Public Feedback - Questions Received, and Responses Provided at the Public Information Meeting #2 held on November 19, 2025.

James Dick Construction Limited

Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA
Public Information Meeting #2
November 19, 2025
Public 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.rrrqea.ca. Comments can be forwarded to rrrqea@jamesdick.com.

James Dick Construction Limited

Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA

Public Information Meeting #2
November 19, 2025, 6;30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.
Public Feedback Report

About This Report

James Dick Construction Limited (JDCL) is undertaking an Environmental Assessment (EA) under Ontario Regulation 539/21 and the *Environmental Assessment Act* to assess the establishment and operation of the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry, (RRRQ) and associated activities including blasting, processing, recycling, and shipping of aggregate materials. The second of three Public Information Meetings was held on November 19, 2025. The purpose of the second Public Information Meeting was to present and receive input on the draft comprehensive work plan and scope for technical studies that will be prepared to evaluate the effects of the project and the 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. The format was organized to provide equal opportunity to participate and to accommodate a greater number of people from the comfort of their home. 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 73 individuals participated in the meeting. An in-person viewing room was also available for those who have difficulty attending virtual meetings. Individuals could register in advance and attend at the viewing room where a live broadcast of the virtual meeting occurred. A staff member was available to assist participants in relaying typed questions to the online meeting. One person attended.

The presentation was recorded and posted on the project website shortly after the meeting. The draft comprehensive work plan was available on the project website and through the Town of Milton and Region of Halton offices prior to the meeting. 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 Public Information Meeting #2

The purpose of the second Public Information Meeting was to present and receive input on the draft comprehensive work plan and scope for technical studies that will be prepared to evaluate the effects of the project and the alternative methods of carrying out the project on the environment. The draft comprehensive work plan was posted to the website on September 18, 2025, for public review. Hard copies of the draft comprehensive work plan were made available for viewing at the Town of Milton (150 Mary Street, Milton) and Region of Halton (1151 Bronte Road, Oakville) municipal buildings.

Public Information Meeting #2 (PIM#2) was held virtually on November 19, 2025, from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Residents who were unable to participate in virtual meetings were also provided with the opportunity to attend at a viewing room where the presentation was broadcast and members of the project team were available to assist participants in providing comments and questions to the meeting while it was in progress.

The objectives of the second Public Information Meeting were:

- To provide an update on the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry Environmental Assessment.
- To present the draft comprehensive work plan and scopes for technical studies that have been drafted to evaluate the effects of the project and the alternative methods of carrying out the project on the environment.
- To receive input on the draft work plan and technical studies.
- To 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 comprehensive work plan and scopes for technical studies.
- Details on registering for the virtual meeting and how to receive information pertaining to the viewing room.

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. The presentation included the location and context, updates on the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry EA, descriptions for the draft work plan and technical studies, how to engage in the EA process and next steps. 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. Questions and comments were read aloud verbatim and the names and identifying information were kept anonymous to ensure the comfort of those participating. Participants could ask multiple questions.

An in-person viewing room was also available for those who have difficulty attending virtual meetings. Individuals could register in advance and attend at the viewing room where a live broadcast of the virtual meeting occurred. A staff member was available to assist participants in relaying typed questions to the online meeting.

The total number of attendees who participated virtually in PIM #2 was 73 connections. Some of these may have included more than one individual. One person attended in person at the viewing room.

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)
- Brian Sulley, RWDI (Air Quality)
- Stan Denhoed, Harden Environmental Services Ltd. (Hydrogeology)
- Derek Flake & Alexandra Davidson, Aercoustics Engineering Ltd. (Noise)
- Andrew Campbell, Explotech Engineering Ltd. (Blasting)
- Scott Catton, Paradigm (Traffic)
- Ian Shaw, Soil – Mat (Geotechnical/Roads)
- Gerry Forbes, Intus (Road Safety)
- Kelly Beri & Ryan Doyle, HDR (Social Impact)
- Greg Sweetnam & Leigh Mugford, James Dick Construction Limited
- Chelsea Major and Mila Masic, MHBC Planning

After the Public Information Meeting, the presentation slides and video of the presentation were posted on the project website (on November 25, 2025).

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 November 19, 2025, Public Information Meeting #2. It includes the verbatim questions that were noted in the Q and A and the responses provided.

During the Question-and-Answer session, a total of one hundred and thirty-four (134) questions and comments were submitted through the Q&A platform. Over 85% of these were addressed verbally during the meeting. This report provides all questions from the Q&A, along with corresponding responses, including those not read aloud.

Participants had the opportunity to submit multiple inquiries, and questions sent by one individual via email in advance were also incorporated into the Q&A. The questions are grouped in the Summary Table by topic and numbered for reference purposes. Personal identifying information (i.e., the name of individuals asking questions) is not included in this summary.

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

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.1. About PIM#2	**1. Will we have access to the presentation?** *Response from Facilitator: Yes, the presentation slides will be posted on the project website so that they are available to anyone who wants to review them. The video of the presentation will also be made available. (The presentation slides and video were posted on November 25, 2025).* **2. Why can't we see the questions as they are added?** *Response from Facilitator: As an independent facilitator, I won't read out names of those who raise questions or comments to encourage open participation. You can't see the questions now, but they'll all be included verbatim in my feedback report, grouped by topic like traffic, air quality, or process concerns—without identifying anyone. This ensures everyone's anonymity and transparency in sharing feedback.*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.1. About PIM#2 (continued)	**3. Will all of the questions that have been sent in the chat be shared with everyone on this call along with the answers? Sue is not reading all the questions.** *Response from Facilitator: Yes, Any questions not addressed during the meeting will be answered in the public feedback report, which will be posted on the website. Thank you for your patience as I work through them efficiently.* **4. Are my previous questions too complicated for this panel?** *Facilitator's Response: No. I haven't read them all yet. Some are quite detailed, so I'm returning to review them.* **5. It is hard to read the diagrams. Why can these meetings not be in person and not on Zoom?** *Response from MHBC Planning: The work plans are available online for download, and hard copies are at municipal offices. If you need a larger hard copy, contact us.* *Response from Facilitator: The meeting is taking place online using Zoom, making it easier to join and allowing members of the public to ask questions or give feedback anonymously. This format also enables the project team to answer more questions.*) **When will the report and answers be available online?** *Response from Facilitator: Preparing the report will take some time. Once completed, it will be posted on the website, shared with MECP, and included in the EA Documentation. We aim to make it available as soon as possible.* **6. Could JDCL please ensure that the following two reports are uploaded to its website for public viewing? The first is the Aercoustics Memorandum dated December 4, 2019. The second is the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry Transportation Impact Study Update, completed by Paradigm Transportation Solutions, dated April 2020.** *Response from MHBC Planning: Yes, the reports can be made available on the website.*
2.2. About the RRRQ EA Process	**1. Premier Ford has stated he will not allow this quarry to be approved. Why would James Dick Construction continue working on a project assessment for something they already have been advised will not be moving forward?** *Response from MHBC Planning: We are quite aware of the comment. The government has also said "Do this environmental assessment" so we're taking that in good faith and doing our best to go through the process that they've laid out.* **2. The work plan states under Ontario Register of 539/21 that the Director of MECP reviews and approves the work plans before the proponent can commence their studies. However, in many cases, the data collection has already been completed, for example the traffic study, aquatic and terrestrial, and ecology studies. How is the public supposed to provide meaningful input if the studies, at least the data collection, is already completed?**

