B, BH-6A and BH-6B.

As discussed within sections 7.4.1, more representative background water quality wells were installed at MW-19. MW-19S was found to have insufficient water for sampling in the fall. The spring water quality within the shallow overburden aquifer, only showed minor elevation of alkalinity. MW-19I, within the intermediate, weathered bedrock had reported elevated concentrations of alkalinity, TDS, chloride, sodium, sulphate, boron and manganese. The deeper MW-19D within the more competent bedrock had reported concentrations of alkalinity, TDS, chloride, sodium, boron and manganese that exceeded the RUC.

Monitoring wells BH8A, BH8B, BH9 and BH10 are considered to be crossgradient to the west. These wells monitor groundwater flowing towards the northern property boundary, however, can also be used to determine compliance along the western property boundary within the northern portion of the site. The groundwater quality observed at these locations has been discussed in more detail in the North Boundary Condition portion of this report, and are generally comparable to the background water quality.

### SOUTH BOUNDARY CONDITION

The southern limit of the active landfill area is located approximately 100 m from the southern property boundary at its closest point. In this area of the site, groundwater flow is generally to the northeast. Within the west portion of the site, in the vicinity of the active area, water quality is monitored at monitoring wells MW6-98S, MW6-98I, MW6-98D and BH3. These wells are considered to be upgradient monitoring locations.

To the east of the active area of the site, groundwater quality is monitored along the southern property boundary at monitoring well MW4-98 and to a lesser degree monitoring wells MW5-98S, MW5-98I, MW5-98D and MW3-98, which monitor groundwater flowing to the east and are located within approximately 100 meters of the southern property boundary.

RUC exceedances for TDS, sulphate, alkalinity, boron, and manganese were noted in well MW3-98S. At the location of MW5-98D, RUC exceedances for TDS, DOC, chloride, sodium, sulphate, boron and manganese were reported. Review of the historical monitoring results for these locations indicates that the reported concentrations are within the typical historical ranges and display relatively stable concentration trends for the majority of the indicator parameters. In addition, these RUC exceedances are generally consistent with the range of concentrations observed in the upgradient monitoring wells and may therefore be related to natural background conditions. It is also noted that the majority of the above referenced parameters for which RUC exceedances are noted are not considered to represent leachate indicator parameters.

At monitoring well MW4-98, slightly elevated concentrations of TDS and manganese continue to be measured. The groundwater quality parameters meet the RUC for all parameters analysed and groundwater quality trends have remained stable since the inception of groundwater monitoring at the site. Results from these cross-gradient southern boundary wells do not indicate the presence of leachate-derived impacts in this direction.

### EAST BOUNDARY CONDITION

As previously discussed, the Town acquired the former Mountainside Homes property in 2014. Therefore, the municipally owned lands to the east (downgradient) of the landfill extend an additional distance of approximately 250 metres up to the right-of-way for Highway 6, which is located greater than 500 metres east of the landfill limit at its closest point. The former Mountainside Homes (MSH) facility is located directly east of the property boundary, with the MSH well located approximately 400 meters from the active area of the landfill. The former MSH well was decommissioned in 2016 and is discussed in Section 9.3 of this report.

In August 2006, two monitoring well couplets, BH12A/B and BH13A/B were installed along the eastern property boundary upgradient from Mountainside Homes. These locations monitor groundwater quality in the shallow, intermediate, and deep units. Consistent with the background monitoring locations, groundwater quality results at these locations indicated that the groundwater becomes increasingly mineralized with depth, with a significant degree of variability.

The following RUC exceedances were noted at each sampling location:

- BH12A: TDS, chloride, sodium, and boron
- BH12B: TDS, DOC, chloride, sodium, sulphate (fall only) and manganese
- BH13A: alkalinity, and sulphate
- BH13B: alkalinity, TDS, and sulphate

Overall, the long-term trend in each of these wells is generally stable with the exception of highly variable conductivity values in BH-12A and BH-12B. Ongoing monitoring at these locations will continue to assess the long-term trends at these sampling locations.

As discussed in June 2016, as part of a supplemental investigation for the Hydrogeological Study supporting the NEMI Landfill site titled *"Hydrogeological Study – Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands (NEMI) – 9571 Highway 6, Little Current, ON"* and dated December 2016, four additional monitoring wells (MW-14, MW-15, MW-16S, and MW-16D) were installed along the new eastern downgradient boundary adjacent to Highway 6. The groundwater quality at these wells was reported to be consistent with the groundwater quality observed at the background monitoring locations.

