

THE CLOVER BAR LANDFILL  
A STATE OF THE ART LANDFILL RECLAMATION PROCESS  
Ann Smreciu<sup>(1)</sup>, Nolan Turner<sup>(2)</sup>, and Don Barron<sup>(3)</sup>

1) Wild Rose Consulting, Inc., 3525 41 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta. T6L 5S5

2) Tree Things Resources Ltd., R.R. #1, Busby, Alberta. T0G 0H0

3) Don Barron & Associates Consultants, Ltd., 11125 156 St., Edmonton, Alberta. T5M 1X9

## INTRODUCTION

The Clover Bar Landfill, located in northeast Edmonton, is situated along the North Saskatchewan River. The site was opened to receive solid waste in the 1970's. The first phases were closed and capped in the early 1980's. In keeping with standards of the day, the area was covered with a shallow layer of topsoil, a mixture of agronomic grasses, and a few ornamental trees for beautification. The result was visually unappealing and ecologically unstable. The site required large inputs of resources for maintenance.

A revised, long-term revegetation plan for the Clover Bar Landfill Site was developed by Landscape Architect, Don Barron, in collaboration with Agrologist, Nolan Turner. A comprehensive site evaluation highlighted the need for mitigation of several site conditions that could discourage or limit plant growth and development. These included: toxic substrata materials, an impenetrable clay cap, shallow topsoils, soil component deficiencies and/or excesses, poor moisture conditions due to slope design and persistent high winds, and an extensive agricultural weed problem from on-site and from numerous adjacent sites. The reclamation plan outlined a series of unique methods to mitigate these conditions. This site was also recognized as a major movement corridor and safe refuge (from man and his activities) for wildlife from nearby natural areas.

## DESIGN

Maintaining ecological and aesthetic integrity of the North Saskatchewan River Valley Park System was a guiding factor in the design process for the Clover Bar Landfill. The design was based on accelerating natural succession by establishing key plant species and recommended the establishment of numerous, strategically placed 'nuclei beds' planted with a heterogeneous mix of native trees, shrubs, and herbaceous perennials.

Phase 1 was designed as a trial to supplement the limited information available regarding the most efficient use of native species and the best production and planting methods. A short-term maintenance program was designed to encourage establishment and development of a sustainable, self-perpetuating, native 'Urban Forest' ecosystem

Principles of recycling and reuse were incorporated into the reclamation plan. Materials recommended for use on-site (topsoil, compost, sewage sludge, and mulch) were recycled from other projects and programs. Plant materials were collected in areas slated for development and

\* Presented at the 21st Annual Meeting, Canadian Land Reclamation Association, Calgary, Alberta, September 18-20, 1996.

irrigation water was obtained from the existing ground water diversion system on the periphery of the site.

## PLANT MATERIALS

Approximately 25 species of woody plants were placed in Phase 1 trial beds. Trees and shrubs were produced by one of three methods. The first was to salvage small, mature plants from areas that would likely be disturbed. Plants were either moved directly to planting beds or maintained in the nursery (in pots) for three months where they were fertilized to encourage significant root development. The second method was by various cuttings. Pole and hardwood cuttings were placed directly into planting beds in spring whereas softwood cuttings were rooted in the nursery prior to being set out. The third propagation method was by seed which were sown directly in planting beds on site or sown in styroblock containers and maintained in the greenhouse until sufficient root and top growth developed. Herbaceous perennials (representing 15 species) were grown in styroblock containers in the greenhouse from seeds or cuttings.

To ensure adaptability of plants to local conditions, indigenous plants used for planting at Clover Bar Landfill were collected within the immediate area (a radius of 50 km).

## CONSTRUCTION, PLANTING, AND MAINTENANCE

Construction of Phase 1 beds was completed in 1993. Phases 2 and 3a were completed in 1994 and 1995 respectively. Bed areas were mowed and existing vegetation and substrates were removed. Beds were refilled to a depth of approximately 30 cm with topsoil combined with sewage sludge and compost. Planting of Phase 1 began in late summer, 1993 and completed in 1995. Phases 2 and 3a were planted in 1995.

Mulch was placed in each area soon after planting. Plants were watered immediately and continued to be irrigated as necessary. Large weed populations had developed on the site (and on adjacent lands) prior to beginning the reclamation process and an intensive weed control program began in June 1994. Planting beds will be weeded for up to three years as required to provide a competition-free environment for native plants to establish well developed root systems. Control measures for other pests and diseases were only taken if survival and establishment of the native plants was likely to be compromised.

