

Public Feedback questions received, and responses provided at the virtual Public Information Meeting held on December 6, 2023.

James Dick Construction Limited
**Reid Road Quarry EA
Public Information Meeting #1
December 6, 2023
Feedback Report**

Prepared by Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP
Public Engagement Consultant and Facilitator
Cumming+Company
cumming1@total.net

For information on the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry Environmental Assessment, please visit <https://www.rrrqa.ca>. Comments can be forwarded to rrrqa@jamesdick.com.

James Dick Construction Limited
Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA
Public Information Meeting #1 (virtual)
Held December 6, 2023, 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
Public Feedback Report

About This Report

James Dick Construction Limited is undertaking an Environmental Assessment under Ontario Regulation 539/21 and the Environmental Assessment Act to assess the establishment and operation of the Reid Road Reservoir quarry, and associated activities including blasting, processing, recycling, and shipping of aggregate materials. The first of three Public Information Meetings was held on December 6, 2023. The purpose of the Public Information Meeting was to introduce the project, to provide an overview of the Environmental Assessment process, and to seek feedback on the criteria and indicators that have been drafted to evaluate the effects of the project and alternative methods of carrying out the project on the environment.

The Public Information Meeting was held virtually and included a live presentation followed by questions and answers. Participants registered in advance and were able to type questions and comments into a Q and A box and these were read aloud by the independent facilitator. Over 120 individuals participated in the meeting and 201 questions and comments were noted. Individuals were able to ask multiple questions. Questions and comments were read aloud verbatim and the names and identifying information were kept anonymous to ensure the comfort of those participating. The format was organized to provide equal opportunity to participate and to accommodate a greater number of people from the comfort of their home. The presentation was recorded and posted on the project website shortly after the meeting. The preliminary criteria and indicators were available on the project website prior the meeting along with a comment forms and comment provided by January 17, 2024, are being considered in the finalization of the criteria and indicators package for submission to MECP.

This report, prepared by the Independent Facilitator Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming+Company (cumming1@total.net), includes verbatim questions and comments and responses provided that resulted from the Public Information Meeting.

Table of Contents

1. About Virtual Public Information Meeting #1	3
2. Public Comments and Questions Noted	
2.1. About the Public Information Meeting.....	3
2.2. About the EA Process for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry.....	5
2.3. About Public Consultation for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA.....	7
2.4. About the Study Area for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA	9
2.5. About the Draft Evaluation Criteria and Indicators	10
2.6. About the Consultants and Studies to be undertaken.....	12
2.7. About the History of Use on the Subject Property	13
2.8. About JDCL Operations and Other Sites.....	13
2.9. About Wells, Surface Water and Groundwater (Geology and Hydrogeology)	17
2.10. About Traffic and Alternate Haul Routes	22
2.11. About Air Quality	26
2.12. About Noise.....	28
2.13. About Socio-Economic Environment	29
2.14. Other General Comments and Questions	30

1. About Virtual Public Information Meeting #1

Public Information Meeting #1 (PIM #1) was held virtually on December 6, 2023, from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. The purpose of the public information meeting was to:

- Introduce the project.
- Provide an overview of the Environmental Assessment Process.
- Present the preliminary draft evaluation criteria and indicators that have been drafted to evaluate the effects of the project and the alternative methods of carrying out the project on the environment.
- Receive input on the preliminary draft criteria and indicators.
- Answer questions about the EA Process.

The notice for the Public Information Meeting included the following:

- Identification of project website for ongoing project information.
- Contact information for providing comments by email and on the project website through an online comment form.
- Reference to the posting on the website prior to the public information meeting of the draft evaluation and indicators.

The format for the Public Information Meeting included a live presentation followed by questions and answers. Residents registered in advance of the meeting and did not need to download any software to participate. Those who wanted to share a comment or ask questions, were able to do so by typing these into the Q and A question box. These were read aloud by the Independent Facilitator. The names of individuals were not read out. Participants could ask multiple questions.

The total number of attendees who participated in PIM #1 was 108 connections. Some of these may have included more than one individual.

The following presented and were available to respond to questions:

Presenters: Vince Deschamps and James Parkin, MHBC Planning

Technical Experts and Project Contacts:

- Greg Scheifele, GWS Ecological & Forestry Services Inc. (Natural Environment)
- Al Sandilands, Gray Owl Environmental Inc. (Natural Environment)
- Brian Sulley, RWDI (Air Quality)
- Stan Denhoed, Harden Environmental Services Ltd. (Hydrogeology)
- Derek Flake, Aercoustics Engineering Ltd. (Noise)
- Andrew Campbell, Explotech Engineering Ltd. (Blasting)
- Stew Elkins, Paradigm (Transportation)
- Kelly Beri & Ryan Doyle, HDR (Social Impact)
- Greg Sweetnam & Leigh Mugford, James Dick Construction Limited.
- Chelsea Major, MHBC Planning

It was noted that comments submitted by the end of the day on January 17, 2024, would be considered by the Project Team in the finalization of the evaluation criteria and indicators package for submission to MECP. It was also noted that comments can be submitted through the project website or email to rrrgea@jamesdick.com at any time throughout the EA for review. It should be noted that a number of comments were submitted through the project website and email correspondence to James Dick Construction by January 17, 2024. These are not included in this report. All comments

and questions are being considered by the Project Team and will be included in documentation for MECP.

After the Public Information Meeting, the presentation slides and video of the presentation were posted on the project website. The Project Team also advised that a Frequently Asked Question (FAQ) document would be prepared to assist in responding to frequently asked questions and would also be posted on the website. The FAQ would be updated at different stages of the EA.

2. Public Comments and Questions Noted

This report section is intended as a record of “What Was Heard” - public comments and questions raised at the December 6, 2023, Public Information Meeting #1. It includes the verbatim questions that were noted in the Q and A and the responses provided. The questions are grouped by topic and numbered for reference purposes. For some responses additional information is included to clarify the response provided. Personal identifying information (i.e., the name of individuals asking questions) is not included in this summary.

Throughout the Question-and-Answer period, two hundred and one (201) questions and comments were asked and noted. Participants were able to ask multiple questions. Several participants made comments, and these are included in this feedback report. Forty (40) individuals asked at least one question or provided a comment. Several participants asked multiple questions. Seven (7) attendees asked more than 5 question with several (2) attendees asking more than 12 questions each. A few participants made comments, and these are also noted. One individual emailed some questions in advance, and these were included.