The following RUC exceedances were noted at the four new east boundary wells:

MW-14: alkalinity, TDS, chloride, sodium, boron, and manganese

MW-15: alkalinity, TDS, chloride, sodium, boron, and manganese

MW-16S: alkalinity and boron

MW-16D: alkalinity, TDS, chloride, sodium, boron, and manganese

Although exceedances were noted, parameter concentrations generally remain within the range of those historically noted at these monitoring locations and are consistent with, or below, the background concentrations observed at the monitoring wells located upgradient of the landfill. In addition, the majority of the above referenced parameters for which RUC exceedances are noted are not considered to represent a suite of leachate indicator parameters. Therefore, based on the general water chemistry, leachate-derived impacts are not evident at these downgradient property boundary monitoring locations.

## 9.2 Water Quality - Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)

### 9.2.1 VOC Leachate Indicator Parameters – Leachate Historical Results

Toluene was previously selected by the MECP as the primary VOC indicator of leachate and is included on the list of leachate indicator parameters provided by the MECP. Leachate characterization samples have been collected from the leachate collection system "manhole" (MH) on a quarterly basis. A Table summarizing the historical VOC results for the leachate samples and a concentration versus time graph for toluene and ethylbenzene are provided in Appendix G.

The long-term trend graph indicates that toluene concentrations have decreased significantly since the inception of leachate monitoring in 2005. Toluene was frequently detected in the manhole samples collected between April 2005 and June 2007 at concentrations exceeding the ODWS. Initial concentrations generally ranged between 100 ug/L and 350 ug/L with the peak concentration of 1,300 ug/L measured in April of 2005. However, toluene concentrations have been consistently decreasing, and since July 2007 has typically been less than 15 ug/L.

In the current reporting period, the toluene concentrations did not exceed 1 ug/L in any of the wells with the exception of the eastern wells MW-16S and MW-16D. It is noted that these wells were installed on the eastern tablelands area of the property, which is situated in the Blue Mountain Formation, which has been observed to be intermittently petroliferous across Manitoulin Island. Therefore, since no other wells on the property have shown elevated concentrations of toluene and all of the eastern boundary wells display detectable concentrations, it is expected that the VOCs in the eastern boundary wells are naturally derived. A more detailed discussion of the source of the VOCs in the eastern boundary wells is provided in Section 9.2.4.

Overall, recent leachate quality results indicate that toluene concentrations have decreased dramatically and have stabilized in recent monitoring years. A similar trend of decreasing concentrations has been noted for several VOCs that were historically detected in the leachate. Concentrations of ethylbenzene also display a relatively consistent concentration trend through time.

A review of the historical VOC results from the manhole indicates that benzene, ethylbenzene, and xylene concentrations were typically much lower than the toluene concentrations. However, since July 2009, ethylbenzene concentrations have typically been higher than toluene when measured above the laboratory detection limits. The highest reported concentrations of these compounds in the manhole samples collected to date are as follows:

- Benzene – 7.7 ug/L (August 2014);
- Ethylbenzene – 32 ug/L (August 2014 & May 2016); and
- Total Xylenes – 224 ug/L (July 2006).

The combination and relative concentrations of these compounds, with toluene historically being the most prevalent, suggests a potential source of solvents or petroleum distillates in the historical data.

### 9.2.2 Detection of VOCs in Groundwater

In order to facilitate the review of VOCs in groundwater at the site, a summary list of analytes detected at the site since the implementation of the groundwater sampling program was completed and is provided as Table 6. The analytes that have been measured at concentrations above the laboratory detection limits (i.e., measurable through laboratory analyses) include the following:

Chloromethane, vinyl chloride, bromomethane, acetone, methyl ethyl ketone (MEK), chloroform, benzene, trichloroethylene, bromochloro-methane, toluene, 2-Hexanone, ethylbenzene, m&p-xylene, o-xylene, and naphthalene.

These VOC compounds are not considered to occur naturally in groundwater at the site. Consequently, RUC values were calculated assuming VOCs were not present in groundwater prior to the initiation of landfilling at the site. Compounds historically detected at concentrations greater than the RUC include benzene, toluene, and ethylbenzene, as well as one minor exceedance for vinyl chloride in 2003, which has not been re-measured since that time. Monitoring locations where ODWS exceedances have been noted within the current monitoring period include MW1-98I, MW1-98D, BH12B, MW-14, MW-15, MW-16S, MW-16D, MW-19I, and MW-19D.

