



## LPAT Day 12 – June 10, 2019

Day 12 is done. There were moments today when our collective hair stood on end we felt so assaulted. Our decorum was maintained, more or less, but if you were in the peanut gallery, you could feel the rustle of sighs of frustration going up and down the rows.

### IMPORTANT HOUSEKEEPING UPDATES:

1. **\*\*\*Tomorrow, Tuesday's, session begins at 10 AM – slight delay approved thanks to the Raptors!!**
2. **Hearing times are 9:30 to 4:45 unless otherwise advised.**
3. There will be **no Hearings on Fridays June 14 and 28.**
4. The **agenda for Tuesday** is at the end of this report.
5. [Sign in on our roster here.](#) **Note: This is a new link with the first two weeks of June listed.**
6. **NEW!! Most participants will present their statements on Monday, June 17. Mark your calendars so you can come to support them.**

**Session Content** (This is not a detailed report – just a very simplistic record of activity because of the complexity of the issues, technical analyses and regulatory requirements. Any inaccuracies or opinions are Linda Sword's, not CRC's!!)

Chris Barnett continued his cross examination of **JDCL Planner Anne Guiot** addressing site plan changes in the most recent (ever-changing) Site Plans. C. Barnett checked every detail, and found several missing links. He went on to review her witness statement, confirming that she had not studied any materials other than those submitted by JDCL, although she was aware of the gist. She had not read CRC documents – and had relied only on agencies with sign-off roles, and GET's Planner, Liz Howson. It was not her business to address local residents' concerns (it was Mr. Stovel's). Her focus was on Aggregate Resource Act regulations. C. Barnett wondered if MNRF had seen more recent site plans than those approved in 2013...including the new version with significant hydrogeological changes – Was she aware, for example, of the 80% change in draw down levels, (no) and was it ok for MNRF not to be made aware? Answering David Germain's questions (Halton) She further clarified that the Site Plan reference to extending the southern blasting zone beyond 165 metres would require a formal MNRF Site Plan amendment...We hadn't realized that such a change could even be contemplated. D. Germain asked if Halton could receive monitoring data from annual compliance reports – She was reluctant to acknowledge the utility – not realizing that Halton Region has a hydrogeologist on staff to review exactly this kind of data. Halton Region's interest in this case seems, often, to surprise JDCL experts.

JDCL's final witness, Land Use and Environmental Planner, Michael Wynia began his testimony. He began with the mandatory list of all the ways HQ would have no impacts – and all its benefits – economic, high-grade aggregate, close to market. He couldn't emphasize enough that now was the time for extraction, so 'we' don't have to protect it anymore. In fact, he told us that 'we' had put GET "on notice a long time ago" that the whole length of Hwy. 7 from 6<sup>th</sup> Line Eramosa to 7<sup>th</sup> Line should be protected for aggregate extraction. The Township hadn't "protected aggregate resources" when they "sterilized the adjacent lands", ie. zoned the lands adjacent to HQ as industrial, now rural employment. Aggregate should have been the first priority in planning. Through a progressive analysis of the Provincial Policy Statement planning guidelines, he kept reminding us that 'we' can't eliminate impact, but 'we' can make it acceptable. Like all the JDCL experts, he was well armoured with ARA guidelines and provincial standards. He was impressed by the ideal transportation set-up at HQ given the 6<sup>th</sup> Line access to the Provincial Highway. (My notes say that I could see steam rising from residents at this point.) Mr. Wynia is also an ecologist, but not for the purposes of this Hearing. As he launched into maps of natural heritage systems (which showed a natural heritage system mysteriously stopping at Hwy. 7) and gave us notes on salamanders, C. Barnett rose to say that we had already heard testimony from two JDCL natural environment experts, and that adding new maps on the last day of JDCL testimony was not acceptable. Mr. Wynia was cautioned by the Chair to keep his planning focus, but then introduced the issue of snapping turtles, species of special concern. His very interesting lecture on their re-productive rates was again interrupted by C. Barnett. However, when Mr. Wynia explained that he and JDCL expert Greg Sheifele, and JDCL itself, disagreed about the extent of fencing required to protect the turtles which were at risk of wandering onto the site and into quarry ponds, C. Barnett decided to let him continue, since he was, ironically, making our case. Like Greg Sweetnam before him he assured us that the site would be the equivalent of the Rockwood Conservation Area...that the managed woodland was never meant to mature into a mixed forest, and that the property was not good agricultural land, so we understood that there was really nothing here to protect.

You can tell we were all riled up ... but the good news came at 4 pm – We could adjourn because the crucial Wellington County Official Plan had somehow not been included in evidence and needed to be copied. Somewhere someone is slaving over a copy machine, missing the Raptors' Game. The really good news came when Chair Scott Tousaw suggested that tonight's 'cultural' event might justify a later start tomorrow. So 10 o'clock it is!!

### **What's on the agenda for Monday?**

**Continued testimony of Michael Wynia and his Cross-examination. Wellington County's first and only witness may be called, time permitting.**