



LPAT Day 7 – May 30, 2019

Day 7 is done. It brought to light even more errors by JDCL experts. It revealed again that, given the old errors, the Hidden Quarry was certain to have had a much greater negative impact than predicted had it been approved in 2016.

There is little reason to be more confident now that still more and new errors are popping up, sometimes to both our lawyer's and the expert's surprise.

IMPORTANT HOUSEKEEPING UPDATES:

1. **Hearing times are 9:30 to 4:45** unless otherwise advised. There is an hour for lunch at no specified time. There are 15-minute morning and afternoon breaks.
2. There will **no Hearings on Fridays June 14 and 28.**
3. The **agenda for Monday** is at the end of this report.
4. [Sign in on our roster here.](#) **Note: This is a new link with the first two weeks of June listed.**
5. **BRING A CUSHION!**
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!!):

David Germain, lawyer for Halton Region, continued **cross-examination of JDCL's Hydrogeologist, Stan Denhoed**, raising concerns about the accuracy of assumptions about the source of groundwater flow to the Brydson Spring and risks to this oxygenated, cold rush of life-giving water south of the site. Another focus was the possibility of water contamination carried from farm operations north of the site through the open quarry 'ponds' to groundwater conduits. Mr Denhoed confirmed that it was possible, but indicated that the likelihood was low and that private well water could be protected with ultra-violet lamps, for example – and that JDCL would undertake to improve some of these systems in advance of blasting.

Chris Barnett began his cross-examination of Mr. Denhoed with a proposition – “The only thing you know with certainty is from boreholes or wells you have drilled.” Mr. Denhoed disagreed, saying he could tell a lot from a few specific tests. C. Barnett therefore proceeded to review the Site Plan to confirm what the bedrock elevations were with the limited data in two phases (boreholes and wells on the edges) and none in the third. They reviewed together each Phase and discovered that in all three locations, the site plan was, in fact, incorrect. Importantly the site plan relies on the elevation of the crusher for noise and air quality management decisions, for example. The noise and air quality analysis and recommendations would therefore have to be reviewed in light of this new information. Further, groundwater modelling addressed the present and the post rehabilitation situations, but not the situation during the 17-year operation. Mr. Denhoed said they would rely on monitoring during this time to show them what was actually happening. The questioning pointed to many more assumptions, and also to changes made to the modelling since Mr. Denhoed's confident 2016 witness statement. If the quarry had been approved based on the 2016 evidence, much would have been wrong. Now we are discovering errors in the 2019 analysis. Mr. Denhoed also stated that the GRCA Tier 3 drinking water areas of influence model is wrong, a document upon which all planning in the watershed will be based. This leads to even greater uncertainty. The DeGrandis ponds, wells and springs are the focus of much questioning. Mr. Denhoed asserted that, in his opinion, the quarry would have no impact on them. C. Barnett then asked if MNRF had seen the new information since they signed off in 2012. The answer was no.

There was just enough time left in the day for a short statement from **JDCL's bedrock hydrogeologist, Dr. Stephen Worthington**. Dr. Worthington had participated in the hydro-g review of the Walkerton contamination crisis, and had addressed the role the karst formation played there. In the case of the Hidden Quarry proposal, he questioned some of the conclusions of CRC's hydro-geologist Dr. Emil Frind – in fact this seemed to be the reason for his testifying. Dr. Frind has yet to speak. In his analysis Dr Worthington used the GRCA Tier 3 model...which Stan Denhoed had just dismissed. The plot gets thicker and more turbid every day! Cross examination begins on Monday.

What's on the agenda for tomorrow?

Dr. Worthington will be cross-examined.

The next witnesses on the JDCL list are Peter Giamou on Ground Penetrating Radar and Dan Hurley on Storm Water. We can't predict if they will both testify tomorrow.