### 9.2.3 VOC Distribution and Concentration Trends in Groundwater

The use of the general water chemistry at the site for leachate indicators is useful, however is relatively complex considering the naturally highly mineralized background groundwater quality. Based on our assessment of the inorganic analytes and metals, leachate migration, particularly to the property boundaries, is not evident.

Figure 6 shows the current and historical distribution of BTEX compounds in groundwater. Analytical results at several upgradient monitoring locations indicate that VOCs have consistently been detected below 5 ug/L, including at the upgradient MW6-series of wells, at the MW-19 well nest (background), and at BH3, BH7, BH5A, BH6A and BH6B. Additionally, more significant concentrations of benzene have periodically been detected in upgradient monitoring well BH5B. Benzene concentrations as high as 20.7 ug/L, which exceeds the ODWS of 5 ug/L, have been noted at this location.

BTEX compounds have consistently been detected in the intermediate and deep units directly downgradient of the landfill at wells MW1-98I and MW1-98D and periodically in wells MW5-98I and MW5-98D. Historical results indicate that VOC concentrations generally increase with depth, and that VOC concentrations continue to display a decreasing concentration trend with time.

Downgradient monitoring well couplets BH-12 and BH-13 formerly monitored groundwater quality along the eastern property boundary. These wells were first sampled in September 2006. VOCs, including BTEX, have

been detected at monitoring locations BH-12A, BH-12B, and BH-13B. At monitoring well BH-12B, located centrally along the east property line, and BH-13B, located in the southeast corner of the property, benzene concentrations typically exceed the RUC and ODWS.

It is noted that the wells installed along the eastern property boundary in 2016 (MW-14, MW-15, MW-16S, and MW-16D) have reported benzene, toluene, and/or ethylbenzene concentrations above the ODWS since monitoring began in July 2016. Each of these wells is installed at a lower elevation than the rest of the wells on Site within the shale of the Blue Mountain formation. Additionally, the fall 2017, analytical results from the new background groundwater monitoring wells that were installed in September 2017 (MW-19I, and MW-19D) indicate benzene, toluene, and/or ethylbenzene concentrations that exceed the ODWS. MW-19I and MW-19D are also screened within the weathered and consolidated shale of the Blue Mountain formation, respectively.

Similar to the upgradient wells, VOC concentrations generally increase with depth, which is especially apparent in wells installed in the lower tablelands portion of the property associated with the Blue Mountain formation. Based on the most recent results, BTEX concentrations at these monitoring locations appear to be decreasing and becoming more stable with time. In shallow monitoring well BH-12A, benzene and ethylbenzene concentrations have never exceeded 10 ug/L and 4 ug/L, respectively. In well BH-12B, screened in the intermediate unit, benzene concentrations have consistently exceeded the RUC and ODWS of 1.25 ug/L and 5 ug/L, respectively, with concentrations of benzene ranging between 21 ug/L and 100 ug/L. However, a decreasing trend has been observed since peak concentrations were measured in 2009/10.

#### 9.2.4 Potential Source of VOCs along the Eastern Property Boundary

Based on a review of: (i) the distribution and nature of the identified compounds; (ii) the relative concentrations; (iii) the hydrogeology of the site; and (iv) the historical property uses, there are several factors that suggest the BTEX compounds detected along the eastern property boundary (i.e., at BH-12, BH-13, BH-14, BH-15, BH-16S, BH-16D), may not be solely related to impacts from landfill leachate. These factors, discussed in detail in previous Annual Reports, are summarized as follows:

