

February 2, 2015



URGENT

Deadline: February 12

Objector Response Letter

Dear concerned residents,

Following last week's CRC newsletter, we have prepared some material which will help you to respond to the James Dick Construction Limited letter you received last week.

Please read through the following list to see whether or not the JDCL Notice of objector response applies to you.

1. You have received a REGISTERED letter from James Dick Construction Limited, including a notice of objector response?

If so, go straight to OBJECTOR RESPONSE GUIDELINES below.

OR

2. You have NOT received a REGISTERED letter from JDCL, but in March 2013 YOU DID MAKE A FORMAL OBJECTION to the Hidden Quarry application in a letter addressed to James Dick Construction Limited and the Ministry of Natural Resources?

If so, please call Greg Sweetnam at JDCL immediately **(905-857-3500)**, ask why you did not receive a response and request that a letter be sent to you with your own individual 20-day response period. If you have your original letter, please have it handy for reference.

OR

3. You have received a letter, REGULAR MAIL, from JDCL, and in March 2013 you did make a formal objection to the Hidden Quarry application but only sent it to JDCL.

If so, this letter is for your information only. JDCL agreed to respond to all objections whether or not they were mailed, as required, to both JDCL and the Ministry of Natural Resources. Technically, only letters received by both the company and the ministry are considered formal objections. Therefore, you cannot make a formal objector response.

OR

4. You have received no letter and you did not object in March 2013.

If so, none of this is relevant to you.

OBJECTOR RESPONSE GUIDELINES

Attached you will find a letter which is an example of an objector response. Please note:

1. If you do not send an objector response letter, JDCL and MNR will consider that you have no objections to the Hidden Quarry application.
2. CRC's research over the past two years has put the spotlight on many outstanding concerns. There are also several studies still to be completed before any final assessment can be made.
3. The attached letter is a sample letter. Its purpose is to assist you in preparing your own letter; in particular, the specific items listed in the bullets may be changed to suit your own particular concerns, especially as raised in your original letter.
4. You will note that the sample letter (paragraph 5) acknowledges that some concerns have been addressed and changes made, but that many concerns remain. JDCL has had to respond to questions and recommendations of governments, municipal and provincial, GET consultants, and GRCA. The bullet points reflect some of the questions that are still outstanding in CRC's analysis.
5. Please personalize your letter. The first sentence is crucial and should be used as it is. Other introductory paragraphs are best if they are your own.

When you have prepared the letter, follow the checklist below if you want your continuing objection to be accepted:

- Send hard copies by **REGISTERED MAIL** to **BOTH** addresses in the sample letter (JDCL and MNR), or deliver it by hand to **BOTH** addresses.
- Send them **BEFORE FEBRUARY 12**.
- Please send your letter as an attachment by e-mail to the **distribution list at the bottom of the letter**.

If you have further questions, please contact Doug Tripp: 519-856-4592.

29 January 2015

Mr. Greg Sweetnam
James Dick Construction Limited
14442 Hwy 50
P.O. Box 470
Bolton, ON L7E 5T4

and

Kristy Sutherland
Ministry of Natural Resources
1 Stone Road West
Guelph, ON N1G 4Y2

Subject: Notice of Objector Response re Application for a Category 2A Licence under the Aggregate Resources Act; Part Lot 1, Concession 6, Township of Guelph Eramosa, Wellington County

Dear Mr. Sweetnam and Ms. Sutherland:

I am writing to reconfirm my objection to the above-specified ARA licence application.

First as a matter of process, I want to draw your attention to Mr. Sweetnam's failure, on behalf of James Dick Construction Limited (JDCL), to comply with Section 4.3.3.2 of the Provincial Standards under the ARA in his setting February 12 2015 as the deadline for objector responses. I received JDCL's registered letter on January 27, leaving 16 days rather than the required 20 days prior to the specified deadline.

Secondly, the proponent has chosen to provide a broad, "comprehensive" form letter to all objectors rather than compose substantive and specific responses to the very real concerns which I raised.

Thirdly, as the JDCL letter states, there are at least three recently commissioned studies—Economic Impact, Agricultural Impact Assessment (noted on page 2 of the JDCL letter) and Haul Route Study (noted on page 11)—as well as Township reviews of a number of issues which have not been completed; their findings may very well support my original objections. In any case, the suggestion by JDCL that there will be no negative impacts related to these issues is at least premature and at worst deliberately misleading. I find the "trust us, everything will be fine" tone of JDCL's response letter inappropriate, condescending and unprofessional and one to which I strongly object.