Summary Table of What Was Heard – Comments and Questions from Participants

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.1. About the Public Information Meeting</p>	<p>1. What is the website? <i>Response provided: The website is shown on the slide on the screen and is https://www.rrrqea.ca. The website was referenced in the meeting notice.</i></p> <p>2. Can we get a copy of the presentation slides?</p> <p>3. Are these slides going to be available to attendees? <i>Response provided: Yes, we can post the presentation slides on the website so that they are available to anyone who wants to review them (the slides were posted on December 7, 2023).</i></p> <p>4. Will the question-and-answer period be included in the recording that is going to be available post meeting? You mentioned the 30-minute presentation would be, but the important response is in the Q&A. Will a recording of the Q&A be available. <i>Response from Facilitator: The presentation portion will be available. The questions and responses will be included verbatim in the feedback report so that they can be organized by topic and theme; this portion of the video will not be posted.</i></p> <p>5. Will we be able to receive a list of attendees? <i>Response from Facilitator: No. The list of who participated is not something that is made available to the public for Environmental Assessment projects. The list of participants is provided as part of the ministry record. There are 108 attendees or connections for this meeting. There may be more than one person at each connection.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.1. About the Public Information Meeting (continued)</p>	<p>6. How can the Applicant possibly think that any one can digest all these slides in 2 minutes and formulate meaningful questions. Why were these not made available earlier? Where would they find the information?</p> <p><i>Response provided: Yes. There's a lot to look at and it is available on the website for review and comment. The draft criteria and indicators were posted when the notice went out and will continue to be on the website. We have also included a comment form and comments can also be emailed to rrrgea@jamesdick.com.</i></p> <p>7. What if we have questions after this meeting?</p> <p><i>Response from Facilitator: Following tonight's meeting, you can provide your input by going onto the website and completing the comment form or emailing comments to the address that has been provided. We have quite a few questions in the Q & A for tonight and it is understood that some participants will need time to review what is being presented. There is a link on the website homepage that when clicked, will take the reader to the draft evaluation criteria and indicators document. You'll be able to also scroll down the bottom as I noted earlier, to find an online comment form.</i></p> <p>8. What is the deadline for submitting comments?</p> <p>9. In your Notice of Public Information Meeting #1 you state that written input received by January 17th will be reflected in the package sent to MECP. Does this mean written input including by email will be accepted up to midnight on the 17th? And if not, what is the submission time and deadline?</p> <p><i>Response provided: Comments are accepted anytime throughout the EA but for the draft criteria and indicators we are going to start preparing the package and the revisions after the end of the day on the 17th of January. Any comments received by then we would review as part of the process of finalization the evaluation and criteria for submission to MECP.</i></p> <p>10. Does the James Dick Firm have the participants names on the introduction slide?</p> <p><i>Response provided: Yes. Slide 2 was put on the screen showing the names of Greg Sweetnam and Leigh Mugford who are participants from James Dick Construction.</i></p> <p>11. Why is this meeting set up so that the public cannot see who's asking? Why are not all questions made public? This seems a very controlled process by the applicants.</p> <p><i>Response from Facilitator: The name of the individual who is asking the question is not being provided to ensure that those that want to ask questions or provide comments can do so in a safe space and to ensure that everyone can be comfortable participating. The questions that are put in the Q and A will be included in the Public Information Meeting Feedback Report verbatim.</i></p> <p>12. I thought that you were going to read questions verbatim. Please re-read the one questions and do not paraphrase.</p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.1. About the Public Information Meeting (continued)</p>	<p><i>Response from Facilitator: Yes, that is the intent, and I am reading them out as they are written. I did paraphrase the one question into different parts but will read it out again verbatim.</i></p> <p>13. A comment was noted that it would have been good to have some of the technical consultants answer questions.</p>
<p>2.2. About the EA Process for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA</p>	<p>1. What is the meaning on slide 12 that no terms of reference are required for the EA? <i>Response provided: The requirements for doing this EA are already specified within the regulation itself which includes the scope of the study and the process to be followed. As such, there are no terms of reference required and that is one of the exemptions that are offered by the EA, by the regulation.</i></p> <p>2. Is this environmental assessment biased in any manner? <i>Response provided: The project team will do their best to objectively look at the impacts that have to be assessed through the EA process and do our best to objectively assess those based on the facts that are available to us.</i></p> <p>3. Why did JDCL wait from July 2021 until now to address the environmental assessment?</p> <p>4. Why are you out now consulting at this time of the year?</p> <p>5. Why has the applicant picked the busiest time of year for many to commence this process? This is like what they did under the environmental registry. Was this strategic on their part, to limit participation in this meeting? <i>Response provided: We were getting ready. We were consulting with MECP to understand the requirements for the EA study. A socio-economic impact consultant was being hired to undertake work. The Project Team was preparing so that we would be ready to issue the notice of commencement and start the consultation. There are a lot of busy times of the year. It is very difficult to find a time that suits everybody. This is an introductory meeting, to introduce people to it. And as we've said, there's a period now, up until the middle of January 2024 for people to look at these criteria and provide feedback.</i></p> <p>6. What is the difference between an EA and an EIS, which is commonly required for mining projects? <i>Response provided: An EA refers to an Environmental Assessment Process which is a statutory process carried out under the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act. An EIS is an Environmental Impact Study is often a more generic term used to describe an impact study that could be carried out as a requirement of the Aggregate Resources Act or Planning Act. This is an EA. We are using the term Environmental Assessment and Environmental Assessment Act as this is what the Ministry is requiring under Ontario Regulation 539/21. As most will know, the government passed a resolution requiring James Dick Construction Limited to undertake an EA in addition to the work already undertaken as part of the Aggregate Resources Act requirements.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.2. About the EA Process for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA (continued)</p>	<p>7. In your notice of commencement of environmental assessment, you state, "The project continues to be subject to the Aggregate Resources Act, ARA, licencing and application review process, which has effectively been paused until the Environmental Assessment Act requirements are met." If the EA is approved, what is the next step in the ARA licencing process? And if the EA is not approved, what is the next step in the licencing process?</p> <p><i>Response provided: The answer in both instances is really derived from the authority that the Minister of Natural Resources has under the Aggregate Resources Act, and he has three options. He could issue the licence, he could refuse the licence, or he could refer it to the Ontario Land Tribunal. So those are really the only three choices that he has. If he refuses it, the applicant can appeal that decision, which would also go to the Ontario Land Tribunal.</i></p> <p>8. The answer provided (above) did not clarify. "If the Minister of the Environment refuses approval to proceed with the undertaking, is that not the end of the process?"</p> <p><i>Response provided: I don't speak for the decision makers. So, maybe you're assuming that the Minister of Natural Resources would then turn around and refuse the ARA licence. And that may be the answer you're looking for, but I don't know. This is an unprecedented situation with a quarry being required to go through these two parallel processes. And I don't know exactly how it would be determined in the end. I've just told you what the statute says and what options it gives the minister at this stage of the process. I am sorry I can't be more help on that.</i></p> <p>9. Is there not a surplus of aggregate to last for the next 50 years? Why is this project necessary?</p> <p>10. You mentioned this aggregate is a needed resource. For what purposes specifically is those needed that can't be serviced by other gravel types?</p> <p><i>Response provided: No, there's a lot of misinformation about availability of aggregate resources. This resource is the Amabel Dolomite, and the number of supply points has significantly decreased. The licenced supply is diminishing. There's a need for greater competition in the marketplace. This is a much-needed type of aggregate resource and as the provincial policy states, this is a tremendous opportunity to have it available in a close to market location.</i></p> <p>11. If we want to validate or contest the assessment findings, do we need to initiate our own assessments?</p> <p><i>Response provided: Well, we're hoping that along the way there'll be enough engagement so that we're in agreement, in concordance at least on the approaches to the environmental assessment itself. Should anybody want to do their own individual assessment, that's up to them to decide to do. But we're hoping that this process will be something that's integrated, comprehensive, and open to the point where we would have input from the public, concerns are being properly identified and addressed and vetted through the government review process.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.2. About the EA Process for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA (continued)</p>	<p>12. What is de-watering?</p> <p><i>Response provided: There is a document that explains the alternatives that we're proposing to consider through the EA and elaborates on the difference between the two methods of mining. We will make sure that that is posted on the website and addressed in the FAQ.</i></p>
<p>2.3. About Public Consultation for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA</p>	<p>1. How are Indigenous First Nations being consulted through the environmental assessment process.</p> <p>2. Who from the Indigenous Communities was consulted and what was their feedback?</p> <p><i>Response provided: MECP directed the proponent as to which communities to engage and that includes the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, and Six Nations, which includes the Haudenosaunee. We have been engaging with the communities and the consultations with them have been ongoing. They will be recorded as well as part of the EA consultation record.</i></p> <p>3. The Facilitator started the meeting mentioning First Nations and Treaty lands. Are there any First Nations claims on the James Dick Construction property and was/ is there any First Nations participation in the EIS?</p> <p><i>Response provided: I'm not aware of any claims, although we are in areas that are affected by treaties, and we have had initial consultation with indigenous communities as is directed by the Crown and that will continue through the environmental assessment process as well.</i></p> <p>4. It was stated that PIM#2 on the proposed work plans would be prior to the field season, in 2024. Field season often starts in early spring. Is there an anticipated month for when PIM#2 will occur?</p> <p>5. When do you forecast being prepared to hold the second public meeting?</p> <p>6. Is there a specific month for when PIM#2 will occur?</p> <p><i>Response provided: Some of the field studies could begin, post melt during the spring freshet. So, we would want to ensure that we had our work plans well fleshed out and well understood and approved prior to moving forward. And part of that would be a second information meeting.</i></p> <p><i>Response provided: In terms of when to schedule the meeting, we will hold that when the work plans are ready to be reviewed with the public. Once we get feedback on the criteria and indicators, our technical team are working on draft work plans for next year, but we want to make sure that our criteria and indicators are properly considered in the formulation of those work plans. And then we'll be able to streamline them and present them in draft format to the public. There may be some components of what we move forward with, and there would be other components, we'd have to build on.</i></p> <p>7. How would they know when that's going to happen, in terms of when would that be? Would there be a notice, or would the information be on your website? How would the public learn about the draft work plans being available?