## MONITORING

Wild Rose Consulting, Inc. was retained in 1994 to design and implement a vegetation monitoring system. The objectives of the monitoring system were to determine if the plant materials and the methods used to produce, install, and maintain plant materials would provide the desired results (i.e. a dense cover of a variety of plant species of diverse age). Two types of data were collected to determine the success of the planting beds. The first was to measure and assess the success of each group of species and planting material type. Assessment parameters included emergence (for seeds), survival, and vigour of plants. The second type of data recorded were observations of natural recruitment or natural invasion by indigenous species from surrounding and adjacent native areas. Data were collected in 1994, 1995, and 1996 and analysed annually. Results are used to re-evaluate designs on an on-going basis.

## RESULTS

Salvaged plant material of most species performed well; they exhibited high survival rates. The advantage of this method is that resulting plants were vigorous and several were spreading (some at rates up to 1.5 m per year). Styroblock material generally survived well in the first year, but many of these plants but were not necessarily vigorous. Species raised in styroblock containers were small and take several years to provide the desired vegetation cover; particularly with species that do not spread by root shoots or rhizomes. Plants grown from cuttings showed variable results.

Several species established well from seeds sown directly in the planting beds but seeding results were variable. Seedlings take several years to develop into large plants that provide a dense cover. During this time weeds must be kept to a minimum and maintenance costs can escalate. Seeding could be particularly effective if used in combination with other methods (e.g. seeding under sparsely planted mature material).

Numerous native plants became established in planting beds by seed spread from existing native stands adjacent to the site. This was especially prevalent in the lowest beds on the north aspect where the beds were only metres from existing native stands along the river. Some of these trees and shrubs that established in 1994 had grown to a height of over 3 metres by 1996. Approximately 20 herbaceous species also became established in various beds.

## CONCLUSIONS

Approximately 50,000 plants were installed in planting beds in the first three phases of the project; over twice this many have emerged from root sprouts, from seeds produced by the initial plant material, or have migrated from surrounding native plant communities. Phases 2 and 3a planting designs were revised to accommodate the higher than expected emergence and survival rates and plant vigour observed in Phase 1. The thriving plant material of the early phases will provide much of the green stock required for the balance of the project (Phases 3b, 4, and 5). Continued monitoring of plant establishment and growth (and more particularly the development of integrated plant communities) will provide a significant amount of information that can be applied to future phases to further reduce costs and increase the potential for success.

The success of plantings in Phase 1 has been extraordinary. In spite of very difficult site conditions and numerous constraints, heterogeneous, dense thickets have developed. These 'Urban Forests' are continuing to evolve and become more complex as additional plant species migrate into these areas and as various wildlife species (deer, rabbit, fox, coyote, and many songbirds) begin to utilize them for food and cover.

## REFERENCES

- Don Barron and Associates, Consultants Ltd. 1993. Clover Bar Landfill Site Revegetation Program.
- Smreciu, A. (Wild Rose Consulting, Inc.) 1996. Clover Bar Landfill Site: Revegetation Phases 1, 2, and 3a. Progress Report.
- UMA and Don Barron and Associates, Consultants Ltd. 1982. Clover Bar Landfill Sanitary Landfill end-use planning study.



CANADIAN LAND RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DE RÉHABILITATION DES SITES DÉGRADÉS

***Conservation and Reclamation:  
An Ecosystem Perspective***

Canadian Land Reclamation Association's  
21st Annual Meeting

Calgary, Alberta  
September 18-20, 1996

# **Conservation and Reclamation:**

## **An Ecosystem Perspective**

Canadian Land Reclamation Association's  
21st Annual Meeting

Calgary, Alberta  
September 18-20, 1996

This report may be cited as:

Powter, C.B., M.A. Naeth and D.A. Lloyd (compilers), 1996. Conservation and Reclamation: An Ecosystem Perspective. 21st Annual Meeting, Canadian Land Reclamation Association, Calgary, Alberta. 153 pp.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The compilers acknowledge the assistance of Jamie Legarie, Alberta Environmental Protection, Land Reclamation Division in preparing the manuscript. We also thank the authors for providing their papers on short notice.