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.2. About the RRRQ EA Process (continued)	*Response from MHBC Planning: One of the provisions of this environmental assessment is that we're building on information that's been collected already as part of the Aggregate Resources Application process. for specific studies like the traffic study, there has been ongoing monitoring, and the traffic counts were updated in 2024. The environmental work's been updated over the years, and the hydrogeological monitoring is ongoing. If there are gaps or things that are out of date, then those are things that would be updated in the work plan with additional data collection.* **3. Why are you saying that you are looking at different alternatives for different studies?** *Response from MHBC Planning: We are doing what the Ontario Regulation 539/21 requires in terms of identifying and assessing study alternatives. These are outlined and we are required to look at alternative methods and alternative haul routes.* **4. Why wasn't "no quarry at all" seriously considered as an alternative? All we're seeing is different versions of the quarry, not whether the quarry should even be here.** R*esponse from MHBC Planning: Regulation 539/21 exempted JDCL from some of the general requirements of an EA that are not particularly relevant to this project and replaces them with some specific requirements. For example, the Regulation exempts JDCL from having to look at alternatives to the project (which would include the "no quarry" alternative) but it specifically requires that we look at the alternative methods of carrying out the project and the alternative haul routes.* **5. Why should we approve a project when we don't actually know which method you'll us or what scale an asphalt operation will do? Shouldn't you have to commit to specifics BEFORE getting approved?** *Response from MHBC Planning: The specifics of the RRRQ project (as originally proposed by JDCL), were included in the licence application made under the Aggregate Resource Act in 2018. However, as a result of the project being designated under the Environmental Assessment Act in 2021, JDCL is required to undertake the EA as prescribed by O. Reg. 539/21to identify a preferred extraction method (i.e., blasting method) and a preferred haul route. Once the preferred extraction method and haul route have been identified, JDCL will conduct an impact assessment of the preferred alternatives. Although JDCL had originally proposed underwater blasting and Reid Sideroad as the preferred extraction method and haul route, the company is now precluded from committing to these until the EA has run its course. At this point in the EA process, we are seeking input from the public on the work plan to assist us in assessing these alternatives.* *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).*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.2. About the RRRQ EA Process (continued)	**6. Has the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) weighed in on this project? What have they said? Where can we look at this?** **7. Is it possible to look at MTO's comments about this project?** *Response from MHBC Planning: Yes, the MTO has been very involved in the review of the traffic studies. They will continue to be involved in reviewing to review the traffic safety and traffic levels of service as the trucks are going to be going directly onto the 401 interchange ramps and onto the highway. The MTO has been very involved and will continue to be involved, and I can check what they've said in the past and I can see if that's something that we can make available on the project website.* **8. Have you considered and are you evaluating these impacts with the widening of Highway 401?** *Response from MHBC Planning: We have been consulting with MTO about their 401 widening EA. We are looking at what their options are for expanding the 401 proximal to the project.* **9. What rehabilitation are you committing to undertake at the site if you get a license to take gravel?** *Response from MHBC Planning: In the original Aggregate Resources Act application, there is a detailed rehabilitation plan. If that's not posted on the site, we can put it there because that's the fulsome answer to what was proposed. You can see the different zones that are created around the edge, the reforestation that's proposed, the habitat creation around the edges of the lakes. It is part of the overall mitigation plan that must be developed as part of the mitigation that'll be coming out of the environmental studies that are being completed.* **10. Have all participants, technical leads been hired by James Dick Corporation or are all these studies being conducted by neutral parties?** *Response from MHBC Planning: James Dick Construction hired all the consultants. Each is a professional adhering to their discipline's code of conduct and standards. We are bound to provide our best professional information and best professional approaches and not be biassed by whoever it is that might hire us. Their work remains objective and unbiased, regardless of the client.* **11. The speakers present this as "this is the plan". Once done, we start blasting. Does this mean that the process is inevitable? Is it just a matter of making small adjustments to make it look like the public is being heard, or is there a possibility that the plan could be rejected by the government?** *Response from MHBC Planning: The plan could be rejected by the government, and we would still have to go through the Aggregate Resources Act, the remainder of the licensing process there, which also could end in issuance or a refusal of the license.* **12. JDCL has not indicated that environmental assessments will consider the issue and impact of idling of queued trucks along the haul route, including to air quality, ecology, local traffic congestion, and public safety. Will the environmental assessments**