</p> <p><i>Response provided: They will be notified by the same means, for which this meeting was notified. It will be published in the newspaper, which is a</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.3. About Public Consultation for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA (continued)</p>	<p><i>requirement of the regulation, and it will be published on the website as well.</i></p> <p>8. Could you agree to not have the second public information meeting during March break? <i>Response provided: Yes. We will not hold the meeting during March Break.</i></p> <p>9. It was said that notice would be in the newspaper, but Milton no longer has a newspaper. What newspaper is it going in?</p> <p>10. We no longer have a newspaper.</p> <p>11. It is no longer called Milton Champion. I believe it is now called Inside Halton.</p> <p>12. We don't have a newspaper anymore so where is the notice being posted and what newspaper? <i>Response provided: Notice was placed in the Milton Champion, which is still being circulated on a digital format.</i></p> <p>13. If you are giving notice of study area and information via newspaper, what newspapers will carry this information?</p> <p>14. Our community no longer has a newspaper.</p> <p>15. In which newspaper would the notice of the second meeting be written? Can we assume it would be the same as what you did for the first public information meeting? <i>Response provided: Yes, that is correct.</i> <i>Follow-up comment: I want to make sure that people know that on the website, there's a place where you can ask to be put on the mailing list. So, if you're not sure about which newspapers, or you're worried about missing it because you're away or what have you, I mean, the most important thing, if you were interested in getting further notice of the stages of this study, then please make sure you put your name and email address on that mailing list, and then you were assured of getting direct notice from us.</i></p> <p>16. Why can we not have these meetings in person and not on Zoom? Response provided: <i>We did consider a range of format options for this, and we felt that this was the most likely to achieve the objectives of the meeting, which was to begin to convey information, and invite feedback on the criteria and indicators. So, I think this was a good practise. I think it's common practise to have these meetings virtually now. And I think for this case it was the right choice.</i></p> <p>17. When will the Municipal Joint Agency review team be reestablished? <i>Response provided: That's the question that only the Town and Region might be able to answer. I don't know, I'm not able to answer that.</i></p> <p>18. When you say FAQ, are there frequently asked questions, is that something that's on the website? <i>Response provided: Yes.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.4. About the Study Area for the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA</p>	<p>1. How was the study area determined? Shouldn't it there be a bigger study area that what is shown on the map? <i>Response provided: Slide 15 shows the proposed study area. When we determined how big the study area should be, we started by identifying the project site which includes the properties proposed for extraction, the licence area as well as the other lands that are owned by James Dick. We then identified receptors or sensitive receptors identified through the air and noise studies undertaken for the Aggregate Resources Act and the properties adjacent to the alternative haul routes. This information was used to determine the 500-metre study area. Having said that, should we be receiving information or concerns from individuals who feel that other properties should be included in the study area or that the study area should be expanded, we would consider this. We would speak to them and consider that.</i></p> <p>2. Why was the impact area only the area within 500 metres of the site, when the village of Campbellville is only one kilometre from the entrance of the subject lands?</p> <p>3. Shouldn't the entire study area be the Village of Campbellville? the study area appears to be all within JDCL owned lands. <i>Response provided: If an impact study suggest that impacts are going outside the study area, we don't stop the study just because it crosses the 500-metre line, but that's the area that's most likely to be affected. And it's not true across the board, but in general impacts will diminish as you get further away from the site. So, it's an area that was established for the purposes of the direct notice. I think as people know, we also were required to give newspaper notice and we were required to give direct notice to people within the study area. So that's the initial purpose of the study area, but it's something that will be flexible through the course of the EA.</i></p> <p>4. The study area seems rather small. My concern is that any impact to the water table could impact residential well water over a much larger area. <i>Response provided: The greatest impact will be closest to the site, so if the impacts are found to be acceptable close to the site, it's unlikely that residential wells further away will be impacted. In general, again, but as I said, if the impact assessment suggests that there's a bigger area of impact, then the study area will be adjusted to take that into account.</i></p> <p>5. I would just like to point out, very few homes are included in the study area. The boundary appears to mostly include undeveloped land. Would it not make sense to look at sociocultural impacts on land where people live? <i>Response provided: There are not many homes immediately surrounding the area or the site, that is true. And we did make sure that we included the area in the study area for the homes that front onto the Haul routes.</i></p> <p>6. For the record your answer to the question regarding the boundary not including many homes doesn't make sense. If you are looking at the effect on property values and enjoyment of our properties, then should you not be assessing lands where people live. <i>Comment noted.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.5. About the Draft Evaluation Criteria and indicators</p>	<p>1. Why is fly rock not included in the list of indicators? <i>Response provided: Fly rock is shown in the first bullet under indicators on Slide 18 and is included.</i></p> <p>2. What about noise? How is noise being considered in the criteria and indicators? <i>Response provided: With reference to slide 17, I don't think noise was listed as a study specifically required in the regulation, but it is something that we know needs to be studied and it's included in the environmental assessment.</i></p> <p>3. The slide says “Quarry operations may disturb habitat and species” - We know it is going to disturb habitat and species. The real question for all of these indicators is what is and what is not acceptable? Who determines or what determines what is and what is not acceptable? <i>Response provided: It varies of course, depending on which parameter we're talking about, but many of them are determined by provincial guidelines and regulations. For example, there is a provincial guideline for how much noise a quarry is allowed to make, and it must be within this limit for the quarry operations to be deemed to be acceptable. Another example is vibration, and this too has a guideline for what is acceptable. For other indicators such as the tolerance for changes to the water table these are based on the ecology of the site. So that's something that must be investigated through the ecological studies, to determine whether there is tolerance for small water level changes, immediately around the site, or not, depending on what the ecological functions are. As the EA progresses, the sorts of details will be made available for the public in the work plans and the impact studies themselves.</i></p> <p>4. The Regulation states in Section 7 “that studies conducted by the proponent must include, without being limited to, in capitals (with emphasis added), the various studies listed”. Therefore, other studies could be done. In particular, the Regulation states, “the proponent shall ensure that studies have been conducted that address all of the effects on the environment”. The community had a lot of concerns about the project, based on the earlier reports. Will the proposed studies address the larger number of concerns expressed by the community? <i>Response provided: Yes. It is important for us to hear from you if you feel that there are gaps or are other things that you feel need to be addressed that are not proposed to be addressed. This is really important so that we include studies to address the concerns of the community. This is the stage of consultation where those should be specified, as specifically as people are able to tell us, what they think is missing. And we have to respond to that. It doesn't mean that we necessarily agree, but we have to respond, and we have to account to the Ministry of Environment, if we decide that something's to be omitted. Or we could include it in one of the existing studies, or commission additional studies to address it.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.5. About the Draft Evaluation Criteria and Indicators (continued)</p>	<p>5. Lots of studies, but I would like to know, who sets what results of these studies would be acceptable? What is an acceptable criterion? Who does the study? Who is the auditor to ensure a proper approach and analysis of the results? Perhaps government regulations set the parameters?</p> <p>6. Assessment does not state what is an acceptable indicator level. No SMART indicators</p> <p>7. Give an example of an indicator failure when the study is done?</p> <p>8. Please share those acceptable guidelines - should be disclosed.</p> <p>9. This is the flaw in the process, there are not acceptable known targets for indicators set in advance. Failure of one should shut the application down.</p> <p><i>Response provided: Yes, as was stated for a previous question, a lot of it is determined by provincial regulations and guidelines, and it will all be reviewed by the provincial regulators. So, they're the ones that will determine whether we've done the studies properly, and whether the measures of acceptability have been met or not.</i></p> <p>10. The use of words may and potentially, etcetera, is not accurate. An independent study really needs to show the impact residents can expect.</p> <p><i>Response provided: The studies will look at the impacts that the residents can expect to experience.</i></p> <p>11. How is this EA outcome decided with all these indicators? Are some indicators worth more points than others?</p> <p><i>Response provided: There is no formula for weighting that we are aware of or would contemplate proposing. The criteria and indicators would be addressed in the work plans and reports. The Ministry would have the final say on this and we can't answer that for them.</i></p> <p>12. Will the work plans be reviewed with the public?</p> <p><i>Response provided: Yes, the work plans will be made available on the website and will be presented at the next Public Information Meeting. Comments can be provided at any time on the evaluation criteria, indicators and work plans as the commenting period never really ends. What I mean is that you can continue to provide input when we get to the work plan stage and say this work plan should address this or that. We are building on this initial consultation, but it's open-ended through the work plans and the final phase of consultation as well.</i></p> <p>13. What is the reported impact anticipated to be on nearby livestock?</p> <p><i>Response provided: We will make note of this and consider whether some of those studies need to account for agricultural activities, if we haven't already mentioned that.</i></p> <p>14. How are you going to measure cumulative impacts? Question not read out at the PIM.</p> <p><i>Response by Project Team: Generally, cumulative impacts are addressed by ensuring that existing and planned developments and activities are taken</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.5. About the Draft Evaluation Criteria and Indicators (continued)</p>	<p><i>into account in the background conditions. For example, the traffic impact assessment has to start with the existing traffic levels and build in a reasonable growth assumption to account for future and cumulative background traffic. As another example, the hydrogeological impact assessment has to account for other approved water takings in the study area including municipal water supply and other aggregate operations. The specifics of how cumulative impacts are assessed will be described in each work plan.</i></p> <p>15. Do all of these assessment criteria apply to any recycling activity as well as extraction? Question not read out at the PIM. <i>Response from Project Team: Yes, the environmental assessment will consider all components of the project undertaking, including recycling activities.</i></p>