- The specific compounds and their relative concentrations reported in these wells are different than those observed in the leachate characterization samples (i.e., "manhole"). When high concentrations of toluene were being detected in the leachate, the corresponding ratio of toluene to benzene (toluene:benzene) was in the range 100:1, more typically associated with solvents or petroleum distillates. In contrast, at the eastern boundary wells, the predominant BTEX compound is benzene which occurs at a toluene:benzene ratio of approximately 1:3 to 1:6, more typically associated with petroleum hydrocarbons.
- Based on the initiation of landfilling at the Site in October 2002, the immediate detection of BTEX compounds at that time in monitoring wells BH12 and BH13 (i.e. September 2006) and the hydrogeological properties associated with the Site (i.e. the bedrock properties and the groundwater flow velocities), the 'early' occurrence of landfill-derived BTEX compounds at the eastern property boundary is inconsistent with the hydrogeological conditions at the site.
- The historical property use(s) reportedly included the operation of a wrecking yard by the previous property owners. Based on discussions with the Municipality, the land situated directly upgradient of BH-12 and BH-13 was the area where derelict vehicles were historically stockpiled and stored. In addition, the other properties situated adjacent to the landfill site were also reportedly used historically as vehicle wrecking yards and as an automobile servicing garage.
- The recently installed new background groundwater monitoring wells MW-19I and MW-19D indicate BTEX concentrations and ratios that are similar to the concentrations reported at the eastern property

boundary, which suggests that the BTEX concentrations are associated with naturally derived BTEX compounds from the Blue Mountain formation, which is known to be locally bituminous in the region.

Consequently, in order to further assess historical property uses and to determine with more certainty the potential contribution of petroleum products (i.e., gasoline, diesel, and/or fuel oil) to the concentrations of BTEX reported at BH-12 and BH-13, additional investigative groundwater sampling was conducted. In 2009 and May 2010, a variety of petroleum hydrocarbons (F1 to F4 fractions) analyses were completed on select groundwater samples which were collected in conjunction with the groundwater sampling requirements. An assessment of the potential petroleum impacts to groundwater was provided in the 2009 and 2010 Annual Monitoring Reports. A general summary of the results and conclusions of this additional sampling is provided below.

Consistent with BTEX detections, elevated F1 concentrations, typically indicative of gasoline impacts, were detected at BH12A (100 ug/L), BH12B (230 ug/L in May 2009 and 150 ug/L in May 2010), and at MW6-98D (110 ug/L). No F1 petroleum hydrocarbons were identified at any other monitoring locations, including the former MSH well.

- In October 2009, F2 to F4 petroleum hydrocarbons were not detected in any of the onsite wells. However, petroleum hydrocarbons in the F2 and F3 fractions, chemically consistent with diesel and/or fuel oil, were identified in the former MSH well at concentrations of 120 ug/L and 170 ug/L, respectively. Additional sampling conducted in May 2010 resulted in the detection of F3 petroleum hydrocarbons at MW1-98I at a concentration of 420 ug/L.

Therefore, although groundwater quality in monitoring well BH-13B, located approximately 100 metres upgradient of the former MSH well, shows exceedances of some VOC compounds, no detections of F1 to F4 petroleum hydrocarbons were noted during the sampling conducted in 2009/2010 at BH13A/B. In contrast, VOC and petroleum hydrocarbon sampling conducted to date indicates the presence of F2 and F3 petroleum hydrocarbons in groundwater collected from the former downgradient MSH well. However, VOCs and F1 petroleum hydrocarbons have not been detected at this location.

Based on a comparison of the analytical data from the manhole to wells immediately downgradient of the landfill footprint (i.e. BH-2, BH-4A, and BH-4B), the petroleum impacts identified by the eastern property boundary do not appear to be consistent with leachate quality.

Based on the most recent field work and observation of wide spread occurrence of BTEX and PHC compounds, the occurrence of these compounds is considered to be naturally occurring. It is shown that the elevated concentrations of BTEX predominantly occur in either the deepest wells on the plateau of the site or in the wells that are situated at a lower elevation and in the eastern tablelands of the property. From an analysis of well logs, the wells in the eastern and lower portion of the property are screened in the Blue Mountain formation whereas the wells in the western plateau that show lower concentrations of BTEX are screened in the Georgian Bay formation.

As a reference, a monitoring well (MW-1) that was installed in the closed Little Current landfill site within the Blue Mountain formation was shown to produce oil and gas. The bedrock geology in the oil producing well at the former Little Current landfill and in the wells installed in the eastern tablelands of the NEMI landfill site was found to be the same. In both cases, wells were drilled into what appears to be the lower portion of the Blue Mountain formation. From an analysis of historical oil and gas producing well records, and MW1 at the former Little Current landfill site, there are indications that the shale of the Blue Mountain formation is petroliferous and hosts petroleum hydrocarbons in the form of oil and natural gas in various areas on Manitoulin Island. Although the closest oil and gas producing wells are located approximately 10 kilometres southwest and south of the landfill, the intersection of oil and gas in a monitoring well at the former Little Current landfill (i.e. approximately 4.0 km from the site) confirms the presence of petroliferous shale in this geologic unit.