I recognize that certain adjustments have been made by the proponent to their plans for the development and operation of this quarry as a result of input from various stakeholders—a reduction in the depth of extraction being one example—but many of my concerns have not been adequately addressed in spite of the vague assurances provided by the proponent. These concerns, which are in large measure supported by the findings of other consultants retained by the Concerned Residents Coalition, include but are not limited to:

- **unacceptable impacts on water quality and quantity** for which the proponent is offering mitigation measures such as deepening affected wells and providing water treatment systems; the proponent has not responded to my concern about the documented breach of the aquitard

by JDCL operations at the Guelph quarry, and no assurances are provided that similar unexpected damage to groundwater could not occur in the proposed operation;

- **the uncertainties regarding blasting, excavation and extraction impacts on aquifers** in a geological environment which is acknowledged to be karst: even if the very limited borehole examinations by the proponent have not detected cavernous karst features, the presence of small fissure karst topography warrants further study, not dismissal as immaterial;
- **similar uncertainties regarding blasting hazards** including fly-rock emission in the karst environment with residential and commercial buildings and the main traffic thoroughfare that are well within fly-rock range;
- **the absence of an acceptable haul route**, in light of the proponent's intention to direct 26 trucks per hour to and from the quarry site along Hwy 7 and Regional Road 25—the main traffic corridors serving this part of Guelph Eramosa—through downtown Acton; and the very real possibility of equally unacceptable haul routes through the Village of Rockwood or down load-limited concessions in Halton Region; as noted, a haul route study is in progress at the time of writing and it is at least premature to suggest that there are no traffic issues; I note that the proponent originally stated there would be no hauling through Rockwood, but now admits to that possibility (p10);
- **the very likely negative impact on my property value** during the twenty years or more of quarry operation, a situation which has been recognized in at least one other jurisdiction by MPAC: as noted, an Economic Impact study is being undertaken at the time of writing and it is at least premature to suggest that there will only be positive economic impacts on the Township and its residents;
- **potential vibration damage to my home from blasting operations:** the proponent has provided vague assurances that any damage attributed to its operations would be repaired at the Company's expense; this is small comfort as I contemplate the possibility of such damage and the very likely necessity of having to prove on a technical and legal basis that the quarry operation is in fact the cause;
- **negative impacts on the natural environment:** I understand that the existence of breeding populations of trout has been documented in the Brydson Creek immediately downstream of the quarry site, and that in spite of the proponent's assurances, it is indicated by a highly qualified aquatic specialist that one cannot conclude there will be no negative impact without further study. This is in addition to the decimation of the very healthy and environmentally significant conifer forest currently standing on the proposed quarry site;
- **potential health impacts due to dust produced from crushing operations and transportation:** I am not convinced by JDCL's assertion that there will be not dust and that, in any case, dust produced from aggregate operations has no negative health effects.

For these and additional reasons outlined in my original objection letter, I reconfirm that I object to the approval of the proposed quarry in Guelph-Eramosa Township. I also support the work of CRC Rockwood and the experts retained by CRC to represent the interests of my community through the ARA application process. I ask the government agencies having jurisdiction in this matter to fully consider my objections and those of others in this community and refuse the licence in this application.

Sincerely

Signature	,	Printed Name
Street Address	,	Municipality, ON, Postal Code

Cc

Mr. Michael Chong, MP Wellington Halton Hills, michael.chong@parl.gc.ca

Township of Guelph/Eramosa

Mayor Chris White, chriswhite1@cogeco.ca

Councillor David Wolk, Ward 1, david.wolk@sympatico.ca,

Councillor Corey Woods, Ward 2, coreywoods@rogers.com,

Councillor Louise Marshall, Ward 3, louise.marshall.41@outlook.com,

Councillor Mark Bouwmeester, Ward 4, markgb@sympatico.ca,

Kim Wingrove, CAO, Guelph/Eramosa Township, kwingrove@get.on.ca

Gaetanne Kruse, Planning Administrator, Guelph/Eramosa Township, gkruse@get.on.ca

Dan Sharina, Chief Building Official, Guelph/Eramosa Township, dsharina@get.on.ca

Elizabeth Howson, MSH (howson@mshplan.ca)

Regional Municipalities

Scott Wilson, CAO, Wellington County, scottw@wellington.ca

Gary Cousins, Planning and Development, Wellington County, garyc@wellington.ca

Allan Alls, Mayor, Town of Erin, allan.alls@erin.ca

Rick Bonnette, Mayor, Halton Hills, mayor@haltonhills.ca

Mike O'Leary, Councillor, Ward 1, Halton Hills, mikeo@haltonhills.ca

Gordon Krantz, Mayor, Town of Milton, executiveservices@milton.ca

Cindy Lunau, Councillor, Ward 3, Town of Milton, cindy@in.on.ca

Colin Best, Local and Regional Councillor, Town of Milton, colin.best@milton.ca

Gary Carr, Regional Chair, Regional Municipality of Halton, gary.carr@halton.ca

Richard Clark, Senior Planner – Environmental, Halton Region, Richard.clark@halton.ca

Brian Hudson, Senior Planner, Halton Region, gr.hudson@halton.ca

Adam Huycke, Planner, Halton Region, adam.huycke@halton.ca

Fred Natolochny, Supervisor of Resource Planning, GRCA, fnatolochny@grandriver.ca

Government of Ontario

Honorable Bill Mauro, Minister, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry,

bmauro.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org

Ted Arnott, MPP (Wellington-Halton Hills) ted.arnott@pc.ola.org

Indira Naidoo-Harris, MPP (Halton), inaidoo-harris.mpp.co@liberal.ola.org

Jane Glassco, Manager, Guelph District Office, MOE&CC, jane.glassco@ontario.ca

Al Murray, Resources Management Supervisor, MNR&F (Guelph District), al.murray@ontario.ca