<p>2.6. About Consultants and Studies to be undertaken</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Who funds the list of participants/consultants shown on Slide 2? 2. Are all project consultants for the EA retained by JDCL and paid for directly by JDCL? 3. If the experts are funded by JDCL, how are the impartial assessments? 4. How can you call a study independent when it is conducted by JD employees and consultants? 5. Doesn't JDCL rely on your co-operation and approval? 6. All the professional opinions are paid for by JDCL. How is it possible that their professional opinions are impartial? 7. Interesting the use of the word "we" consultants are not independent. <i>Response provided: James Dick Construction. Yes, all are retained by James Dick Construction Limited. With respect to impartiality our livelihoods depend on our credibility, and our impartiality, and our objectiveness, and our understanding of the policy and legislation environment, and making fact-based recommendations and opinions. We wouldn't be in business very long if we just said what our client wanted us to say.</i> 8. Has this firm been retained by James Dick Construction for other environmental assessments? <i>Response provided: My firm (MHBC) has been retained by JDCL for other Aggregate Resources Act applications, and rezoning, and official plan amendment applications. But this is the first environmental assessment because this is the second time a quarry in Ontario has been designated. And it's the first time that the operator decided to proceed with the environmental assessment.</i> 9. Will your reports be peer reviewed? And if so, who chooses the peer reviewers? <i>Response provided: My understanding is the review would be completed by the government, the ministries, and the government stakeholders that are part of the study. So, the Town, the Region, the Conservation Authority, the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Natural Resources, and Ministry of Culture, and so on. So those are the reviewers that I think the Ministry of Environment particularly relies on to assess the validity of the work that we submit.</i>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.7. About the History of Use of the Subject Property</p>	<p>1. Please explain the reference on Slide 9 about the previous owner and compliance concerns <i>Response provided: What I said was that the site had been licenced as a sand and gravel pit, and that licence was revoked by the Ministry of Environment, in 2008. I don't know exactly what the compliance issue was whether they were not paying the fees, whether they were trying to do activities on the site that weren't permitted by the site plan. What I said is, it was revoked for compliance reasons, which is really the only reason the ministry, the authority, would revoke a licence is if they're non-compliant. And I don't know the details of what they were doing. It was a different landowner at the time.</i></p> <p>2. Why don't you know the details of the non-compliance? <i>Response provided: I don't know because I have not investigated it, I don't know. I don't know because I don't know.</i></p> <p>3. Was the previous sand and gravel extraction below water?</p> <p>4. You mentioned that the previous sand and gravel pit did below water extraction. Is that not disinformation, given it was a sand and gravel pit and did not extract below the water table? <i>Response provided: It did extract below the water table, that's why there are ponds there.</i></p>
<p>2.8. About JDCL Operations and Other Sites</p>	<p>1. If approved, how many years will this quarry be in operation? <i>Response provided: I should have looked that up. We can put it on the FAQs. I don't have the answer at my fingertips, I'm sorry.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: The estimated number of years of operation is 15-30 years, subject to the rate of annual extraction and market demand.</i></p> <p>2. Can you please comment on the proposed eventual use of a site as an asphalt recycling facility? Is this planned use going to be included in the EA studies?</p> <p>3. Why are you asking to support an asphalt plant what has that to do with quarry operations? <i>Response provided: Yes, as I recall there is recycling, I think, is one of the proposed uses and it would have to be considered in the environmental assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: To clarify, an asphalt plant is not proposed. Recycling of asphalt materials, as well as concrete and crushed aggregate materials is proposed as an accessory use. This is detailed in draft ARA Site Plan (revised 2020) note 1.2.11 of the Operations Plan (page 2):</i> <i>Recyclable asphalt and concrete materials and crushed aggregate material may be brought to the site for accessory recycling and blending with on-site materials. The maximum amount of unblended imported material to be stored on-site is 60,000 tonnes.</i> <i>Recyclable materials will be stockpiled near the portable processing and/or screening plant in Phase 5 and a minimum of 30 metres from any water body or man-made pond. The maximum stock pile height will be 20m.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.8. About JDCL Operations and Other Sites (continued)</p>	<p><i>Any rebar and other structural metal will be removed from the recyclable material during processing and placed in the designated scrap pile and removed from the site on an on-going basis.</i></p> <p><i>Recycling and removal of recycled aggregate will be ongoing throughout the operation of the quarry. Should sales of native aggregate from the site fall below 100,000 tonnes in any calendar year, all recycling materials shall be removed from the site within 3 years. Recycling operations will cease and be removed from the site after Phase 5.</i></p> <p><i>Aggregate recycling on Licenced aggregate sites is increasingly encouraged by provincial policy. The Provincial Policy Statement (2020) provides that “Mineral aggregate resource conservation shall be undertaken, including through the use of accessory aggregate recycling facilities within operations, wherever feasible”. Changes under the Aggregate Resource Act (ex. O. Reg. 244/97), encourage the importation of aggregate materials for recycling uses on Licenced sites, and outline provisions to be added to ARA site plans to ensure responsible management of recycling activities. The draft ARA Site Plans (2020 revisions) can be found on the ‘Reports & Documents’ page of rrrqea.ca.</i></p> <p><i>As noted, recycling is only proposed as accessory to the proposed quarry and would be discontinued and removed when the quarry is complete. It should be recognized that the present zoning permits an ‘aggregate recycling facility’ – defined as “a premises used for the recycling of used aggregate materials such as concrete and asphalt into a usable product but does not include the operation of an asphalt or concrete batching plant” – as a stand-alone use (i.e. a use not accessory to an aggregate operation). If a stand-alone recycling use were pursued in the future, it be subject to applicable MECP permits (ECAs); this use is not designated as a project for the purposes of the Environmental Assessment Act. Stand alone recycling is not proposed at the present time.</i></p> <p>4. What is the status of the James Dick approved quarry site named The Hidden Quarry on Highway #7, near Rockwood, which was approved several years ago? And why do you need another quarry when you already have one?</p> <p><i>Response provided: The approval that James Dick Construction Limited was given was a conditional approval, so I believe that they are working to satisfy the conditions before the licence would issue. The reason for wanting more than one quarry is related to different products, in different market areas.</i></p> <p>5. JDCL modified the site plan just before the LPAT for the Hidden Quarry. Why would we expect JDCL not to change the site plan in this case?</p> <p><i>Response provided: There was a previous discussion about a post-approval site plan amendment. And I want to make sure people are understanding the distinction between the process to change an approval after it's been granted. And what this question refers to is as you're going through an application review process. I would expect that the site plan gets changed as you progress towards an LPAT hearing. That's where people</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.8. About JDCL Operations and Other Sites (continued)</p>	<p><i>make suggestions, people make comments, people have concerns. And experts discuss those concerns, and changes are made to the proposal. So that's a good thing that happens because of the review process.</i></p> <p>6. If this quarry gets approval, who do we sue for damages to our community, water table, and wells, our community environment, and our wellbeing? <i>Response provided: Although it's a hypothetical question with assumed impacts that wouldn't be allowed to occur. And I don't know the answer to that. It would be a lawyer who could answer that.</i></p> <p>7. Are there rehabilitation plans in place in the event the pit is approved? Question not read out at the PIM. <i>Response provided by Project Team: Yes. Once extraction is complete, the Site Plan requires that the Licensed area be rehabilitated to a naturalized land use that will be integrated with the natural heritage features on the rest of the property and adjacent lands. Progressive rehabilitation will follow the sequence of operations as shown on the Site Plan and will be completed in direct correlation to the development of the quarry as the extraction limits are reached.</i></p> <p><i>The final rehabilitated end-use will be ponds with littoral areas, naturalized shorelines, cliff and talus slopes, and some wet meadow areas. Littoral areas will provide habitat for spawning fish, breeding amphibians, turtles, and marsh-dwelling birds. Cliff and talus slopes along pond edge will provide will provide good habitat for snakes and have the potential to function as snake hibernacula. Areas extracted above the water table will be covered and seeded with a native wet meadow seed mix.</i></p> <p><i>Ecological enhancements are also proposed during site operations, including: invasive species control, installation of artificial nesting platforms for Osprey, construction of a amphibian breeding ponds, creation of artificial turtle nesting areas, and creation of habitat for greenish sedge.</i></p> <p><i>Rehabilitation of the Licence will result in the creation of approximately 21 ha of open-water and littoral areas and around 2.0 ha of wet-meadow areas. In addition, approximately 0.5 ha of new amphibian breeding pond habitat will be created. No buildings or structures associated with aggregate operations will remain on site.</i></p> <p><i>For more detail on the rehabilitation plans, please see page 5 of the updated draft ARA Site Plans (2020) that were submitted as part of the Aggregate Resource Act process. You can find these plans on the 'Reports & Documents' page of rrrqea.ca.</i></p> <p>8. Would JDCL be restricted from transferring the quarry licence? <i>Response provided: No, the Aggregate Resources Act allows the minister to transfer licences between companies.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: Please note, if the quarry licence were transferred in the future, the new operator would still be bound by approved Aggregate Resource Act Site Plans for the site.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.8. About JDCL Operations and Other Sites (continued)</p>	<p>9. Will JDCL accept the results of the EA or is the intention to go to LPAT and this is just a waste of time and money?</p> <p>10. Ultimately, any and all of the effects of the quarry will have a negative impact on the area and all that live within it. This new quarry activity comes at a time when our environment is at the height of harmful impacts due to human activities. What will you do if the EA results have the residents continue to be strongly against this from happening?</p> <p><i>Response provided: I think as is the case with any contentious land use, whether it be a high-rise intensity, or quarries, or landfills, the decision maker will have to make a decision taking into account the continued opposition from the community and the overall broader public interest will be taken into account, as well as the local community concerns.</i></p> <p>11. What will be the final outline of the quarry and where will the processing loading facilities be and how will the railway line be affected by the project?</p> <p><i>Response provided: The proposal is to limit the extraction area and the processing area to the previously disturbed areas of the ponds and around the ponds. And there's an area more in the southern part of the property on the west side of the tracks that is a disturbed area. So, there's going to be no incursion into the wetlands or woodlots.</i></p> <p><i>The ponds before they're extracted for bedrock, there can be platforms built by placing rock in the ponds to make additional areas for where there'll be processing and drilling set up. So, you can create land in the shallow ponds for some of that. And there was something in there about the access to the site would be the same access as has been used for sand and gravel extraction.</i></p> <p>12. What are the proposed operating hours of the quarry.</p> <p><i>Response provided: I would have to look it up. It's, certainly, public information and post it on the site plan. But again, I don't have it at my fingertips, so we'll post that.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: Per the draft ARA Site Plan (Operational Plan, pg. 2):</i></p> <p><i>The proposed quarry will have the following hours of operation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>· Drilling, extraction, processing: Monday - Saturday 7:00 am -7:00 pm</i> <i>Shipping: Monday - Saturday 6:00 am -6:00 pm</i> <p><i>No operations, except for equipment maintenance, on Sundays or holidays as defined in the Employment Standards Act. A response to emergencies is not limited by the hours of operations shown on this plan.</i></p> <p>13. Can the public have access to the site during this process?</p> <p><i>Response provided: No, it's private property. And it's dangerous for people to be going there. I should add that James Dick Construction has been available for the last five years. If anybody has specific questions or wants to see the site then on a guided tour, then they can ask.