Further evaluation and/or delineation of the potential petroleum hydrocarbon impacts and the potential source(s) of the impacts would require further investigation and additional sampling. However, further petroleum hydrocarbon sampling is not considered necessary at this time as the additional petroleum hydrocarbon sampling conducted to date and a brief review of the historical property uses suggest that the identified impacts along the eastern property boundary are not related to landfill leachate.

### 9.3 Downgradient Bedrock Well – Former Mountainside Homes Property

The MSH Well was reportedly installed in 1970 and was decommissioned in 2016 by a licenced well driller as per the requirements of Ontario Regulation 903. This well is located approximately 400 metres downgradient and to the east-southeast of the landfilled area within the additional lands owned by the Town. The well is reportedly screened from 6.7 to 23.4 m (22 ft. to 77 ft.) and is reported to intersect the “black slate” (inferred to be black shale) unit. The MSH well, previously referred to as the Smith well (designated SM), was first sampled in 1998 prior to the commencement of landfilling operations and was subsequently added to the annual sampling program in 2005.

In the February 2005 correspondence from the MECP, the Ministry reported that the well did not comply with the requirements of the regulations and the MECP identified several O.Reg. 903 deficiencies associated with the well.

The MSH well has reportedly not been used as a potable water supply. Based on the Town’s acquisition of the Mountainside Homes property, and since the well does not represent a potential offsite water supply, the MSH well was discontinued from the sampling program in 2015 and subsequently decommissioned in 2016.

### 9.4 Surface Water Quality

Surface water monitoring at the site consists of monitoring from a network of five locations (SW1 through SW5) in the spring, summer and fall, when sufficient water is available. The surface water sampling locations are presented on Figure 2. A summary of the surface water sampling results is provided in Table 7. Summaries of the historical surface water sampling results and trend graphs are provided in Appendix F.

Surface water sampling locations SW1 through SW3 monitor groundwater quality in a small watercourse located approximately 300 metres to the south of the site. Surface water flows from the Beaver Pond, at SW1, to the east towards Highway 6. Monitoring locations SW2 and SW3 monitor surface water quality downgradient of the landfill (SW2) and at the downstream side of the concrete box culvert where the stream crosses Highway 6 (SW3). This stream is considered to be intermittent, with generally low flows and is interpreted to get its base flow from groundwater discharge, with some surface water drainage contributions, mainly during storm events.

Surface water quality within this intermittent stream has generally been consistent, with some seasonal variability. Infrequent elevated concentrations of chloride and/or sulphate are noted at SW2 and SW3. Additionally, the conductivity generally increases as the surface water flows to the east. Surface water quality at SW3 is more variable relative to the upgradient sampling locations. Since this sampling location is situated adjacent to and immediately downgradient of Highway 6, the variability is potentially associated with surface water run-off from the provincial highway. Historically, phosphorus and iron exceedances of the PWQO are commonly noted at SW-1, SW-2, and SW-3. In the current reporting period, exceedances of the PWQO for phosphorous were identified and are consistent with previous monitoring years and with historical trends at these locations. These exceedances and the variability in concentrations noted are not considered to be related to landfill leachate and appear to be naturally derived.

Surface water sampling location SW4, collected from the extended detention pond, and surface water sampling location SW5, located in the northeast corner of the site near the entrance, collect surface water run-off from the site. Relative to the water quality in the intermittent stream, surface water quality at these sampling locations is more highly mineralized, generally showing a higher conductivity and concentrations of chloride and sulphate. Based on the absence of high concentrations of other leachate indicator parameters, surface water quality in the detention pond and the pond at the main entrance to the landfill do not appear to be influenced by landfill leachate.

In summary, although some PWQO exceedances are noted for phosphorous, these appear to be naturally derived. Therefore, impacts from landfill activities to the surface water quality are not apparent.

## 10. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Due to the documented direction of groundwater flow from the south-southwest to the north-northeast and considering the distance from the active landfill area to the west and south property boundaries, leachate impacts at these property boundaries are not anticipated.

