

April 7, 2014

Concerned Residents Coalition
Delegation to GET Council Meeting

Dan Kennaley

1. Our desire is to work with the Township in ensuring that there is a thorough evaluation of the Hidden Quarry application.
2. Part of ensuring that a thorough evaluation takes place is to evaluate the information that the applicant submits in support of the quarry application, but also to make sure that the peer review consultants are doing their job—that every determination made by the peer review consultants is the result of thorough analysis and is completely substantiated by that analysis. We, the CRC and Council both, need to be testing every determination made by each and every one of the Township's peer review consultants
3. This will send a message to the peer review consultants—you had better have very, very good reasons for your opinions along the way and for your ultimate recommendations—that you had better not be just going through the motions—that Council is very concerned about this quarry application and really wants it to be carefully and thoroughly evaluated.
4. One of the aspects that the Concerned Residents Coalition has found frustrating about the evaluation process thus far is the difficulty we have had in obtaining copies of information which are apparently being exchanged between Township peer review consultants and the applicant. Without this information we are left in the dark as to whether the concerns of the peer review consultants are being resolved and we have no way of potentially challenging this subsequent information being provided by the applicant, nor challenging the determination of the peer review consultants that flow from this subsequent information. So we would like Council to ensure that all the information associated with this application, including any information and communication between the applicant and the Township's peer review consultants is also provided in a timely fashion to the Concerned Residents Coalition.
5. The other interrelated matter that the Concerned Residents Coalition has found frustrating is that we don't know what is happening to the issues that are being raised by the Concerned Residents Coalition. We have been expecting

these issues and related information to be forwarded to the Township's peer review consultants and we have been expecting a response through Council from the peer review consultants. And not at the end when the consultants present a recommendation to Council. By then it may be too late and too large a task to ensure that the every determination made by the peer review consultants is a result of thorough analysis and is completely substantiated by that analysis.

6. Turning to the Summary of Delegations to GET Council which has been provided to Council, and to summarize a little further still:

a) We appreciate Council having obtained cultural heritage and visual impact studies from the applicant and would now request Council obtain peer reviews of the cultural heritage and visual impact studies;

b) We are requesting a meeting with Burnside regarding issues raised in peer reviews and applicant responses to those issues which are currently being assessed by Burnside;

c) We are requesting that Council undertake an economic impact assessment of the proposed Hidden Quarry, not only to determine the impact of the quarry on the value of properties around the quarry site, but also to evaluate other economic impacts. And these other economic impacts include determining how much additional tax burden will be shifted to each and every other property in Guelph-Eramosa Township as a result of declines in assessed values of properties near the quarry site;

d) We are requesting a response to the issue of impacts on agricultural resources including the mushroom farm adjacent to the quarry site;

e) We are requesting a response to the issues raised about impacts from blasting vibration and fly rock and we are more specifically requesting that Council hire a specialist peer review consultant with regards to this issue—a firm like Golders. The current peer comments with regards to blasting are inadequate; and

f) We are requesting a response to the interrelated issues regarding hydro-geological impacts, well monitoring and concerns with regards to mitigation in the event that well interference occurs, with regards to the inaccurate characterization of the quarry site as not having karst features and the implications for hydrogeological impact and hydrogeological modeling in light of karst features being present.