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.9. About Wells, Surface Water and Groundwater (Geology and Hydrogeology)</p>	<p>1. Regulation 539/21 requires that a door-to-door well survey program and water quality monitoring program be conducted. When will this work be undertaken? How many rounds of water quality monitoring will be conducted? <i>Response provided: It'll be undertaken next year if the work plans are approved by MECF. At the next stage of the EA, the public will be able to review the proposed work plans. In particular, the proposed hydrogeological work plan will be made available so that there can be a good understanding of the proposed area for the door-to-door well survey. This is information that we intend to ask about or try to collect. And it would be one visit to get basic information. There are monitoring wells much closer to the site and on the site that are monitored continuously. So that's where most of the data comes from. But the door-to-door survey is also an important piece of information that'll be expanded on in the work plan.</i></p> <p>2. Will residents be given a copy of their water analysis? <i>Response provided: Yes.</i></p> <p>3. What area will be included in the well survey? <i>Response provided: I don't know whether that's been determined or not. We need to identify what the receptors are going to be within the limits of the study area. Yes, I believe it'll be covered in hydrogeological work plan and residents can provide comments in the next stage of the consultation on the area.</i></p> <p>4. How broad is the well survey geographically? We are south of limestone and are concerned.</p> <p>5. Considering that aquifers span a significantly longer distance than 500 meters and many others obtain their water supply from this aquifer, how can the survey of wells be restricted to such a small distance surrounding the site? What about other surrounding wells? <i>Response provided: That will be determined through the hydrogeological work plan.</i></p> <p>6. What would a well survey look like? What resident would be happy on the risk to their well water? With all due respect, making a comment that wells will not be impacted, is not on side. <i>Response provided: Of course, any door to door well survey, is subject to permission of the owner. And typically, it consists of a questionnaire about collecting information, what the resident knows about the well, how deep it is, when it was installed, what sort of water usage there is from the house. And then from there, it depends on the particular well, whether it is prudent to take a sample of water from the well, or how to measure the water level in the well. So, it becomes more specific to the type of well, and installation that's there. So, we're going to have to make sure, just given the interest and number of questions that we're getting about this, we're going to have to make sure that the work plan that we put forward, is very detailed and specific, as to how that door-to-door survey would be completed.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.9. About Wells, Surface Water and Groundwater (Geology and Hydrogeology) (continued)</p>	<p>7. In respect of well supply in the area, what happens when the quarry does impact the well supply? What guarantees do property owners have?</p> <p>8. The MHBC Planner mentioned that there would be protections for wells local to the site. How does he propose to protect said wells?</p> <p>9. How does a resident demonstrate that it is negatively impacted by JDCL? That would require fairly significant analysis by experts, which is expensive for a normal person to undertake, not to mention even finding experts.</p> <p>10. Would a person who is concerned about the effect of blasting on their well structure and/or water quality have to establish that their well and water are in excellent condition prior to operations of JDCL?</p> <p>11. How can it be determined if a well was damaged by a / the quarry? <i>Response provided: What was proposed at the end of the Aggregate Resources Act process, is included the Water Management Implementation Report. That report is posted on the project website. Section 5.3 of that report lays out the protocols that would apply. Generally, what it says is, that if there's a complaint received, then James Dick is responsible for immediately providing a temporary replacement water supply, while the cause of the disruption is determined. James Dick is responsible for investigations. They answer to MECP on this, but they are also responsible for doing the investigations to determine what the effect was. And if the effect was determined to be because of the quarry, then James Dick is responsible for remediating the impact, or adjusting the quarry so that the impact is no longer occurring. We can include information in our Frequently Asked Questions about where to find that information.</i></p> <p>12. If my well water is impacted negatively, who will find a solution and pay for it?"</p> <p>13. So, should the studies be done, and it determined that the well water is impacted negatively, who will find a solution and who would pay for it? <i>Response provided: If it's determined to be due to the quarrying, then it would be James Dick Construction that was responsible for remediation and paying for the replacement water supply.</i></p> <p>14. Table 1 of the site plan indicates that there will not be dewatering. What guarantees are there that JDCL will not, in capitals, make a simple site plan change, after getting its permit and then start to mine by dewatering, (which has significant impacts on health in the area, and is much more financially efficient)? <i>Response provided: That wouldn't be a simple change to the site plan. It would be a significant modification to a proposal that had been, if it did get referred to a tribunal, and reviewed and approved by a tribunal. I would say it's bordering on inconceivable to me, that you would be able to do that, but if somebody did propose that, it would be subject to all the consultation obligations of a major site plan amendment.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.9. About Wells, Surface Water and Groundwater (Geology and Hydrogeology) (continued)</p>	<p>15. I live in the Town of Milton and currently receive town water from the Kelso Aquifer. I strongly oppose a proposal of your company to blast under the water table at Reid Side Road. I believe there was another similar situation where the water table was punctured resulting in problems. I do not like the idea of contaminants from the blasting process infiltrating our water supply or reducing the capacity of the supply. I moved to this area because of the purity of our water supply. I do not like the prospect of flying rock near the 401, or the proposed asphalt recycling on the site with associated air pollution, and increased truck traffic that would result.</p> <p><i>Response provided: It is important for everybody to understand that the site is not in any wellhead protection area that supplies water to the town of Milton and there's been disinformation about that. So, there's no way there's going to be any effect on town of Milton water supplies. As far as the residential wells around the site itself, there has been a study of the impacts and that'll be updated and renewed through the environmental assessment. There are under the Aggregate Resources Act application, there were protocols proposed that will protect all the residential water supplies in the area. James Dick would not be allowed to operate the quarry if it was going to affect residential water supplies in the area. But that is certainly, as you saw, certainly on the list of matters that have to be carefully considered through the environmental assessment process. So, there will be a work plan produced of how that will be done and then you'll see at the end of the process what the conclusions are. But the bottom line is that the water supplies in the area have to be protected if the quarry's to be operated.</i></p> <p>16. Gravel with water may infiltrate groundwater systems that communities, individuals, and farmers rely on for drinking water. Wash water is often warmer than the receiving body of the discharged water. Temperature and turbidity changes of wash water affect fisheries and aquatic habitat for many species.</p> <p><i>Response provided: Those are certainly impacts that need to be considered through the environmental assessment process and they're included in the evaluation criteria. So, there is turbidity created when you mine aggregates from below water, but it can't be allowed to escape from the property into the aquifer and the turbidity just settles in the pond.</i></p> <p>17. Reference is made to discharge of wastewater into Kilbride Creek and tributaries. The proponent stated that the water used on site would be filtered and used to recharge the ground with water. Does the proponent intend to discharge water into Kilbride Creek instead?</p> <p><i>Response provided: I don't recall that there was any direct discharge proposed from the ARA site plans. We can check this to confirm, but it certainly would be identified. If there was, it would have to be identified through the work plan and the impact studies.</i></p> <p>18. How much water does JDCL propose to take per day, for the quarry operations?</p> <p><i>Response provided: I don't have that information at my fingertips. It certainly is available in the reports that were filed under the Aggregate</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.9. About Wells, Surface Water and Groundwater (Geology and Hydrogeology) (continued)</p>	<p><i>Resources Act. We will make a note of the question and post an answer on the project website.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: Since the environmental assessment has not yet been undertaken, our response relies on the Level 1 and Level 2 Hydrogeological Assessment prepared by Harden Environmental (2018) for the ARA application. Based on this assessment, a Permit to Take Water (PTTW) will be required as the total water pumping within the site boundaries will exceed 50,000L/day. The proposed washing will circulate an estimated 2,500,000 L/day. Approximately 97% of the water is recycled via silt pond(s) and approximately 3% is lost due to evaporation and entrainment in the aggregate product. This results in a potential consumption of 75,000 L/day (52 L/min). This consumption is estimated to occur for 200 days per year. This study can be found on the 'Reports & Documents' page of rrrqea.ca.</i></p> <p>19. How do you know, from slide 18, a reduction in flow of water, before you actually do it? So, is there a reference here on slide 18, to the reduction in flow of water? The question again is, how do you know the reduction in flow of water, before you actually do it? <i>Response provided: Because the changes happen gradually, and there's an extensive monitoring programme that would be required on the site, so you would be able to see the change coming. And there's what we call warning levels and trigger levels that, if there's a sensitive area that is susceptible to water table change, there would be a monitoring well between the extraction and that area. And if the water level in that monitoring well, was on a downward trend and went below a previously agreed upon established level, then you would know that some mitigation, or reduction in extraction, or remediation would be required, before the impact affected the, for example, fisheries, or ecological resource, that was to be protected.</i></p> <p>20. Questions submitted in advance of the meeting about the Mohawk Racetrack were read out as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please review how the impact on the regional bedrock water table will be monitored? • Please indicate which chemical parameters in surrounding water will be measured for baseline studies? • Please confirm which chemical parameters will be monitored for the duration of the project work to identify newly mobile parameters due to mining activity. For example, when in an anoxic environment, arsenopyrite is immobile in water, but it becomes mobile once the bedrock is exposed to dissolved oxygen. How will the surrounding and local water quality be measured for these parameters? • Mohawk Racetrack discharges to the Kettle Lake adjacent to highway 401, then crosses under the 401, and travels in a southerly path through the subject lands. Will there be impact from a development on the maintenance of this discharged path? <p>21. Does the well study also include he wells and septic systems of the Mohawk Racetrack which could be affected by this operation?</p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.9. About Wells, Surface Water and Groundwater (Geology and Hydrogeology) (continued)</p>	<p>22. Please review how the impact on the regional bedrock water table will be monitored and what are the thresholds for alerts? <i>Response provided: We will provide a copy of the email received to Harden Environmental Services who is doing the hydrogeological analysis. They could contact you to discuss the specifics with respect the Racetrack. Generally, there is information about this in the Implementation Report that I referred to earlier (exactly where the monitoring wells are, and how frequently they are monitored). Often there's ongoing monitoring with a data logger, with all the parameters. It's different for every well and every feature and the information is set out in tables there. It is something that we can either make sure the information is posted so people know where to find it. Or it's something that people can stay tuned for and would be included in the work plan and reports and impact assessments that have to be prepared and updated through the Environmental Assessment Process.</i></p> <p>23. Please note that in the Hydrogeological Assessment, R32 and R33 has not included two significant water-taking wells (Mohawk Racetrack) and one well for the former Mohawk Inn property. Why? <i>Response provided: That is good information that we should be aware of, and we will have to have account for that.