The use of the general water chemistry at the site as leachate indicator parameters is useful. However, the groundwater chemistry and impact characterization are relatively complex considering the highly mineralized background groundwater quality. Based on a detailed review and assessment of the upgradient groundwater quality, a comparison of groundwater quality to leachate quality, as well as on a review of correspondence from the MECP, the list of leachate indicator parameters includes the following:

- Alkalinity, ammonia, total phosphorus, iron, chromium, TKN, BOD, COD, and DOC

Based on our assessment of the inorganic analytes, natural organics, and metals, potential leachate migration to the north and east was identified. However, leachate migration and groundwater quality degradation related to these analytes was not evident at the downgradient property boundaries to the north and east.

VOC compounds have been detected at several upgradient and downgradient monitoring locations, including the background monitoring wells (MW-19I, and MW-19D), well couplet BH-12 and the newly installed eastern boundary wells MW-14, MW-15, MW-16S, and MW-16D, which monitor groundwater quality in proximity to the eastern property boundary. The concentrations of benzene and to a lesser extent, ethylbenzene compounds exceeded the applicable RUC at some of these boundary wells. However, based on the occurrence, relative concentrations as compared to the leachate quality, nature of the identified compounds, as well as the site hydrogeology, the BTEX compounds detected do not appear to be related to landfill-derived leachate and are expected to be naturally derived.

PWQO exceedances of total phosphorous were noted in the intermittent stream and the onsite detention ponds designed to collect surface water run-off from the site. These occurrences are considered to be naturally derived. Therefore, impacts from landfill activities to the surface water quality are not apparent.

## 11. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To further evaluate the progression of development and the attenuation capacity of the Site, it is recommended that the additional downgradient property be registered as landfill buffer lands and that the existing Environmental Compliance Approval be amended accordingly to recognize the new buffer lands.
2. It is recommended that the surface water sampling program be revised from twice annually and during storm events to three times annually in the spring, summer and fall to coincide with the groundwater monitoring program. Sampling during storm events by a qualified consultant is limited by the location of the site. It is also proposed that the list of parameters be revised to better correlate with those required for groundwater and leachate monitoring parameters. This would include the removal of phenols from the indicator list and barium, cadmium, copper, lead, mercury, zinc and phenols from the comprehensive list (i.e. for SW-4). Based on MECP correspondence dated January 6, 2012, it is our understanding that this recommendation has been forwarded to the Surface Water Technical Support Section for their review but has not formally been reviewed and accepted to date.
3. As per comments enclosed in the MECP correspondence dated January 30, 2017, it is recommended that the leachate sampling schedule from the manhole be decreased from monthly to quarterly. In order to maximize sampling conducted by a qualified consultant, it is recommended that three of the four samples be collected by a qualified consultant in conjunction with the groundwater and surface water monitoring programs, and one sample be collected in January by trained Township staff. This would result in the following leachate sampling/monitoring schedule:

Monitoring Description	Sampling Frequency	Personnel
Leachate Levels	Quarterly: January, April, July, and October	Township Staff
Flow Volumes	Monthly	Township Staff
Leachate Seep Inspections	Monthly	Township Staff
Quarterly Leachate Sampling	January – Indicator List	Township Staff
	May – Comprehensive List	GMBP
	July/August and October – Indicator List	GMBP

4. Due to the addition of the new eastern boundary monitoring wells (MW-14, MW-15, MW-16S, and MW-16D) and the removal of the former MSH well, which was formerly considered to be a potential downgradient receptor, the wells that were formerly used as eastern boundary condition wells (i.e., MW-12A, MW-12B, MW-13A, and MW-13B) are now considered to be redundant as they are located 200 and 300 metres from the established downgradient boundary and do not provide additional info pertaining to the site's compliance with the RUC. Therefore, it is recommended that MW-12A, MW-12B, MW-13A, and MW-13B continue to be used for water level measurements but be removed from the monitoring program.

All of which is respectfully submitted,

GM BLUEPLAN ENGINEERING LIMITED

Per:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Charpontier'.

K.M. Charpontier, Env. Tech., Dipl.

Per:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alan Bringleston'.

A.W. Bringleston B.E.S., C.E.T.

Per:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M.D. Nelson'.

M.D. Nelson, P.Eng., P.Geo

OCT 16 2020

Bill

Mayor and council, I would like to outline what I feel are short comings with our water front.

What I am about to list are not knew, they have been taking place for several years. I have raised these concerns verbally before with no result, so here they are in writing.