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.2. About the RRRQ EA Process (continued)	**consider this issue, which has been previously raised by the public but remains unaddressed?** *Response from MHBC Planning: One of the conditions of approval would be that trucks are not permitted to queue on the public roads. There's a long driveway here that can accommodate any of the traffic arriving at the site, so there's not going to be any queuing on public roads. Apart from that, the trucks coming and going, the emissions from the trucks that are coming and going, whether they're driving or idling, yes, will all have to be taken into account in the assessments.* **13. Based on the quality and the tone of the assessment, we have serious concerns that the reviewers are not acting impartially. Their conclusions appear to minimize legitimate community risks and consistently favour the proponent's position. This pattern raises significant doubts about the objectivity of the process and undermines confidence in the fairness of the review."** *Comment noted.*
2.3. About JDCL site operations	**1. Can you explain why JDCL have applied for a 990,000-tonne license when annual extraction appears to be maxed out at 350,000 tonnes?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Having a larger license allows us to stockpile material in slow years so that we would have materials available to bid on some of the mega projects for example projects like Highway 413. Some of these projects may require many more tonnes than we could provide in one year. So, we can extract that material from below water table and stockpile it on site and then use it if there's a particularly large job. That's primarily the reason.* *The other thing too is that the Ministry has been vacillating over the years about if you're bringing in any material from a recycling perspective, so material coming into the quarry at different times in history has been added to the license tonnage. We want to make sure that we have a large enough license there to cover whatever we're doing.* *The numbers that the traffic studies are assessing are the maximum and they're probably way overstated, but we felt it was better to be conservative with those numbers and they're very manageable as well. There's a video on the James Dick website that basically simulates what the peak hour traffic would be. The clips have been edited together to simulate the background traffic along with the quarry traffic. It is a boring video as you are literally just waiting for the next truck to come. It shows what the real world of what that truck traffic would look like.* **2. How many years does JDCL expect to operate this, Quarry?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Basically, until the rock that is there is gone. It is very difficult to put the brackets on. But if you do the math and the expected tonnage in the 300,000s and then there's approximately 12 million tonnes of rock there. So, it would be about roughly a 20-to-30-year lifespan depending on how much of that rock we can physically get at. A lot of people look at this site and compare it to the other large quarries that you folks are familiar with in the Milton area, and this is nothing like that, I mean we're a tiny operation in comparison to the other operations you're used to up at the Dufferin This is a much smaller facility, but nonetheless it has*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.3. About JDCL site operations (continued)	*high quality rock, and we need to bring it to market in order to build high quality infrastructure.* **3. Some quarries are only operating at 10% capacity due to the low demand for aggregates. What kind of new math and capitals are you using to state that this aggregate is needed? We have a sufficient supply for 50 years already.** **4. There are so many quarries in this area already, why do we need another one?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: This is the highest quality bedrock in Ontario. This is the type of rock that you use to build the infrastructure that lasts for centuries, not for decades. I always use the example of the CN Tower and the Gardener Expressway. The Gardiner Expressway started to fall apart very early after it was constructed because there were multiple issues with it, but it was built with a type of rock that wasn't as suitable as this rock. The CN Tower, the first major concrete remediation jobs scheduled in the CN Tower when I talked to the engineers of the CN Tower, it was 1,200 years from now.* *As we're building up all this infrastructure in the GTA, I think it's incumbent upon us as aggregate producers to bring the material forward so that we can build infrastructure that'll last for centuries, not decades. That's an aggregate conservation strategy. We'll use less aggregate overall by using the highest quality material at the beginning. Milton's production of this high-quality Amabel has dropped by 90 plus percent in the last two decades. That means that that market is being backfilled by lower quality rock being used to build our infrastructure. I would argue that we're building our infrastructure out of the lowest quality material that we have in decades today. So, bringing this material on board is essential to bringing the rock quality up, the concrete quality up, and to have those structures and that infrastructure last as long as possible to give taxpayer value.* *I'm really passionate about this. I see this as being one of our key corporate mission statements here in order to get that high quality material, and by doing so, we'll be consuming vastly less energy than we would bringing in the poor-quality rocks because number one, you don't have to rebuild the infrastructure three times over the next century. So, you save all that rock, you save all the energy involved with that, but you also are shipping this material from close to market location. Much of this material will be used to build Milton right next door. So rather than bring poor quality rock down from north of Orillia, we can bring the highest quality rock right next door and build the highest quality infrastructure. I would respond to anyone who doesn't think that Amabel Dolomite, the only provincially significant bedrock in Ontario, is needed. I strongly believe it is, and I think we are doing the right thing by bringing it forward*. **5. What constitutes high quality rock?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Ontario is a hodgepodge, a geological hodgepodge. There are all kinds of different geological rock formations, and all kinds of different, what we'll call quaternary deposits, which are the more recent deposits that came out of the last ice ages. So, the rock itself has properties of hardness, of roughness, of its ability to hang onto cement paste. Basically, hold together in concrete. And as well, there's also chemical properties that rock has.*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.3. About JDCL site operations (continued)	*So, some of those rocks that were, again, used, you find up near Orillia that they're using more have a chemical flaw in them, and they react negatively with cement paste. And they create a little bit of a gel around the rock particle, which has the effect of jerking that concrete apart. And you see it, as you drive around Ontario, you'll see these structures that have like a spiderweb of cracks in the surface. And that allows water to infiltrate, which allows for freeze thaw damage, and then ultimately that water can make it down as far as the rebar, and then big chunks of concrete start to get pried off of that.* *So, the rock that is on this site is the Amabel formation, and it was deposited about several hundred million years ago, and it was big coral reefs that have basically had the calcium in them largely replaced by magnesium by geologic processes over the years. So that's why it's called a dolomite and not a limestone necessarily. But it's the chemical, the physical, or the hardness, and the shape particles of the physical properties of that rock that all go together to make that the highest quality. If you look at the list in the Ontario Geological Mapping, all of the rock formations in Ontario, from an aggregate perspective, the only one that's provincially significant is the Amabel formation. And that's because it is so revered for its use and high rises. And as we all know, as we build our society up rather than out, there's a higher proportion of crushed stone required in our aggregate mix in Ontario. So, it's going to be more important over the years. And I hope that answers the question. It's a series of things that lead to that high quality designation.* **6. Can you kindly share a map following this meeting with all those in attendance of all the places in Southern Ontario where Amabel Dolomite is currently present and an indication of where it's currently being extracted, the volume of supply, and the proponent's data analysis?** *Response from MHBC Planning: There are current supply demand studies that confirm the need for Amabel Dolostone close to market. The State of Aggregate Resources of Ontario Study (SARO) shows the distribution of the resource.* *I think what is important for people that are looking at those maps is to also consider the constraints that apply to it. The Amabel Dolostone is the limestone that makes up the Niagara Escarpment, and of course, the Niagara Escarpment Plan does not allow consideration of extraction on the escarpment itself. So, there's designations in that plan of natural and protection that completely rule out any possibility. A lot of the Amabel Dolostone has wetlands on it that you can have no development in provincially significant wetlands. So yes, there's the geology of the resource is one thing, but all the constraints that apply, and some of that's quantified in the SAROS report.* *Follow-up response after PIM from MHBC Planning: The most recent Supply Demand Study is dated October 2024. Mapping of the Amabel Dolostone is found in Ontario Geological Survey Aggregate Resource Inventory Reports (ARIP) A consolidation of the ARIP reports is found in SAROS Paper 2 where the constraints are also reviewed. The Greater Toronto Area (including Halton Region) contains approximately 24,438 ha of bedrock resource. After applying the 20 constraints, approximately 23,643*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.3. About JDCL site operations (continued)	*ha of the resource had overlapping constraints. This results in approximately 97% of the bedrock resource base being constrained.* *As stated, the results of this study continue to reflect a shortage of close to market licensed high-quality sand and stone suitable for making asphalt and concrete products.* *https://data.ontario.ca/dataset/aggregate-resources-index* **7. There was mention that the site was previously operated until 2008. I have lived in Campbellville since the early 1990's and do not recall any sand and gravel pit operations (which are very different from what is being proposed by the applicant) in the late 90's and there most certainly were none after 2000. Can you kindly provide the source of your information, given the statement is arguably not, correct?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: After Springbank S&G sold the pit it was still licenced, and it changed hands a couple of times with operators doing various things there. The MNR eventually revoked the licence in 2008.* **8. What are the proposed hours and days of operation, and are these specified somewhere so that people can see that information?** **9. What are the proposed operating days and hours? And are there trucks go in and out all day?** *Response from MHBC Planning: The proposed quarry will have the following hours of operation: Drilling, extraction, processing is Monday to Saturday, 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM, and then the shipping is Monday to Saturday, 6:00 AM to 6:00 PM. This is referenced on page 16 of the public feedback report from the first Public Information Meeting.* *Information on daily trucks is found at question 6 on page 24 in response to similar transportation questions.* **10. Are there any plans to move to electric trucks to reduce emissions?