The compilers edited some of the papers for format and length. We apologize for any errors that may have resulted.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LIST OF SPONSORS</b> .....	vi
<b>INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES</b>	
Industrial Site Decommissioning in Alberta .....	1
<b>Walter J. Ceroici</b>	
Changing Knowledge Needs for Wellsite Reclamation .....	3
<b>Jim Smith</b>	
The Orphan Facilities and Pipeline Program: An Industry/Government Responsibility .....	7
<b>David Lloyd and David Sandmeyer</b>	
In-Situ Amelioration of Sodic Mine Spoil Using Sulfur, Gypsum and Crop Management ...	11
<b>Jeff J. Sansom, M. Anne Naeth, and David S. Chanasyk</b>	
Bioremediation of Contaminated Sites .....	13
<b>Christopher Schneider</b>	
Contaminant Metal Concentration in Alberta Soils Under Different Land Uses .....	17
<b>Gerry Lutwick, Gordon D. Dinwoodie, David Gower and G. E. Nason</b>	
Waste Disposal Guidelines from a Testing Lab's Perspective .....	19
<b>John Ashworth</b>	
Reclamation of a Former Heavy Oil Plant in Northeastern Alberta .....	23
<b>Tim R. Bossenberry, J. Jeffrey Wilson, David Evans, Darrell Chollak and George Walker</b>	
Nutrient and Metal Levels and Dynamics on a 30-year Revegetated Copper-Nickel Tailings Site at Copper Cliff, Ontario .....	27
<b>Jeremy Niemi, John Giffen and Keith Winterhalder</b>	
<b>FORESTS</b>	
Land Application of BCTMP Mill Waste Research in Alberta .....	31
<b>Terry M. Macyk</b>	
Reclamation to Native Forest Ecosystems in the Oil Sand Region .....	33
<b>Steve Tuttle</b>	
Land Capability Classification for Forest Ecosystems .....	37
<b>Leonard A. Leskiw, Steve Tuttle and Earle Anderson</b>	
Forest Land Restoration on Vancouver Island .....	39
<b>David Polster</b>	

Lichen Diversity in the Reclaimed Areas of Sudbury, Ontario .....	43
<b>S. Wainio and Peter Beckett</b>	

## **MOUNTAINS**

Application of Population Biology, Conservation Biology and Succession Theory to the Reclamation of a High Elevation Coal Mine .....	47
<b>Clint R. Smyth</b>	

Plant Community Changes in Response to Anchor Chaining and Seeding on Pinyon/Juniper Sites in Central Utah .....	51
<b>J. Gregory Sutor</b>	

Tailings Disposal and Reclamation at the Coal Valley Mine .....	53
<b>Dane McCoy</b>	

In-Pit Disposal Program for Acid Generating Waste Rock .....	57
<b>Jamie Quesnel and S. W. Stogran</b>	

Reclamation, Trans Canada Highway Twinning, Banff National Park .....	63
<b>Otto Hammer</b>	

## **GENERAL ISSUES**

Railway Reclamation: Issues and Opportunities .....	67
<b>Chris B. Powter and David A. Lloyd</b>	

Experiences in Reclaiming Railways Under Alberta's new Reclamation Guidelines .....	71
<b>Mark Polet</b>	

Pipeline Abandonment: A Discussion Paper .....	73
<b>Karen Etherington</b>	

Legal Perspectives on Land Reclamation .....	75
<b>Gilbert Van Nes</b>	

Liability for Reclamation: Enforcement at Common Law .....	77
<b>Adrian Currie</b>	

## **WATER AND WETLANDS**

Coursier Reservoir: The Planning and Costs Associated with the Reconstruction and Revegetation of a Subalpine Lake .....	81
<b>J. Leah Jackson</b>	

Spray Lakes Reclamation Project .....	85
<b>Margwyn R. Zaccaruk</b>	

The Pine Coulee Project: Linking Reclamation Planning to Impact Assessment .....	89
<b>Ron Middleton</b>	

Design and Construction Management Aspects of Constructed Wetlands .....	93
<b>Bernard Amell and Kim Eastlick</b>	

Natural Revegetation of an Alberta Peatland after Horticultural Peat Extraction .....	97
<b>Wayne S. Tedder and Larry W. Turchenek</b>	

## **RUNOFF/EROSION**

Computer Modelling of Soil Erosion from Reclaimed Land .....	101
<b>Les Sawatsky, Wes Dick and Senarath Ekanayake</b>	

