

**PARTICIPANT STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD HEARING RELATING
TO THE HIDDEN (ERAMOSA) QUARRY**

Name: Mary Cuerrier
Address: 4996 Sixth Line Eramosa Twp.
Rockwood, ON N0B 2K0
Legal Description: Concession 5 East Part Lot 3

Qualifications

I have resided on the Sixth Line Eramosa Twp. for the better part of 45 years. Since 1973, my parents, William and Joyce Hill, have owned the property at 5006 Sixth Line Eramosa Twp. I lived there as a teenager, when the population of Rockwood was 985 people. My father, two of my brothers and I commuted to Toronto for school and work. It took us approximately 50 minutes to reach downtown Toronto, a commute that regularly takes 1½ to 2 hours today. In the late 1970s, we drove to Georgetown to become some of the first commuters on the new GO Train.

In 2007, my husband, André, and I purchased the property at 4996 Sixth Line Eramosa Twp. and we have resided there ever since. For several years, André commuted to Woodbridge every day for work, leaving before 6:00 am to limit his commute to approximately 1¼ hours. I travel to the western GTA for work and our son rides a small school van to Cambridge. Between September and April we travel back and forth to the hockey arenas in Acton and Georgetown 5-7 times per week. We are a family who is very familiar with the traffic patterns on Highway 7 between Georgetown and Guelph.

I am a graduate of the University of Western Ontario (Bachelor of Arts in English), the University of Guelph (Bachelor of Applied Science in Human Nutrition) and York University (Master of Business Administration in Marketing). I am a Registered Dietitian and a Member of the Ontario College of Dietitians and the Dietitians of Canada. I have been an employee of Abbott Laboratories Limited since August 8th, 1995.

Context

I first heard of the proposed “Hidden Quarry” application from my son’s then school bus driver, Lorrie Fowler, who resided at 104 Lou Hiltz Crescent, Rockwood, ON. Lorrie had seen James Dick Construction Limited’s (“JDCL”) Aggregate Resources Act Form 1 - Notice of Application for a Licence and Form 2 – Notice of Public Information Session in the local newspaper, *The Wellington Advertiser*, in January 2013. Soon after mentioning this conversation to my parents, a meeting notice was quickly distributed for any interested parties to convene in their kitchen to discuss these applications. As the recording secretary of the two meetings that ultimately took place, I gained an initial understanding of how a quarry at the end of the Sixth Line might impact me, my family and our neighbours on the Sixth Line.

Initial Objections – Traffic Study

My greatest concern was how the truck traffic going into and out of the quarry might impact those of us who live, and travel several times a day, on the Sixth Line. I stand by the issues that I raised in my initial Letter of Objection dated Friday, April 13th, 2013. At that time, I outlined several concerns I had with the Cole Engineering Group Ltd. Report (Project No. TR12-0013 Traffic Impact Study prepared for JDCL in April 2012), including:

1. Study Approach – Horizon Year

Cole applied a “conservative growth rate of 2.5% per year to all traffic movements within the study area *as per discussions with Township staff*”. I believe this 2.5% growth rate should be properly calculated from the most recent census data and validated before being applied to such a long-term project (i.e. minimum 20 year projected lifespan of the quarry). This region is just outside of Ontario’s Green Belt, where new, affordable housing is being built. In fact, over 300 dwellings have recently been added to Rockwood in the Noble Ridge development.

2. Existing Traffic Conditions – Traffic Assessment

According to this section, Accu-Traffic Inc. (ATI) apparently assessed the existing traffic volumes at the Intersection of Highway 7 and the Sixth Line Eramosa Twp. on Tuesday, February 14th, 2012. When then, do I see “Count date: 17-Feb-12” on half of the Accu-Traffic Inc. sheets shown in Appendix A of the report? Friday of Family Day weekend strikes me as an odd date on which to get a true picture of traffic counts. I am further confused as to why the traffic assessment would be done in February. February is clearly identified on Page 5 of the Cole report as the **least** busy month of site-generated truck traffic for the reference Erin Pit (i.e. representing ~1.8% of the annual production). If February is the month of least production and therefore least truck traffic, this does not yield a true picture of traffic impact on the already busy Highway 7. A more realistic representation would be presented with a traffic assessment conducted in June or August when quarry truck traffic and Highway 7 traffic are at their peak.

Furthermore, the trip generation pattern referenced at other existing JDCL aggregate sites identifies the busiest and least busy hours of trucking volume:

- a) The first hour of the day (i.e. 6am to 7am) is cited as the busiest hour of the day in terms of truck volume at the proposed quarry site. For me, this raised the question: why do all of the ATI traffic assessments start at 7am, excluding the peak hour of 6am to 7am? Common sense also tells us that this is also likely to be one of the busiest hours for eastbound commuter traffic on Highway 7. My son’s own school van arrives at our house after travelling along Highway 7 at 6:55 am.
- b) The last hour of the day (i.e. 4pm to 5 pm) is referred to as a period of low volume trucking because most “material has left the quarry prior to 4pm due to the fact that it must arrive at the jobsite before jobs shut down at 5pm”. Again, I was confused as to why ATI would conduct a traffic assessment from 4pm to 6pm. According to Figure 4-2, there won’t be any trucks leaving the proposed quarry site after 5pm and only 1-3 trucks leaving between 4pm to 5pm.

3. Safety Considerations

However, my greatest concern by far with the initial traffic study was the obvious lack of attention given in the Cole Report (Section 7.2 – Safety Considerations) to the safety of the school bus and farm equipment traffic on Highway 7. There was absolutely no mention of school bus traffic at all in the initial traffic study. And, by conducting the traffic study in February, there would be no farm equipment travelling on Highway 7. This occurs in the peak quarry truck traffic months of June and August.