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Absolutely, as technology evolves, a site like this coming from a higher elevation moving towards the market, which is at a lower elevation, is ideally suited for electric trucks. You're taking the heavy weight of the material and you're running downhill towards the market, where you can recharge your batteries when you're doing any braking, and then you're emptying your load in the market and coming back, so absolutely. We can't run electric trucks from Sudbury and deliver material down to this market area. We can from a site like this. Our mission statement, as stated at the very beginning of the presentation, is to have the lowest energy footprint of any of our competitors, and that speaks to that. We've sent delegates down to California to look at the Tesla units that are being used down there, and as that technology comes on board, we'll be implementing it.*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.4. About whether there is an asphalt plant proposed on the site and handling of recycled material	**1. What about the asphalt operations? If there is going to be asphalt processing with all the smells and fumes, how is that going to affect us? And is there a study that would cover this topic including adverse impacts?** *Response from MHBC Planning: I want to be clear about terminology. asphalt plants are where asphalt is batched or manufactured, asphalt plants are where you mix the liquid petroleum with the aggregate and create a hot mix that is then taken out to the road. There is no asphalt plant as part of this proposal.* *The reference that people do see to asphalt is in relation to recycling. There is a provision to allow a degree of asphalt and concrete recycling on the site, but that doesn't involve any liquid petroleum. It does not involve odours and so on.* ***2. What happens if you're recycling old asphalt and concrete is that you are using the same crushing equipment, the same trucks, the same loaders and excavators that are handling the natural aggregate that's produced at the site that they're also mixing in some degree of recycled materials. And all those impacts will have to be considered as part of the studies.*** *The trucks bringing the material into the site have to be counted. The equipment crushing the material and any emissions from that have to be counted. I hope that this response helps to clarify that there is not going to be an asphalt plant on this site while understanding that there is a small component of recycling that would occur. This is what is referred to as accessory recycling that would only be going on as long as the quarry is there. And the only other thing I would note is that recycling is a permitted use at the site today. With respect to the existing site zoning, a recycling yard or recycling activity is permitted, and this has been the approval for as long as that zoning has been in place.* **3. When you recycle the old asphalt, how do you keep the bitumen from the old asphalt from getting into the water table?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Recycled materials will be stockpiled in segregated piles in the processing area. All recycled asphalt materials will be located a minimum of 30 metres from any water body or man-made pond, and at least 2 metres above the established water table so there will be no pathways available by which the old asphalt (or any contaminants contained therein) would be able to enter the water table* **4. Why is there even a need for recycling? Has nothing to do with extraction?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Aggregate recycling on Licenced aggregate sites is increasingly encouraged by provincial policy. The Provincial Planning Statement (2024) 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.*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.4. About whether there is an asphalt plant proposed on the site and handling of recycled material (continued)	*The combining of crushed asphalt and quarried aggregate to produce granular base products used in road building helps to reduce the amount of quarried (virgin) aggregate needed and that is what we would be doing by recycling concrete and asphalt. Given the availability of the resource, in concert with the site being zoned to permit aggregate recycling, and the proximity/ease of access to future road construction projects (e.g., the new Hwy 413 and the Hwy 401 widening), including aggregate recycling as part of the RRRQ project is a logical choice.* **5. I looked it up. Why don't the rules limit recycled materials to 20,000 tonnes like they are supposed to?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: The ARA permits recycling greater than 20,000 tonnes per year but limits how much is stored at one time - and it depends on the annual licenced tonnage* **6. There are different ways of recycling asphalt. Which method will be used HOT or cold?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Hot and cold processes refer to using crushed asphalt products at an asphalt plant or in the paving process. Aggregate recycling in the quarry is just crushing and screening.* **7. I can see the phrase in the draft work plan processing of recycled asphalt and concrete. So, are you going to have asphalt processing or not?** **8. I am not sure that I understood the answer to the asphalt issue. Does the EA study consider asphalt recycling?** *Response from MHBC Planning: There is a provision that permits asphalt recycling, not asphalt production. So, asphalt recycling is permitted and the impacts of that have to be taken into account in the EA that we're completing.* **9. Can you commit in writing that there will be no asphalt processing ever at this site and if you want to add it that you would have to go through a full public process?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Sure, I would commit to that if we could get in the context of a settlement.* **10. If there is no asphalt processing now, can you add it later? Do you need environmental review? How about public involvement?** *Response from MHBC Planning: As noted previously, asphalt 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.*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.4. About whether there is an asphalt plant proposed on the site and handling of recycled material (continued)	**11. The site plan shows areas for processing equipment. What exactly is that equipment? Is it just crushers and screens, or are there things to make asphalt?** *Response from MHBC Planning: There is no asphalt plant, and there's a list of the equipment on the site plans and in the work plan. So, there's a detailed itemized list of all the equipment that would be used for each operational method in the work plan.* *Facilitator: Can you identify where in the work plan this information is contained? Response from MHBC Planning: Page six of the work plan would have a listing of the types of equipment that would be there.*
2.5. About the Social Impact Work Plan	1. **The work plan indicates the community survey on socio-economic impacts will be predominantly multiple choice. While this is easier for the proponents' data analysis, it limits the input the community can provide. Will you provide an option for additional comments for all questions, as well as separate space to allow the community to feel heard and to provide meaningful input?** *Response from HDR: It is predominantly right now proposed to be multiple choice, but we're still working on and developing the survey so we can take a look and consider other potential options and methods to get your input* **2. The study area for the social impact section seems to be too limited at only 1 km from the site. Given the location of the site adjacent to the community centre and most of the access roads, the impact will be much larger. I suggest a minimum of area to north of Conservation Road, 1 km east of Guelph Line, 1st Line to the west and 5 Sideroad north of 401.** *Response from HDR: The Study Area for the social component of the SIA was selected to include the area within 1 km of the Project Site and potential haul routes as this is where it is anticipated potential nuisance effects (e.g., effects on air quality, noise, blasting, vibration or traffic from operations at the quarry or along the haul routes that affect the use or enjoyment of properties) could be experienced. Most of the Social Study Area (as shown in Appendix G, Figure 1 of the draft Work Plan) either coincides with, or exceeds, the limits described in the comment (recognizing that Campbellville Road north of the 401 represents the extension of 5 Side Road). The exception to this is the southern limit, which extends to one kilometre south of Campbellville Ave West (Regional Road 9). Being as neither Twiss Road nor Guelph Line (Regional Road 1) are being considered potential haul routes south of Regional Road 9, it is not necessary to extend the Social Study Area as far south as Conservation Road.*
2.6. About the Air Quality Work Plan	**1. Why is JDCL's environmental assessment using air quality data from Milton and Brampton and not collecting air quality information from the actual site?** *Response from RWDI: We are using the data from Milton because that is data that is provided by the Ministry of Environment and therefore has been through their QAQC process. The data from Milton is going to be more conservative and more protective than using data from the site. Given the fact that the air quality monitoring station, Milton will be collecting data from a mix of local emission sources that would be expected to be higher than*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.6. About the Air Quality Work Plan (continued)	*the background air quality sources in the area around the Reid Road Quarry and Campbellville, given that it's a forested, much more rural area. So that is the reason or the rationale for using that data*. **2. Follow-up to Brian Sulley's comment about the use of Milton data, being a resident of the area we can attest to the air quality in Milton and Campbellville are very different depending on weather patterns.** *Comment noted.* **3. So why is the concentration of crystalline silica being determined for the PM10 fraction and not the PM2.5 fraction of dust?** *Response from RWDI: The Ministry of Environment criteria for silica, crystalline silica, is based on the PM10 fraction. As you get smaller particles, especially when you are dealing with limestone, the silica content will decrease due to the hardness of silica relative to the surrounding material that makes up the particulate. So, the Ministry has chosen PM10 as their benchmark for looking at crystalline silica, and that is the value that we're using. We are also looking at PM2.5 as one of the contaminants, but silica is addressed through the PM10 fraction.* **4. Will the air quality assessment include option three, no quarry?** *Response from RWDI: No, we are only looking at the alternatives as presented as part of the work plan.* **5. How can the air quality study be limited to 500 metres beyond the borders of the quarry? Would particles not travel further than that, especially if asphalt refining is still part of the planned use of the quarry?** *Response from RWDI: There is no asphalt plant proposed for this site. The particulate matter that is generated as part of quarry operations will be at the highest on the site and will drop/decrease exponentially with distance beyond the property line. So beyond five hundred metres the concentration would be indistinguishable from what is already occurring in the area. Near the site, which is what we are most interested in. That said, under Regulation 419, the area that we are required to look at is a modelling coverage area of over five kilometres away from the site. So that will also be looked at.* **6. Will you be tracking and reporting on all GHG emissions produced by the quarry operations? Will the public be able to access the data and how do you plan to mitigate GHG?** *Response from RWDI: Yes. Quarries do not generate enough greenhouse gases to require reporting under the current reporting requirements in Canada, but the calculation of GHG emissions will be done as part of the assessment, so that information will be provided.* **7. A crystalline silica is a known carcinogen, particularly dangerous for young children. The quarry is within 1.5 kilometres of downtown Campbellville, and quarry trucks will be driving through town to get to the highway, which will also carry a risk of silica exposure. How is this quarry being so close to town even being considered as a valid location with these extreme air quality risks present?**