I was on council when the original plan for our water front was in its first planning stage and being considered by council. Therefore, having been on the water front for 60 plus years and a local tax payer I feel some changes need to take place.

I brought some of these concerns up to Dave verbally at the budget meeting that I attended and here they are in writing. Before I list the short comings from my point of view, you cannot expect one person to be in charge of all our recreation and water front and expect things to run smoothly. I have since learned you will be hiring a person to be in charge of our water front on a contract bases! I feel this is a good move on council part.

! Loss of revenue, this takes place in my opinion when you allow boaters to tie up and use the services most of the day and leave before they have to pay for the night! I was told this is so that they will shop locally! Well some do shop locally, but most of it comes from off Island if you look at the names on the bags they carry to their boats. There should be a charge the minute you tie up to the docks to cover the services they will use, which will be deducted from the price they will be charged if they then decide to stay for the night. What has been happening, they take up a space that other boaters would use, who would stay for the night but pass on through as there is no openings ( conveyed to me by boaters ). Some sort of identification should be placed on the boat when they pay so staff can easily identify those boats who have paid and what amount. Staff should be patrolling the docks on an hourly bases instead of staying in the building behind the post office. With the high water, there will be less places for the boating traffic to use this summer.

The other loss in revenue, is after the water front employee's go home boaters who are anchored out will come in with their dingy's to see if there is any open spots! If there are they come in tie up and use the services, but leave the next morning before they have to pay.

Another suggestion I would like to make is all boaters have to contact water front staff before they dock, which will aid in knowing how long they plan on staying and to determine the charge for use of the facility.

I feel a cut off time should be set for the initial charge to cover before they have to pay for the night, such as 2 pm.

2. I have advocated for years that one staff member be stationed at the west end of the dock on a 2 hour rotation. The west end of the dock gets more use as you are closer to the showers and the washrooms and are away from the noise of main street and more private. By stationing some one there, they will be able to keep an eye on the facilities and help with the needs of the boaters more readily. They will also be able to make sure the west end facilities are kept clean. Last year the small green used propane cylinders were placed around the garbage can on the dock ( 12 of them ) and left there for 2 days before someone removed them. What kind of message does that give the boaters of how we look after our water front.

3 The showers, should have and upgrade with new paint and proper shower curtains on them so the water does not splash out on the floor. Another suggestion I have made in the past, is away to identify to the boaters what showers are in use so they do not have keep trying codes to try and find an open shower. In other public wash rooms, when you lock the door a sign on the outside will say occupied indicating it is in use.

4 The washroom that is designated for public use, should have the shower services shut off as they are being used by other than boaters to shower in. This will also keep them open for the public and not be tied up by the boaters having a shower.

5. In the past I have witness boaters taking their dogs into the showers with them. After they come out I have gone in and seen dog hair all over the place! If you are going to allow this, having someone stationed at the west end then they would be on hand to go in and clean up the mess before the next user comes along.

6. My next two items are first the open roof which limits the use of the building when you have wet weather, or hot sun. Though should be given to the idea of extending the solid roof to this area! Several years ago I had the pleasure to visit a

building similar to ours at the bottom of Georgian Bay and the gentleman who was in charge of it's construction ( a volunteer from the community ) gave me a tour of it. It had a cooking area similar to ours, but it also had retractable motorised side curtains so they would provide shelter from the wind and rain. The night before they had held the wedding of his granddaughter in it. I had brought this idea back and had made a verbal suggestion for the Town to consider, but did not hear back about this idea.

7. Another suggestion expressed to me was a cooking area with a roof over it so it can be used with out disturbing the people already using the shelter of the buildings roof.

8. Has anyone thought about a suggestion box, that users of our water front facilities could drop off idea's in? One at each building and see where this may lead!

### Spider Bay

I was alarmed when at the budget meeting, when I asked what the revenue this facility was bring in. The figure I was told by Dave was similar to the revenue generated back in the 1980 when as a member of council and head of the committee looking after this facility the Town was generating, after we paid the Federal government their share!

I suggested maybe a closer look into the lost revenue not being collected! First the number of uses of the launch ramp that is not being paid for! I have heard of users who have not paid in several years who use it several times a week. I personally was visiting a seasonal boater having a refreshment, when he pointed out to me to watch a boater with a sail boat on a trailer, park, put up his sail, launch his boat, park his vehicle and trailer and head out into the channel. Not once did he go into the building to pay, nor did anyone come out to help and collect any money! How many times a day does this take place?