Updated Objection – Revised Traffic Impact Study

When I look at the cover letter from Mr. Joseph E. Gowrie, P. Eng., Cole Engineering, attached to their Revised Traffic Impact Study dated April 2016, I am struck by one statement, “*The study finds that the development, while assessed with a conservative truck volume of 38 two-way trips per hour, is expected to have **no significant impact to the surrounding road network***”. Let me repeat that “**no significant impact to the surrounding road network**”. Impact on road network? Is that all that matters here? What about everything else that this truck traffic will impact? Even when I look at Future Considerations, all I see are how the pavement is going to change with intersections, turning lanes, tapers and truck signs. These things have one thing in common they are inanimate objects!! The very word “impact” means that one thing will have a strong effect on *someone* or something.

What is still missing in this Revised Traffic *Impact* Study is the strong effect it will have on the “**someones**”. Again, there is no mention of the impact this truck traffic will have on the living things near the Hidden Quarry. There is no mention of the wildlife, the domestic animals or the PEOPLE who will be impacted by all of this congestion and pollution. There is no consideration of the people who live, work and commute on those roads. I am especially perturbed by the total lack of consideration for the safety of the people on the 6th Line. From my discussion with Stephanie Burnham, a student in the Rural Planning and Development Master's degree program at the University of Guelph, I understand that one of the first priorities of a Traffic Impact Assessment should be to set out an emergency plan for the people who would be impacted by the proposed traffic change. I have never seen nor heard of anything to do with emergency vehicle access on the 6th Line beyond the proposed quarry site. We have only one way in and out of the 6th Line. I am shocked that police cars, firetrucks and ambulances will be competing with gravel trucks to reach the people beyond the quarry site and this has not been taken into account at all.

School Traffic Safety

I mentioned at the outset, that I have a son who travels to and from school in a school van along the Sixth Line. As a student in the French school system, he travels west along Highway 7 to Guelph and then on to Cambridge. With the removal of the railway bridge on the Sixth Line, there is no other means of entering or exiting the Sixth Line than at Highway 7. I am very worried about his safety and that of the other school van occupants (including the school van driver) should this quarry application be approved. I have serious concerns about the risky driving that might occur when a stressed-out, impatient commuter encounters a school vehicle that must wait for all the trucks to clear the roadways and enter the quarry or get up to speed when exiting the quarry.

In addition to the safety of my son, there are almost 3,000 children walking, biking and being driven to schools by personal vehicles, taxis and school buses in Rockwood and Acton every day. The schools in Rockwood (Upper Grand District School Board) and those in the Municipality of Halton Hills are part of Ontario's **Active & Safe Routes to School** Program. This program "promotes safety, physical activity and environmentally sustainable transportation to and from school". Guideline #1 in the *Child and Youth Friendly Land Use and Transportation Planning Guidelines* states: "In transport and land-use planning, the needs of children and youth should receive as much priority as the needs of people of other ages and the requirements of business." The needs of the school children and youth of Rockwood and Acton have not been a priority at all in the transport and land-use planning of this quarry application. Absolutely no consideration has been given to the safety of almost 3,000 students who would be impacted by the 26 Eramosa Quarry truck trips per hour should this application be approved.

Lastly, one traffic fatality has already occurred at the intersection of Highway 7 and the Sixth Line of Eramosa Township. On March 24th, 2011, long-time Sixth Line resident, Gordon Ball, died making a left turn from Highway 7 on to the Sixth Line. This is already a dangerous intersection without the addition of approximately 135 JDCL trucks per day.

Flyrock

My deep concerns over the safety implications of this quarry don't end with traffic safety. I have come to understand from listening to, proofreading and even presenting my father, William Hill's, work the risk that flyrock from this mine poses to everyone in its vicinity. These random, destructive blasting incidents damage property and even kill, yet this issue has been dismissed by JDCL.

I gained a first-hand appreciation for the threat that flyrock poses to the many homes, farms and businesses near the quarry site when I read a statement to the Guelph-Eramosa Township Council on behalf of Susan Haslem in February 2017. Mrs. Haslem lives directly across from the proposed quarry site on Highway 7. Her statement went like this:

Regarding the Application for James Dick to operate a quarry using dynamite in close proximity to so many people living, working and commuting on Hwy 7 past the property. I am here to ask you to consider the safety of those people, animals and properties surrounding the blasting area.

I know the chances of flying rock are slim and it is an accident or an unknown entity under the ground BUT it does happen, I have experienced it and do not want to experience it again! It happened on Halton Country Golf Course on a fairway beside the Quarry, it was sudden, with no warning and luckily no-one was hurt. We were just teeing off and about to walk down the fairway when it was suddenly showered in rock! We were surprised a second time when a few pickup trucks suddenly drove onto the fairway. A crew of men wearing hard hats jumped out, picked up all of the rocks, threw them into the backs of the trucks and drove back to the quarry.

It is to you we look for protection from being hurt or killed from flying rock or our homes and business damaged. Unsuspecting travellers in cars, GO buses, transport trucks and especially school buses, travelling on Highway 7 won't know of danger until it happens.

The Sixth Line of Eramosa Township is a beautiful, peaceful rural road, home to humans, animals, birds, farmland, and forests. Highway 7 is dotted with businesses, homes and farms. Tens of thousands of vehicles from bicycles to school buses, transport trucks, tractors and combines travel it every day, passing right by this proposed quarry site. A quarry located at the corner of Highway 7 and the Sixth Line, with its truck traffic and dangerous potential of flyrock, places **ALL** of this directly and irresponsibly in harm's way.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Cuerrier

Date