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.6. About the Air Quality Work Plan (continued)	*Response from RWDI: Yes. So, the Ministry of Environment does have a criterion for silica that we'll be using as the basis of the assessment. The emissions of silica due to limestone quarrying are significantly lower than say for sand and gravel operation. So, it has to do with the amount of silica in the material. That decreases again with distance from the quarry, since that will be the major source. Once the trucks get onto the road, the amount of silica bearing dust is significantly decreased.* **8. Can you confirm that the air quality work plan and assessment will consider and assess the viability of mitigation measures to protect against adverse effects to neighbouring property uses, human health and the environment?** *Response from RWDI: Yes, we can confirm that the air quality assessment will consider mitigation measures to protect against adverse effects as part of both the comparative analysis and impact assessment components of the EA.*
2.7. About Well Surveys And Monitoring	**1. How far from the site is the door-to-door well survey being undertaken?** **2. What is the boundary for the door-to-door well survey?** **3. What is the geographic study area for the residential wells (reference is slide 20)?** *Response from Harden Environmental: If I can direct you to slide 35, that shows the extent of the well survey. And similar to the dust and noise studies, we are looking at the wells fairly proximal or close to the quarry because that is where the biggest impact would occur. And when we are weighing out during this environmental assessment process, we have to weigh out these alternatives, and the wells in that area are sufficient to allow us to determine whether which method that we're weighing out or alternative that we're looking at is going to have the greatest or at least impact.* **4. Why are the residents on Reid Road not included in the proposed well survey?** *Response from Harden Environmental: As mentioned in a previous response, we are trying to assess these two alternative methods of mining at this stage. And we're looking at the nearest wells, because they're where the greatest impact could occur. If the quarry does get approved and goes forward, then we will be recommending a broader, or more definite baseline well survey that may very well include Reid Road if the Ministry of Environment or if the agency reviewers recommend that. At this stage, we're concentrating on those areas that are nearest to the quarry to understand the aquifer and the type of wells that people are using, and to base this environmental assessment, this alternative evaluation on potential impacts to those wells.* **5. Can I go out and get my well tested if I'm not in the 500 metres? How do I make it official, so I know where my well is at now?** *Response from Harden Environmental: Yes. So, you can definitely get your well tested at any time. There are many labs in Ontario that allow you to get your well tested. For the environmental assessment, we are not going to be taking water samples from individual wells. We are going to be taking water samples from on-site. And then as we go through the process, and once an*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.7. About Well Surveys And Monitoring (continued)	*alternative is chosen, and the quarry, if it gets approved, then we will be taking samples as a baseline from wells within a designated area. That will be negotiated with the Ministry of Environment.* **6. How will James Dick Construction ensure that my well water is not contaminated?** *Response from Harden Environmental: As part of this EA process, we are looking at water quality and that is one of the requirements of the EA put to us from the Ministry of Environment and water quality is one of those criteria that we have to look at, and that's what we will be determining through this EA, how to prevent, and which method it can be used to mitigate or prevent water quality impacts offsite.* **7. We are greatly concerned with the impact on our well water. Will you test my well specifically before you start, and then keep testing it regularly? We need to know the baseline, not just some general survey of the area.** *Response from Harden Environmental: We are not sampling individual wells at this stage. But once a preferred alternative is chosen, and the quarry looks like it's going forward, or has been approved, then a comprehensive baseline study will be done on nearby wells. And again, the number of wells in the area will be a negotiated number. And it may very well not be just a one-off. We have quarries where there's annual samples being taken, or even biannual samples. So, it all depends on the outcome of the final study.* **8. What guarantee do we have that our wells won't run dry or get contaminated? And if my well fails because of the quarry or the dewatering, who pays to fix it? How fast will it be fixed? What is the plan for this? What area is included? Can't just be the study area.** *Response from Harden Environmental: We are assessing these two methods at this stage, but I can say that for every single quarry and gravel pit that we have worked on and got approved, there is a comprehensive contingency and well complaint protocol. And all of them include immediate response. And if the quarry or the gravel pit is complicit in the impact to the well, then it is up to the aggregate operator to remedy that.* **9. Given that the proposed Reid Road Reservoir quarry will operate below the water table in a highly vulnerable aquifer relied upon by local households, and recognizing that no hydrogeological model can guarantee zero impact on private wells, what specific measures will your company implement to ensure community water security is fully protected rather than relying on monitoring that only identifies problems after they occur?** *Response from Harden Environmental: As part of this EA, we are weighing out these two alternatives and there are potential impacts on both water quality and water quantity. And at the end of this environmental assessment, then we go on to a preferred alternative. And at that point we'll be able to show the mitigation or contingency plans that are associated with those preferred alternatives. But at this stage, we are being asked by the Ministry to go through this EA alternative process and then ultimately, we*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.7. About Well Surveys And Monitoring (continued)	*will circle back again and improve and adapt our original studies to indicate how we're going to prevent any potential offsite impacts.* **10. In Campbellville, JDCL has referred to the target area by various names such as Amabel layers and Bedrock layer. In a letter from JDCL, this layer was referred to as the Gasport layer which is also known as the Gasport aquifer which supplies drinking water to Campbellville. JDCL proposes to remove a section 100 feet deep from the Gasport aquifer.** *Response from Harden Environmental: It is not clear which letter from JDCL is being referred to here, but we can confirm that extraction is being proposed from Amabel dolomitic limestone (also referred to as the Gasport Formation). For the purpose of the hydrogeology technical discipline, the term Amabel is used, but the term Gasport is considered equivalent.* **11. JDCL's EA work plan now states that pond depths will be 22 metres, while the depth of ponds in previous reports is 30 metres. Does JDCL plan to do any dewatering of the pit at any time to allow mining of the Amabel formation from 22 metres to 30 metres deep**? *Response from Harden Environmental: My understanding is that there are limitations to the equipment, so that's why we were going to be looking at the 22-metre depth of extraction. JDCL would be able to provide more information on this question.* *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: As a requirement of the EA Process, we are required to assess the difference in impact from not dewatering to dewatering. I really like "not dewatering" but we are required to study both methods, because that's what the government has asked us to do. Subject to what the final EA says, I cannot anticipate a scenario where we would ever be dewatering on this site.* *With respect to the second part of the question, the style of drag line that we run right now, that is common, like an eight-yard drag line, we know we can drag down to 22 metres fairly easily. And we've visited a number of sites where we've seen these facilities working. Most of the southern United States uses this mining method, it's very common, very well understood. The State of Florida, they exclusively use this mining method. So, we intend to use the same type of machinery we're using now. So that's why we altered the depth of the quarry from 30 metres up to 22 metres.* **12. Appendix E of the work plan includes Figure 2, which shows the area of the private well survey. Can you confirm that the wells used to supply water for Woodbine and Mohawk Park will be included?** *Response from Harden Environmental: Slide 35 was put on the screen. The red line shown on slide 35 includes the Mohawk Raceway, so the wells there will be included.* **13. Please confirm how the project will impact on the existing approved drainage path used by Woodbine to discharge lagoons. The discharge currently travels adjacent south of the project study and is included within the study area.** *Response from Harden Environmental: We've looked at all of the surface water pathways coming out from the proposed quarry area and they lead towards the Woodbine and then one of them turns around and comes back,*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.7. About Well Surveys And Monitoring (continued)	*it goes through the KOA Park campground and then comes back across 401. And there's no intention or possibility that pathway will be affected. There's no surface water that's proposed to be discharged into that location or physical changes to that pathway. So, at this point I would say there's no chance of changing that pathway.* **14. If dewatering affects my well, is that considered an impact from the quarry or is it separate? Like who's responsible?** *Response from Harden Environmental: As a hydrogeologist, I can answer that. If the quarry operations impact on your well, then it's up to James Dick Construction to remedy that.*