</i></p> <p>24. If water isn't a problem, why do you call it a reservoir?</p> <p>25. What does a temporary water supply mean? <i>Response provided: The reservoir just refers to the larger body of water that'll be created in the rehabilitation plan. So, there'll be a water reservoir is what's shown as the end state rehabilitated condition of the quarry after the bedrock is extracted. So that was, I believe, the reason for the project name. And the temporary water supply, it could be a cistern, it could be a water truck, it could be bottled water. It's intended to be very temporary while the investigation takes place to determine what the cause is. But it would have to be sufficient to replace the pre-impact use of the water.</i></p> <p>26. The letter I received from JDCL states that the Gasport formation will be removed in the area of excavation. The Gasport formation is the aquifer that supplies the community. Why wouldn't this open the surrounding aquifer to surface contaminants? <i>Response provided: Right, so it is getting into the actual studies themselves. So, for the purposes of right now, we do have water quality and we're very aware that the bedrock that is to be mined is a groundwater aquifer for local water supplies. Not the Town of Milton water supplies, but individual wells in the area. And those types of concerns certainly have to be addressed in the work plan and the studies to follow.</i></p> <p>27. Will you be assessing flow in wells for people who live close to the quarry site before any blasting occurs? <i>Response provided: Yes.</i></p> <p>28. Could you please elaborate on why you feel that the water supply to the Town of Milton that comes from the aquifer would not be affected by this proposed quarry? <i>Response provided: The Town of Milton gets its water from an aquifer, a wellhead protection area that's not underneath the site. There seems to be</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.9. About Wells, Surface Water and Groundwater (Geology and Hydrogeology) (continued)</p>	<p><i>some misunderstanding and misinformation about that. I just want to be clear that the municipal wells for the town of Milton are not in this aquifer.</i></p> <p>29. Realising that the aquifer also feeds Northwest Milton wells in the City of Milton, so what are you doing for protection? <i>Response provided: I'm not prepared to go further into water supply impact at this stage. It's something that it is on our criteria and evaluation that water supplies must be considered in terms of quantity and in terms of quality. This is referenced on Slide 18 of the presentation. So those details will have to wait to be discussed in further detail as we get into the process.</i></p> <p>29. How will this impact the municipal Campbellville well?</p> <p>30. Considering that Campbellville is on top of an aquifer, how far east in the village, and east are you testing wells for those on the east side? This is important. <i>Response provided: Yes, we agree, that's important. It would be considered and the testing area would be identified in the work plans.</i></p>
<p>2.10. About Traffic and Alternate Haul Routes</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why are there two "Alternative haul routes"? What is the actual primary haul route? 2. Please elaborate on the two haul routes that James Parkin referred to. Did he say one was right through the village of Campbellville? 3. You are planning a haul route through the middle of Campbellville Village? 4. Alternate route #2 is through the village. 5. The Haul Route #2 goes directly through the village. I'm not sure if trucks can even turn left properly to go north on Guelph Line as the intersection is currently built. James Parkin mentioned 2 haul routes initially. Is he changing his answer? What is the second haul route. Kindly give a clear answer. Is Reid Side Road the only haul route? 6. Who devised the alternate haul routes and was CNR consulted as 2 of their road crossings are included in the route? <p><i>Response provided: Just to make sure, because I know it's sometimes on a small screen, but just to make sure people can see, and I don't think I can use my cursor to trace it, but you can see at the bottom of the legend, there's two little dotted or diamond symbols, Haul Route Alternative One and Haul Route Alternative Two. So Alternative One is down Reid Side Road, as was originally proposed under the Aggregate Resources Act application. And Alternative Two is south on Twist and then east on Campbellville Road, and then north through the village of Campbellville.</i></p> <p><i>Response provided: One of the alternative haul routes goes along the edge of the village, and as I explained in the history of the site, that road was built to take trucks from a gravel pit in this area. It's also now become the road for the industrial subdivision. So, it's a direct link to the Highway 401 interchange and that is the proposal. I do want to make sure people understand this relates a bit to the study area and a bit to the question about the exemptions and the regulations.</i></p> <p><i>Regulation 539/21 exempted James Dick from some of the general requirements of an EA that are not particularly relevant here. And it replaces them with some specific requirements. For example, the Regulation exempts JDCL from having to look at alternatives to the project</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.10. About Traffic and Alternate Haul Routes (continued)</p>	<p><i>but it specifically requires that we look at the alternative methods of carrying out the project. And the two things that are specified in the Regulation are the mining method that we must look at alternatives to what's been termed the underwater blasting or the sub aqueous extraction. We are required to look at the alternative method of dewatering the quarry is what we've interpreted that to mean.</i></p> <p><i>And JDCL is also required by the Regulation to look at alternative haul routes. We undertook a screening process as part of the preparation for notice of commencement to identify alternative haul routes. While we may think that the one that was originally proposed in the Aggregate Resources Act application is probably the best, we need to also consider an alternate route and that's why we've had to put the proposal to go south on Twist and then right into the main downtown of Campbellville, along the Campbellville Road. So that's a requirement of the regulation and that informed us on the study area so that we included properties that front on that road. Both of these routes will be evaluated through this environmental assessment process based on all of the criteria and a determination will be made whether one is more suitable than the other. One haul route will ultimately be selected as the preferred haul route, not both.</i></p> <p>7. What haul routes will be studied? <i>Response from Facilitator: I think you've just addressed that in the two that you've noted.</i></p> <p>8. Why does JDCL want a second haul route through Campbellville? This seems very detrimental to the village. When would JDCL need to use that haul route if it takes him to the same place, the 401? <i>Response provided: We are required by the regulation to propose an alternative haul route. James Dick does not intend to use it. James Dick doesn't think that it's a better route. But for whatever reason that escapes me, I'm not aware of why the ministry thought that this should be considered. But we were required by the regulation to come up with an alternative route, and we are required by the regulation to come up with an alternative route and we have to follow through in the environmental assessment process to evaluate it to determine whether it's got pros or cons compared to what the original proposal was.</i></p> <p>9. Why is the 401 not included in the traffic assessment? This will undoubtedly be included in actual haul routes.</p> <p>10. Do the haul route studies include the recent and ongoing upgrades to the 401 and related noise issues?</p> <p>11. In proposing haul routes, how would JDCL address blocked access to 401 due to very frequent highway blockages/accidents? <i>Response provided: I know that the traffic impact studies include the functioning and capacity of the interchange, but again, that's something that is a question noted and we would talk about that in the work plans as to whether or not 401, itself, needs to be included in the traffic impact study.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.10. About Traffic and Alternate Haul Routes (continued)</p>	<p>12. Slide 17 quarry operations and haul routes can result in increased noise. Of course, residents' quality of life is going to be impacted, if approved. Is that something that's also part of the noise work, in terms of the review? <i>Response provided: Yes. The haul route noise is part of both the transportation and the noise assessment.</i></p> <p>13. What is the actual primary haul route? <i>Response provided: The Aggregate Resources Act licence proposal was to use Reid Side Road, which is the road that was built in the '70s to take material from the site directly to the interchange.</i></p> <p>14. Why is the market only to the east considered? Why is the market to the South not taken into consideration with regards to haul routes?</p> <p>15. Why does the assessed haul route not consider Highway 6 to the 403? This is also a high demand area to service. <i>Response provided: The market is primarily to the east, and so that would be driving trucks the wrong way, away from the market.</i></p> <p>16. How many gravel trucks are estimated to exit the quarry each day?</p> <p>17. How many trucks are proposed to leave the quarry per hour and if the 401 is jammed as it often is where does that truck traffic go?</p> <p>18. Where would trucks queue before they enter the site?</p> <p>19. How can you control which haul route a truck driver will use? Question not read out aloud at the PIM. <i>Response provided by Project Team: Since the environmental assessment has not yet been undertaken, our response regarding traffic currently relies on the Transportation Impact Study (2018) and Update (2020) prepared as part of the ARA application process. The initial study and update can be found on the 'Reports & Documents' page of rrrqea.ca. Relevant findings to the above question are as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The shipping of material from the subject site is forecast to generate approximately 16 inbound and 16 outbound truck trips per hour during the AM peak hour</i> • <i>During the PM peak hour, the subject site is estimated to generate approximately 3 inbound and 3 outbound truck trips per hour.</i> <p><i>The haul route is east/west along Reid Sideroad to Highway 401; material will be shipped to/from the east via Highway 401. The applicant does not intend to ship material to/from the west.</i></p> <p><i>In terms of queueing, the internal haul route (private road on JDCL lands) measures approximately 700 m and will be designed to accommodate heavy vehicle traffic in both directions. No heavy vehicle queueing or parking will occur on Reid Sideroad or at the Twiss Road intersections. Appendix H of the Transportation Impact Study Update (2020) contains documentation on the internal haul route. In addition, a Highway Truck Parking Area is identified within the Licenced area on the updated draft ARA Site Plans (2020). The draft ARA Site Plans (2020) includes the following: "No queueing or staging of trucks will be permitted on Twiss Road or Reid Side Road at anytime. If required, truck staging will be located on the internal driveway</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.10. About Traffic and Alternate Haul Routes (continued)</p>	<p><i>and a highway truck parking area will be located adjacent to office/scale house area (note 1.2.5)". The ARA Site Plan, if approved, is a legally enforceable document.</i></p> <p><i>Trucks will only use the haul route, except for local delivery. Truck drivers are under contract by James Dick Construction Limited (JDCL). As such, it is in their best interest to obey the rules set out by their employers. In addition, JDCL drivers are paid by the hour, which reduces incentives to speed, and provided with extensive driver training programs to enhance safe driving. JDCL also monitors all of their trucks by GPS, and their dispatch system ties in to real time traffic data to avoid dispatching at times of traffic congestion.</i></p> <p>20. When Reid Sideroad was a quarry road, there were no large housing neighbourhoods as there are now. You are making a presumption that there will be no impacts.</p> <p>21. If Reid Side Road is used as a haul route, will there be any noise mitigation measures enacted by JCDL to lessen the noise pollution to residences such as noise barrier fencing?</p> <p><i>Response provided: That would be something that would be considered through the rest of the process. I don't know the answer to that.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: the noise study will look at the relative change from the existing background traffic noise levels in the area to the noise with future traffic, including the proposed RRRQ trucks. In rare cases where the increase in traffic noise is considered extreme, acoustic barriers have been considered, but JDCL doesn't own these roads so coordination with other authorities or property owners would be needed.</i></p> <p>22. Route 2 omg who would ever consider that as an alternative.</p> <p>23. Do not want quarry but if it happens a new road from site north to highway with new ramp is a no brainer.</p> <p>24. Campbell Ave. West and Campbell Ave. E. is a NO truck route. How can this be a haul route.</p> <p><i>Comments noted.