Runoff and Sediment Yield under Grazing in Foothills Fescue Grassland of Alberta .....	103
<b>M. Anne Naeth and David S. Chanasyk</b>	

Runoff Curve Numbers for Two Reclaimed Watersheds in Central Alberta .....	107
<b>Ted E. Harms and David S. Chanasyk</b>	

Vegetation Characteristics, Grazing Disturbance and Soil Erosion .....	111
<b>Suzanne I. Gill, M. Anne Naeth, David S. Chanasyk and V. S. Baron</b>	

## **PRAIRIE**

Renewing the Ecological Integrity of Disturbed Native Prairie .....	113
<b>Heather S. Gerling</b>	

Mixed Grass Prairie habitat Restoration Project: Landscape Restoration in the Moist Mixed Grass Prairie .....	117
<b>Dean Nerberg</b>	

Native Prairie Regeneration After Pipeline Construction: A Comparison Between Topsoil Stripping versus No Topsoil Stripping During Construction .....	119
<b>Gordon Dunn and Gina Fryer</b>	

Restoration of Native Sandhills Vegetation after Pipeline Construction in the Great Sand Hills Region of Saskatchewan .....	123
<b>David G. Walker, Laurier Kremer and Wayne Marshall</b>	

The Effects of Grazing, Mowing, Glyphosate and Burning on Smooth Brome in Fescue Grassland .....	125
<b>D. J. Brown and M. Anne Naeth</b>	

## **VEGETATION**

Avoiding Downy Brome When Buying Seed .....	127
<b>Kerby Lowen and Sarah Foster-Stubbs</b>	

Biodiversity and Reclamation: How Many Species do we Need in a Seed Mix? . . . . .	131
<b>Dana Bush and M. Anne Naeth</b>	
Germination and Survivability of Selected Native and Introduced Grasses and Legumes . . . . .	133
<b>William E. Pelech and M. Anne Naeth</b>	
Road Maps for Repairing Ecological Damage . . . . .	135
<b>Andy Hammermeister</b>	
Ecovar Developments in Western Canada . . . . .	137
<b>Les Wetter and Brent Wark</b>	
Plant Growth on Aggregated Oil Sands Processing Wastes . . . . .	139
<b>Xiaomei Li, Jim Storey, Paul Y. P. Yeung and Martin Y. P. Fung</b>	
The Clover Bar Landfill: A State of the Art Landfill Reclamation Process . . . . .	141
<b>Ann Smreciu, Nolan Turner and Don Barron</b>	
<b>BULK DENSITY</b>	
A Method of Characterizing the Bulk Density of Compressible Particulate Material . . . . .	145
<b>D. Guenther, Stacy Schaub and J. Leonard</b>	
Near-Surface Compaction Under Grazing of Annual and Perennial Forages . . . . .	149
<b>Dennis Twerdoff, David S. Chanasyk, M. Anne Naeth and V. S. Baron</b>	
Grazing Impacts on Bulk Density and Soil Strength in the Foothills Fescue Grasslands of Alberta, Canada . . . . .	151
<b>David S. Chanasyk and M. Anne Naeth</b>	
Computer Modelling of Soil Erosion from Reclaimed Land . . . . .	155
<b>Les Sawatsky, Wes Dick and Senarath Ekanayake</b>	

**LIST OF SPONSORS****Diamond Level**

Alberta Environmental Centre  
TransCanada Pipeline Limited

**Gold Level**

AGRA Earth & Environmental Limited  
CHEMEX Labs Alberta Inc.  
Government of the Northwest Territories  
TransAlta Utilities Corporation

**Silver Level**

Canadian Energy Pipeline Association  
Cardinal River Coals Ltd.  
Inco Limited  
Olds College  
Imperial Oil Resources

**Bronze Level**

Alberta Treasury Branches  
Cigar Lake Mining Corporation  
Enron Oil Canada Ltd.  
Estevan Coal Corporation  
Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co. Ltd.  
Inland Industrial Materials  
Manalta Coal Ltd.  
Nelson Dynes & Associates Inc.  
NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd.  
PanCanadian Petroleum Limited

**Iron Level**

EnviResource Consulting Ltd.  
Morgan Hydrocarbons Inc.  
Petroleum Industry Training Service  
Western Ecological Systems Management Consulting Inc.