2.8. About inclusion of the assessment of dewatering as an alternative	**1. When you speak to "dewatering" that means pumping out the groundwater so you can blast. How much water are we talking about – like barrels or a swimming pool or your complete ponds? Where does all that water go? Is it lost permanently?** *Response from Harden Environmental: the volume of water that would be involved in the dewatering "dry" extraction alternative method, as well as the fate of the discharge, will be determined as part of the work plan, although it is anticipated that this would require at least one of the ponds to be completely dewatered at any one point in time (to a depth of up to 22 metres below the water table). The sub-aqueous "wet" extraction alternative method would require no dewatering, which is why JDCL selected this as the extraction method proposed in the original ARA license application.* **2. What is involved? And what is the area included in the water quality monitoring?** *Response from Harden Environmental: For this environmental assessment, when we're comparing the dewatering option versus the sub-aqueous mining, we are going to be looking at water quality from the on-site monitors at this stage. And then once we've gone through this stage and the preferred alternative is chosen, then there will be recommendations for additional monitoring and possibly off-site, or likely off-site in people's wells as part of a pre-quarry condition of license.* **3. If you will not be dewatering, why is this alternative being studied? The license for quarrying will only specify the depth of excavation in the area??** *Response from MHBC Planning: Because explicitly that's what's referenced in the regulation, is the alternative to underwater blasting. Therefore, we have to look at what those alternatives are and evaluate them for the EA.* **4. Has the government given the go-ahead for blasting so close to 401?** *Response from MHBC Planning: No, the government has not given approval for anything, because we're still going through the EA process. We're doing an evaluation of what the preferred alternative for extraction will be. So, at this point in time, no, they have not given approval to conduct any kind of blasting.*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.8. About inclusion of the assessment of dewatering as an alternative (continued)	**5. The Dufferin Quarry north of Milton has been in effect since the 1950s. This quarry has a history of dewatering under the water table and pumping that water into manmade open reservoirs. They have been blasting under the water table. This has resulted in draining the wetlands in the surrounding areas, which now require pumping water back into the wetlands. In the future, they feel that this situation will be helped by having the open water reservoirs drained down to help to replenish the wetlands, however, they feel that these reservoirs will need to be kept at particular levels, so that it drains. I do not believe that this has been tested out. Also, after the quarry owners turn the site over to Conservation Halton, they'll have to continue monitoring these water reservoirs if this works using taxpayer funds. In the meantime, they have admitted that they have lowered the water table, which they expected was going to happen, and they say that they do not expect that the water table will return to the previous. This is not something that we want to have happen at the Reid Road Quarry site as people depend on their water table remaining at the current level, and do not want their wetlands drained.** *Response from MHBC Planning: I don't think we can really comment on anything about Dufferin's operation tonight at this meeting. We appreciate the information.* **6. We do not want the areas of recharge to be affected for the wetlands, as this could negatively affect the wetlands and our water source. Wetlands are crucial to protect the planet from climate change. They trap carbon and protect the water sources to hopefully counteract fire concerns related to our forests. De-watering and pumping the water into surface open reservoirs leaves the water open to contamination and evaporation, so this is not a good strategy for water protection.** *Comment noted.* **7. How long does the dewatering take, a few days, a few months?** **8. How long does it take for the water table to come back?** *Response from Harden Environmental: In terms of this environmental assessment, we'll be looking at, one of the alternatives is not to do any dewatering and the second alternative is to dewater the quarry and that would happen in a stepwise fashion. I think maybe an eight-metre face would have to be opened up and dewatered to an eight-metre level and then once that's completed, then you'd have to go to the next level. So that will take years of operation and that dewatering would go on for years and possibly take years to recover from that process.* **9. Will the hydrogeologist report fully examine the impact of dewatering?** *Response from Harden Environmental: Our response is that at this stage, again, we're evaluating the difference between the two methodologies, and which will have the greater or the least impact. Then following that, and once the alternative is made, then yes, then a fulsome analysis will be done on the preferred alternative.*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.8. About inclusion of the assessment of dewatering as an alternative (continued)	**10. What is the water taking proposed by JDCL?** *Response from Harden Environmental or MHBC Planning: As noted in the Report submitted for the 2018 ARA Application, A Permit to Take Water will be required as the total water pumping within the site boundaries will exceed 50,000 L/day, and is associated with aggregate washing and dust control, with some losses as a result of evaporation and entrainment with aggregate.*
2.9. About process and impact of blasting methods	**1. Can you normally go with dry blasting with just modelling? Don't you usually have to do extensive studies to get a licence for a quarry?** *Response from Explotech Engineering: I think that is just a similar question to something that MHBC Planning touched upon earlier. As part of the EA process, we're required to look at both the wet and dry blasting options. So whatever option ends up getting selected as the preferred option will be the option that quarry if approved will go forward with. So similar to a dry or wet blasting scenario, both options need to get looked at as part of the work plan.* **2. So, you are doing this wet blasting underwater, that's never been done in Ontario before. How do we know it's even going to work? And if you switch to dry blasting instead, does that mean that you have to drain the whole area? Seems like both are a bad idea.** *Response from MHBC Planning: It has been done in Ontario before. James Dick Construction has used it at other sites, and recently had it approved for another quarry that they're proposing. There is a theoretical possibility that they could apply for amendment to the site plan if they wanted to use a different method of mining. But it would have to go through entirely new review, new reports, new hydrogeology reports, new environmental reports, all the equipment would be different. So, it would be a very fundamental change that would be subject to fundamental reconsideration.* **3. Where has underwater blasting been done in Ontario before – which sites?** **4. Which JDCL quarries in Ontario have used the underwater blasting technique?** **5. What other specific sites has JDCL done underwater blasting to the same depth under the water table that is in this proposed plan?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: JDCL has performed underwater blasting at 3 other JDCL sites. There are other Ontario aggregate producers we know of who have used this process in the past as well. Producers will use this process as they see fit and they don't go around advertising what processes they use, as such there is no 'registry' or list of producers one can consult in order to find out who might be using this process. Every site is different.* **6. So, if the wet blasting doesn't work out, you just switch to dry blasting instead, right? Do you need any special permissions for that, or can you just change methods?** **7. What if you start with wet/water blasting and in five years from now you decide that dry blasting is easier, do you have to tell anyone? Do we get a vote on that?**