I suggested to Dave in our discussion at the budget meeting, some way of controlling the ramp, so you have to pay before it can be used like you see in parking lots in the city.

Upon paying the boater should have a method of displaying in his wind shield that he has paid and for what. Then staff could readily see when they check ( hourly ) that the required fee's have been paid.

The other suggestion I made was to fix up the grounds next to the fence for seasonal boaters to park with their names on the fence so you know who the trailers belong to. This would also free up the space they now occupy near the launch ramp for use by your daily boating users.

The geese are becoming a bigger problem each year as their numbers increase. You cannot walk in Spider Bay, or even the downtown dock with out getting goose dung on your shoes. The same goes at our swim area and ball fields, Surely the Ministry can be approach to see if there is a method the Town can use to cut down on their numbers!

I hope council does not take these ideas, as some who is trying to tell you how to run our Town, rather , I am trying to outline what I feel what is required to take place ( with input from all users )to be considered to return the jewel of the North Channel and boating mecca to the high standard we have come to enjoy and to be proud of.

I look foreword to hearing back from council in what I have expressed in this letter. If further clarification of what I have outlined in this letter is needed? I would be willing to discuss this letter in person.

Gary Green

Bruce Burnett, president  
Little Current Lions Club  
PO Box 205  
Little Current, Ontario  
POP 1K0

October 21, 2020

Town of Northeastern Manitoulin and the Islands  
Attn: Mayor Al MacNevin and Council  
Postal Bag 2000  
Little Current, Ontario  
POP 1K0

Dear Mayor MacNevin and Council:

We are beginning to plan for Haweater 2021 and hope you will accept this letter of request for two items: sponsorship in the amount of \$1,500 and renewal of the municipality's regular contribution of \$2,500 for portable toilets. The Lions would be pleased to organize the actual rental of the units on the municipality's behalf.

We thank you for your continued support of this club and look forward to Haweater 2021.

Stay safe and take care,

Lion Bruce Burnett

**Mantoulin Centennial Manor  
Board of Management Meeting  
September 17, 2020  
(unapproved)**

**Present via teleconference:**

Pat MacDonald, Wendy Gauthier, Hugh Moggy, Dawn Orr, Dan Osborne, Art Hayden, Mary Jane Lenihan, Keith Clement; Extendicare Regional Director Tamara Beam; Administrator, Marie Howard, DOC

**Guest: Recorder: Expositor: Warren**

**1.0 Call to order**

Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m. by Chair, Pat MacDonald.

**2.0 Approval of Agenda**

42/20 Orr/Osborne

That we approve the agenda

...carried

**3.0 Approval of Minutes**

43/20 Hayden/Gauthier

That we approve the minutes August 2020

...carried

**4.0 Business Arising from Minutes**

- GST/Rebates; the contract has been signed for Deloitte to pursue to pursue the recent court ruling that may allow the home to retroactively receive increased GST/PST rebates

**5.0 Correspondence**

- none

**6.0 Administrator's Report**

44/20 Moggy/Osborne

That we accept the Administrator's Report as presented by Tamara Beam. The financials to be sent to all Board members upon receipt

...carried

**7.0 Extendicare Report**

We did not receive the financial report for the meeting. The report will be sent to board members when available. Question can be directed to Tamara Beam for clarification.

**8.0 Fundraising Update**

The total funds in the Tree of Lights campaign is 16, 828. 85. The total funds in the fundraising account is 38, 729.88. The goal for the Tree of Lights campaign for October 31 to December 31, 2020 is \$25, 000

Since COVID the Residents at Manitoulin Centennial Manor have been utilizing the outdoor corridor. This area has been identified as needing an upgrade to the land scape: walkways, tree removal, new fence etc. The re-development of this area will enable new activity programs that will be collaborative with community partners. We are asking the board to approve the new fundraising campaign be for the re-development of the outdoor corridor. The target goal for this campaign will be \$125, 000.

5/20 Osborne/Lenihan

That we accept the fundraising update

...carried

5/20 Gauthier/Orr

That we approve the new fundraising drive with a target goal of \$125 000 for Manitoulin Centennial Manor to re-develop the outdoor corridor.

...carried

Presentation by Nickle City Communications Ltd.: John Daigle

#### 0 Meeting Date

The next regular meeting will be October 15, 2020 at 10:00. The location to be determined.