</i></p> <p>23. Can representatives of JDCL explain why a "family business" feels comfortable turning upside down the family homes of those that live in the Village of Campbellville by running aggregate trucks through a very tranquil village? For many this is their retirement home and also their retirement plan.</p> <p><i>Response provided: We will note the comment. I hope that through participation in the process, and following how these studies assess the impacts on people's homes, that people get some satisfaction from the work that's being done and the input that they have into it.</i></p> <p>24. Who gives approval for haul routes and alternative hall routes?</p> <p>25. Who is the approval authority for such haul routes? Who approves them?</p> <p><i>Response provided: It is a combination because the Ministry of Transportation is a government review agency that will look at the impacts of the use of the interchange at Highway 401. The Ministry of Natural</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.10. About Traffic and Alternate Haul Routes (continued)</p>	<p><i>Resources has to consider all of the Aggregate Application considerations and MECP has asked that we consider it. I can't really pin it down on who the person is that's going to decide. As far as deciding which alternatives to look at in this EA, what you see on the screen is what we're proposing, the two alternatives, but that's open for comment from the public. If people think that there are other routes that should be evaluated through the EA, then that's something that is open for discussion.</i></p> <p>26. I did not hear you mention potential risk to the fire station, why?" <i>Response provided: That was on the list of considerations. The EMS, it was on the traffic study slide, so we're aware of that. And there was work done on that through the ARA process. Trucks have to yield to EMS vehicles, that's the law. And EMS stations exist on much, much busier roads than Reid Side Road would ever be, but we know it's a concern of the public and it is something that we will have to be evaluating through the traffic impact studies.</i></p>
<p>2.11. About Air quality</p>	<p>1. For air quality or impact assessments, the area impacted would be considerably larger than 500 meters outside of the borders of the quarry. The study area seems to be selected to minimize the greater impacts of the quarry. <i>Response provided: Due to the nature of the operation, the greatest impact will be closest to the site, and decrease rapidly with distance. If the impacts are found to be within the Provincial benchmarks close to the site, air quality impacts further away will be even further below the Provincial benchmarks. In general, if the impact assessment suggests that there is a bigger area of impact, then the study area will be adjusted to consider those.</i></p> <p>2. Mining of the limestone is only the first part of the process. Above ground operations will include crushing, grinding and screening operations. Many of these will be very dusty. What is planned to minimize dust formation in the surrounding areas? <i>Response provided: The environmental assessment will consider the affects of all components of the proposed aggregate operation on the environment.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: Since the environmental assessment has not yet been undertaken, our response relies on the Air Quality Assessment (2018) and Addendum (2020) prepared by RWDI as part of the ARA application, which outline recommendations to mitigate dust onsite, as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · <i>Water or another provincially approved dust suppressant will be applied to internal haul roads and processing areas as often as required to mitigate dust;</i> · <i>Processing equipment will be equipped with dust suppressing or collection devices, where the equipment creates dust and is being operated within 300 metres of a sensitive receptor; and</i> · <i>The site will operate in accordance with the Best Management Practices Plan (BMPP) for Dust. The BMPP may be amended from time to time, considering actual impacts and operational considerations.</i> <p><i>These recommendations are also implemented on the Draft ARA Site Plans (2020 revisions) found on the 'Reports & Documents' page of rrrqea.ca.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.11. About Air quality</p>	<p>3. Good evening, thank you for sharing the information as you have. Can you speak to studies related to on the air quality with fragmentation pieces (fly rock) circulating in the air and health impacts i.e. on lungs / respiratory - residents would inhale fragments into their lungs (analysis on all quarries that operate) and also the impact that this fracturing will do to the homes from a structural perspective and foundations? Residents have and pay insurance healthcare (has there been studies done on the long term impacts that quarries have made on those within distances and experienced any health changes for example breathing problems or other health changes). How will JDCL integrate into covering any damages that homes may incur from such blasting? Has JDCL studied health insurance guarantees for all those living in the area if the quarry starts up and, in the future, IF residents experience any direct health changes? Summary: what are the health guarantees and home structural guarantees? Full question not read out at the PIM</p> <p><i>Response provided by Project Team: <u>Pertaining to Structural Impacts of Blasting</u> The environmental assessment will consider the effects of blasting operations of the proposed quarry on the environment.</i></p> <p><i>Since the environmental assessment has not yet been undertaken, our current response relies on the Blast Impact Analysis and its addendum (2018 and 2019) and the expertise of Explotech. The purpose of a Blasting Impact Assessment is to assess the area surrounding the proposed Aggregate Resource Act licence with regard to potential damage from blasting operations and compliance with the Ministry of Environment, Conservation, and Parks guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the structural impact of the blasting, the United States Bureau of Mines (USBM) has developed a set of criteria utilizing a graded scale incorporating reduced permissible particle velocities at reduced dominant frequencies. This criteria is universally accepted as the basis for controlling blast vibrations. As a simplification, some regulatory departments have chosen to implement particle velocity limits of 50mm/s at high dominant frequencies (in excess of 40 Hz) and 20mm/s for low frequency vibrations (less than 40Hz). This is not to say that damage automatically occurs once these levels are breached and, in fact, threshold damage would not occur in the average residence until ground vibrations reached significantly higher intensities than those listed above. The Ministry of Environment Conservation and Parks has recommended even stricter guidelines than those accepted by the USBM, limiting ground vibrations to 12.5 mm/s. The MECP criteria have been set at very conservative levels in an effort to restrict adverse public response as opposed to strictly alleviating possibility for structural and cosmetic damage. Aggregate operation must be carried out safely and within MECP guidelines.</i></p> <p><i>The Blast Impact Analysis and its addendum (2018 and 2019) provided recommendations to be implemented for all blasting operations to ensure</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.11. About Air quality</p>	<p><i>that blasting in all phases of this project are carried out in a safe and productive manner and to suitably manage and mitigate the possibility of damage to any buildings, structures or residences surrounding the property. These recommendation are implemented on the draft ARA Site Plan (2020, notes 1.2.28C), which if approved, are enforceable. The Draft ARA Site Plans (2020 revisions) found on the 'Reports & Documents' page of rrrqea.ca.</i></p> <p><u><i>Pertaining to Air Quality Impacts</i></u> <i>From an air quality perspective, "fragmentation pieces (fly rock)" are referred to as airborne particulate, or dust. There are several particle sizes that Air Quality experts examine due to the potential air quality and health effects associated with them. This includes the size fractions known as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• "Total suspended particulate" (TSP), which includes particles smaller than 44 µm in diameter, which are small enough to be carried through the air;</i> <i>• "Inhalable particulate" (PM10), which includes particles that are 10 µm in diameter or smaller; and,</i> <i>• "Fine inhalable particulate" (PM2.5), which includes particles that are 2.5 µm in diameter or smaller.</i> <p><i>All of these are included in the Air Quality Assessment previously conducted as part of the ARA application process and will be included in the Environmental Assessment. The Air Quality portion of the assessment will examine the airborne dust created by all activities on-site such as blasting, extraction, processing, shipping, truck traffic and tailpipe emissions from trucks and heavy equipment, and due to truck traffic along the haul routes.</i></p>
<p>2.12. About noise</p>	<p>1. What about the businesses in the area? There are labourers using heavy machinery and in forklifts, a shudder through the ground may be dangerous while they are working. <i>Response provided: When you blast at a quarry, you must meet noise and vibration limits. And the standards are among the most stringent in North America. So, the vibration standard is low enough that it won't cause any damages to structure. So, people working on heavy equipment in the area would be creating more vibration underneath themselves than is permitted to be allowed by the blast in the quarry.</i></p> <p>2. Was the previous gravel extraction blasting below water? <i>Response provided: No, there was no blasting, and it was extraction of unconsolidated sand and gravel.</i></p> <p>3. Question 12 from page 20 (repeated here) Slide 17 quarry operations and haul routes can result in increased noise. Of course, residents' quality of life is going to be impacted, if approved. Is that something that's also part of the noise work, in terms of the review? <i>Response provided: Yes. The haul route noise is part of both the transportation and the noise assessment.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: The noise study will look at the relative change from the existing background traffic noise levels in the area</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
	<p><i>to the noise with future traffic, including the proposed RRRQ trucks. In rare cases where the increase in traffic noise is considered extreme, acoustic barriers have been considered, but JDCL doesn't own these roads so coordination with other authorities or property owners would be needed.</i></p>
<p>2.13. About Socio-economic impact</p>	<p>1. The quarry could have economic impacts. Who will pay when my house value goes down?</p> <p>2. What about the real estate impact?</p> <p>3. How are you planning on addressing drop in property values, due to a gravel pit in the area?</p> <p>4. I did not see any reference to the impact on local real estate property values.</p> <p><i>Response provided: We are going to be considering socio-economic impacts, including effects on use and enjoyment of property. But there's no system in Ontario that requires people who change land use to compensate for increases or decreases in property value.</i></p> <p><i>Under the socio-economic study, we have the consideration of loss of enjoyment of property, which is indirectly related to property values. And really, all the impact studies that we're doing speak to normal use and enjoyment of property, so we are addressing it, indirectly, through the impact studies and obviously making sure that water supplies are protected. So those are the ways that we're addressing property values. But if that's something that people would like more directly addressed, then there's ways to do that, under the socio-economic, social impact assessment, that we can consider that comment.</i></p> <p>5. What about the businesses in the area? There are labourers using heavy machinery and in forklifts - a shudder through the ground may be dangerous while they are working.</p> <p><i>Response provided: when you blast at a quarry you have to meet noise and vibration limits. The standards in Ontario are among the most stringent in North America. The vibration standard for what is acceptable is low enough that it won't cause any damage to structures. So, people working on heavy equipment in the area would be creating more vibration underneath themselves than is permitted to be allowed by the blast in the quarry.</i></p> <p>6. How has James Dick applied lessons learned from the Dufferin Quarries and the resulting socio-economic and environmental impacts. Question not read out aloud at the PIM.</p> <p><i>Response provided by Project Team: Unable to answer based on information provided (i.e. what impacts are being referred to?).</i></p>
<p>2.14. Other General Comments and Questions Noted</p>	<p>1. I would hope that you would consider other money-making uses for this land instead of gravel mining. For example, turning it into a place where families of all ages would like to come for recreation and fun. Doing research regarding what is popular, and searching out new creative ideas that would draw the public would be great! People are always looking for things to do for fun with their children. Teenagers and older people alike are searching for places to go that stimulate their minds and/or exercise their bodies as a break from the day-to-day routine. with the continued population growth, there is certainly a market for innovation in the area!</p> <p><i>Comment noted.</i></p>