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.9. About process and impact of blasting methods (continued)	**8. Can you switch between the dry and wet blasting depending on the conditions? Or do you have to pick one method and stick with it?** *Response from MHBC Planning: In response to these questions, you can't just switch or change methods. You'd have to go and do a comprehensive reconsideration of the whole site plan.* **9. I am confused – if wet blasting and dry blasting have totally different impacts on our water, why is there just one study covering both? Shouldn't each method have its own separate analysis?** *Response from MHBC Planning: the EA is intended to conduct a comparative analysis of the two extraction methods (i.e., sub-aqueous "wet" blasting and dewatered "dry" blasting) to determine which of these will have less potential impact on the environment (including groundwater and surface water). As such, both methods need to be studied in parallel in order to compare them to one another. However, once the preferred alternative is identified, JDCL will conduct a comprehensive assessment of the potential impacts of that extraction method.* **10. It is not likely that since you are also considering blasting under the water table and dewatering that your company would also drain the wetlands and lower the water table. What is your perspective on this issue? We're referencing whether there would be any draining of the wetlands and lowering of the water table**. *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: I'll just quickly answer that. There are many benefits to not dewatering. You don't spend energy pumping water out of the quarry, you don't lower the water table, you don't impact on wetlands. You have instant rehabilitation once you've finished dragging the rock out of that lake, the water table is right back where it should be, and you don't have really any dust in that type of an operation because all the material is damp that comes out of the water. There are many benefits to not dewatering.* *Having said that, in good faith with this EA process the government has asked us to study something that we initially had no intention of actually doing, which is dewatering this site. We have to do what the government tells us to study, but in all likelihood, it's a no-brainer that not dewatering is a much lower impact way to mine. We have a great deal of experience doing it, both for decades up at Guelph and up at Glen Christie as well.* **11. If you did not dewater, what blasting chemicals would be added to the water as a result of blasting?** *Response from Harden Environmental: This is exactly the purpose of the EA, to evaluate the different chemical impacts from either dry blasting or subaqueous blasting, and that will be an outcome of this study.* **12. Does the 401 have to be closed for blasting below water? Above water? How often does blasting happen?** *Response from MHBC Planning: No, the 401 would not have to be closed for blasting. The frequency of blasting it's typically it's once or twice a week.* *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: If we compare this to our Guelph and our Cambridge operations, it's about once a week. We did about 22*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.9. About process and impact of blasting methods (continued)	*blasts a year, from 14 to 22 blasts a year, and each blast has an impact of about a second. So, you're looking at 14 seconds to 22 seconds of blasting impact per year.* **13. I'm worried about fly rock and highway traffic. What studies have been done into the safety of passing motors, which are about 100,000 vehicles a day on Highway 401? Even though the blasting is temporarily brief, the fly rock would be deadly to a vehicle at 135 kilometres per hour. Over the life of the proposed quarry, the risk strikes me as very significant. Even though it is illegal for fly rock to leave the site, there's no guarantee that it will not occur.** *Response from MHBC Planning: The distribution of fly rock, the control of fly rock, the risk of fly rock is all going to be assessed as part of the blasting impact assessment.* **14. The work plan evaluation of fly rock states the fly rock distances will then be overlaid onto the RRRQ property to display the visual impact. Will you include the visual impact of fly rock at the closest quarrying point to Highway 401 less than a hundred metres away?** *Response from Explotech Engineering: As part of the EA assessment, the reason the Environmental Assessment Area was selected was because it is currently underwater. That provides us with a good option to look at, and as part of the work plan, look at whether it stays fully watered or if the area is dewatered. Regarding blasting areas close to the 401, there are multiple blast designs that can be utilized at a quarry. As the extraction were to get closer to 401, that blast design would change based on what the blasters are seeing through rock, the output of the blasts as blasting gets closer to that location. Ss part of the work plan, we will only be assessing the Environmental Assessment Area as noted in the work plan.* **15. In the Work Plan's evaluation of flyrock, JDCL states "The flyrock distances will then be overlaid onto the RRRQ property to display the visual impact for the initial blasting area". The 2018 Blast Impact Analysis states "The proposed initial quarry operations will commence with a sinking cut at the North limit of the Phase 1 Extraction area." in reality, this is the NE corner of Phase 1, and 200 metres from any property boundary. Will you include the visual impact of flyrock at the closest quarrying point to Hwy 401 (less than 100 metres away) and if not, why not?** *Response from Explotech Engineering: The flyrock distances will be overlaid onto the Environmental Assessment Analysis Area found in Appendix D of the Work Plan Package. This specific area was chosen for the Work Plan to compare the results of blasting conventionally or underwater. A flyrock analysis at the property boundary at the closest point to Hwy 401 is not included as a scope of the Work Plan Package assessment. The 2018 Blast Impact Analysis is a report prepared as part of the ARA application which will be conducted after the Environmental Assessment Comprehensive Work Plan is completed.*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.9. About process and impact of blasting methods (continued)	**16. If dewatering and dry blasting is ultimately used, what are some examples of typical mitigation measures to manage fly rock and prevent off-site fly rock contamination?** *Response from Expo Tech Engineering: Those answers will be made as part of the assessment. So that's included in the fly rock section of the work plan.*
2.10. About assessment of noise impacts	**1. Why is Highway 401 not a sensitive receptor?** *Response from RWDI: A highway such as the 401 is normally something that we consider as a source when we're doing highway environmental assessments for instance, we do work on highways. So, no, it wouldn't actually be a receptor in and of itself.* *Response from Aercoustics: Similar answer. The receptors that we're considering in this case would be the houses along the roads, whereas the highway would consider as a source, it's not considered a receptor.* **2. How will noise and vibration impact on the racetrack be monitored and considered? Should there be noise and vibration on the racetrack, how would that be monitored and considered?** *Response from Aercoustics : Essentially, the noise receptors we consider selected based off Ministry requirements. In this case, the racetrack would not be considered a sensitive receptor, typical in these sorts of studies. Essentially, the Ministry requirements, they're meant to prioritize nuisance noise impact on people, but it's unlikely that noise impact on the racetrack would cause any issues to animals, particularly given the distance, it's a kilometre away. As well as we'll be looking at the impact on intervening houses closer to the actual project, which means that things further away would be protected as well, meaning at those locations.* **3. Horses react to fireworks so obviously they will react to blasting and we have concerns about this.** *Response from MHBC Planning: The same standards apply across the board as far as the amount of vibration and noise that you're allowed to make is controlled for multiple purposes.* **4. In speaking with an individual living in the area of 10 Sideroad and Highway 25, they related that the effects of the Dufferin Quarry was that they first experienced the physical impact in terms feeling that a blast had occurred and then hear the noise of the blast. This had the effect of disturbing sleep depending on when it happened.** *Response from MHBC Planning: As noted previously, JDCL is not in a position to comment on Dufferin's operation. We appreciate the information.* **5. The MECP document titled "Noise Guidelines for Landfill Sites" dated October 1998, provides general guidelines for evaluating the noise impact of off-site source vehicles (e.g. truck traffic associated with external haul routes). Do GENERAL GUIDELINES that are 27 years old provide the best information on noise impacts along haul routes near residential areas?** *Response from Aercoustics: The RRRQ EA uses the most current and appliable standards and guidelines in assessing the effects f the proposed project on the various components of the environment. In this instance, the*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
	1998 MECP guidelines represent the best available source for evaluating the noise impact of truck traffic along the alternative haul routes.
2.11. About assessment of natural environment impacts	**1. Over the years, community members and other interested parties as well as their environmental advisors have raised concerns with both the scope of the previous assessments conducted on behalf of JDCL and with the methodologies employed by JDCL's consultants. Concerns have been raised with but are not limited to fish, vegetation and species at risk studies and these concerns have not been meaningfully addressed to date. JDCL states in its work plan that it will not carry out further assessments for several species including salamanders, fish and hawks. For other species such as turtles and snakes, no assurances are provided that mitigation measures will be implemented to protect these species.** *Response from MHBC Planning: The work plan has been very deliberate in setting out the work that's been done over the years. There's been environmental surveys and monitoring done at the site since 2016 and it's been updated several times, and the dates of all those surveys are included in the work plan. So that's certainly a topic that the Ministry of Environment will be looking at and the consultants that are doing that environmental fieldwork have made their proposal for the data that they feel they need to complete the assessment. But it is certainly something that the Ministry of Environment will be deliberating over and if there's comments from the public or others, for example, the Ministry of Natural Resources, or other agencies as to whether that work is sufficient or not, that's something that needs to be determined before the studies are completed. We were quite particular in being transparent about what we intend to rely on and that's something that is open for comment.* **2. Since the JDCL's studies predate the statement that Ontario Nature has declared all turtles, all Ontario turtles now at risk, will the turtle habitat be reassessed?** *Response from MHBC Planning: We will take into account whatever updates the current species at risk lists include. And if that demands additional work because of an added species, then we'll have to do that.* **3. The showy orchid, a rare Ontario native plant, occurs on this site. Have you considered this, and what protection will you provide for this endangered species?** *Response from MHBC Planning: I don't know whether that species has been found on site or not, but if the species at risks, the current species at risk lists all have to be taken into account, and the presence or absence of those species has to be determined.* **4. Conservation Halton has a record of an otter on this property. Has your study accounted for the presence of otters?** *Response from MHBC Planning: The more information that we can be provided about that observation would be helpful. The comment will be reviewed by the Natural Environmental Consultant for their follow-up if they are not already aware of this.* **5. Subject to technical comments from the MECP regarding any deficiencies or gaps with the environmental studies previously conducted for fish, terrestrial and aquatic species, vegetation and**