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
<p>2.14. Other General Comments and Questions Noted</p>	<p>2. As someone directly in the study area, this means I am going to be impacted. We do not support this project and are disappointed that we would have to shoulder the burden of this quarry, so that JDCL can profit. It's very wrong. <i>Comment noted.</i></p> <p>3. I pointed out several significant flaws in the noise and ground water reports from your consultants and did not receive any real answers. When are you going to provide real answers. Comment not read aloud at PIM. <i>Response from Project Team: Thanks for your question. Without knowing what comments you are referring to, we are unable to provide a sufficient answer to this comment. Please reach out to rrrqa@jamesdick.com with specific questions so we can assist. As well, please note that concerns with how reports will be conducted may be best directed to the next round of consultation, the focus of which will be the proposed environmental assessment work plan; this will be the focus of Public Information Meeting #2.</i></p> <p>4. Has the company ever considered selling the land for alternative use? <i>Response provided: In JDCL's opinion the proposed quarry is the best use for the property. Provincial Policy protects the land for this use. Alternative uses that might preclude or hinder extraction of the protected mineral aggregate deposit may not be permitted.</i></p> <p>5. A significant gap is the overall high level of non-compliance within the aggregate industry. Per the recently issued Auditor General Report. Despite all of the work going into the Environmental Assessment; even if the quarry is licensed, the community has low assurance that the Proponent will comply with commitments they've made. (Given that the oversight is low; and non-compliance is high.) <i>Comment noted.</i></p> <p>6. Is the dolostone aquifer the same aquifer as is being mined by Dufferin Quarry proximate to 6th Line? Question not read aloud at the PIM. <i>Response provided by Project Team: Yes. The aquifer being mined in both locations is the dolostone aquifer known as the Gasport Formation.</i></p> <p><i>Response addition provided after the PIM: The Dufferin Quarry and the proposed Reid Road Reservoir Quarry will be mining the same dolostone geological formation. This geological formation is regionally extensive and extends from Tobermory to Niagara Falls. There is no overlap in terms of the groundwater source areas or groundwater areas of influence for these quarries separated by more than six kilometres.</i></p>