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.11. About assessment of natural environment impacts (continued)	**species at risk. Will JDCL commit to carrying out further assessments to more appropriately evaluate impacts to these species both onsite and offsite? And will JDCL include in its assessment both onsite and offsite mitigation measures for all species impacted by the proposed quarry activities with a plan for implementation and effective monitoring?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: We are listening to the experts here and we've done a very comprehensive suite of studies already. This work plan builds on all those. It's very interesting that the site itself today has been the subject of a hundred percent extraction in the past and in the relatively recent past, only a decade or two ago was this site finally rehabilitated and the license was wound up. We don't think there's going to be much of a change in the look of the site. There'll be a slight increase in the area of ponds and lakes on the site, but the same biota will survive in the same pool of genes will from the existing wildlife on the site will continue to repopulate the areas as we extract them.* *We think there's going to be an overall net benefit in that we're going to have more habitat in the future, aquatic habitat than we have right now. But we'll certainly be listening to all the experts and the advice of the Ministry as it comes down to what further work is required. And we certainly are looking forward to any input from the public tonight to advise us on what people see as important as well. So, everyone's information is being taken into account and it's all important and that'll all be assessed by the Ministry, who are impartial third-party assessors and final arbiters of the work plans here.* **6. A 100-foot-deep lake is completely different habitat, proving no feeding grounds for herons, etc. The water temperature will be much cooler also affecting the species.** *Comment noted and will be referred to the Natural Environment Consultant.*
2.12. About Traffic Work Plan and assessment of Alternate Haul Routes	**1. Surely you can't even consider Haul Route 2 along Main Street?** **2. JDCL's 2023 Project Alternative document concludes that Route#2 (Twiss Road – Campbellville Road – Guelph Line) is "considered reasonable for inclusion in the Reid Road Reservoir Quarry Environmental Assessment". But this document also states, "approximately 21.4% of the route (0.6 km) is posted to permit truck traffic." If less than 25% of Route #2 permits truck traffic, how is this considered a viable alternative for the environmental assessment?** *Response from MHBC Planning: Understood. As per the requirements of this EA study, we have been directed by the Province to consider haul route alternatives. We had a hard time coming up with reasonable alternatives that might've been considered, but we're required to identify an alternative and examine it. So that's why the alternative to Haul Road going down around south of Campbellville is there. So, we're required to include that.* *Further response from MHBC Planning: If you look at the work plan document within Appendix A, we did an assessment of all the reasonable haul routes, and we conducted a screening assessment to look at all the potential accesses into and out from the site accessing the 401. And that's included as an appendix to the work plan under the Environmental Assessment Project Alternatives Appendix. But one of the challenges with*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.12. About Traffic Work Plan and assessment of Alternate Haul Routes (continued)	*the regulation was that we are required to look at alternative haul routes. So, we had to look at any of those haul routes potentially that could go in or out of the site and access the 401. And then from there, look at what the reasonable alternatives would be.* *And essentially, it came down to the two alternative haul routes that we are including in this study. The alternative that goes down Twiss Road, Campbell Road, and back up through Guelph Line was the second only feasible route that we would ever have considered, and that's why it was included within the study. But if they're looking for more information about which other haul routes we looked at and what the criteria were for screening haul routes to be part of the process or not, it's included within that document.* **3. What is the number of trucks per day, both in and out of the proposed quarry?** *Response from MHBC Planning: The number of trucks, this is based on the previous studies, so this is something that would be determined or reviewed and determined again for the purposes of the EA study. But in the Aggregate Resources Act study, what the traffic consultants talk about is the peak hours. So, there's hours of the day that are busier than others. And what they talked about was approximately 16 trucks inbound and 16 trucks outbound for the busiest hour in the morning and about three inbound and three outbound for the busiest hour in the afternoon.* **4. Do the number of trucks include trucks to the recycling centre?** *Response from Paradigm: Yes, they would.* **5. Do the inbound and outbound trucks include those bringing in hauling used asphalt and concrete?** *Response from Paradigm:* Yes, they would. **6. So, 16 trucks in and out at peak hours and three at lesser hours. So, a good estimate on an eight-hour day would be 72 trucks in and 72 trucks out, or a total of 144 trucks moving in and out a day.** *Response from Paradigm: Based on the previous study that estimate's pretty good in terms of a daily truck amount. It was previously estimated at 140 trucks. As the pit starts to operate, there's some peaking in the morning and then it typically tapers off towards the afternoon, which is why there's a decline in truck trips.* **7. What happens when there is a closure or a major slowdown on Highway 401? Where will quarry trucks go? Will they be coming through our roads?** *Response from Paradigm: The trucks will be required to stick to their haul routes, which will be to and from the 401, whichever haul route is identified as the preferred one, whether it's haul route one or two.* *Further response from MHBC Planning: if the 401 is closed, then the trucks will have to use the designated detour routes. But I mean that's the same whether the aggregate comes from this site or whether it comes from somewhere further west of here.* *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Time is money within the trucking industry, and we've got pretty sophisticated software now where we can see*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.12. About Traffic Work Plan and assessment of Alternate Haul Routes (continued)	*where there's slowdowns, and we just don't dispatch trucks to the quarry if it's at a time when there's traffic stoppages as well.* **8. What is the average weight of a family car? What is the average weight of a fully loaded gravel truck with and without a trailer. What is the equivalent number of cars to a fully loaded gravel truck?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: I can try to answer that in the absence of anyone else. The weight of my truck is about 5,000 kilograms and a truck is obviously carrying a lot more weight than a single-family car.* *The average weight of a fully loaded gravel truck is probably in the neighbourhood of 60 to 80 tonnes.* **9. JDCL did not answer the question on what of an average car and the weight of a fully loaded truck.** *Comment noted.* **10. Are the trucks double or single axle and do they have trailers?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: There are several different configurations. We use straight trucks, we use tri axles which have one steering axle and four load-bearing axles, two of which are drives. And then we also have a variety of tractor-trailer type units where there's a tractor that has three axles and then the trailers can have three or four axles on them. So, it'd be a total of anywhere from six to seven axles, that's to spread the load out so that the trucks are easy on the road. I might add that, believe it or not, city buses have a much higher wheel load than gravel trucks do. Even though people think gravel trucks are higher, it's just because of city bus has that many fewer axles than the gravel truck.* **11. I understand that there are two planned routes for trucks leaving the quarry, but I also understand that the trucks will be independently owned so the drivers will not be restricted to these routes. Why are other possible routes not being studies for potential impact?** **12. Who owns the gravel trucks? Are they independently owned or owned by James Dick Construction? Independently owned, how do you police it if trucks do not follow the haul routes but decide to use alternative community roads that have load restrictions? How is this policed? Is the company accountable?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Generally speaking, the majority of the trucks are owned by James Dick Construction, but we do have customers that come and pick up. We do very jealously guard the haul routes and if anybody wants to be a bad actor, we just will refuse to load them at the quarry. We can enforce it that way. We enforce the haul roads, but most of the trucks will be James Dick Construction trucks.* **13. Has any consideration been given to the emergency services located on Reid Side Road? How will an emergency vehicle be allowed to proceed?** *Response from MHBC Planning: Yes, that has to be considered. It's part of the traffic study. And of course, all vehicles have to yield to emergency services including truck*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.12. About Traffic Work Plan and assessment of Alternate Haul Routes (continued)	**14. Which of the 401/ Guelph line interchange and modifications proposed by MTO are being considered by JDCL in the EA. Significant changes are proposed to Reid Side Road Road by MTO. These should be considered in the EA.** *Response from Paradigm: The EA is still ongoing for the 401. If the EA does identify a preferred alternative for the 401 interchanges with Guelph line and we expect to assess that alternative in the traffic study.* **15. Have you discussed with the Province and MTO creating your own access and exit routes on and off the 401 instead of clogging community routes? Neither of your proposed haul routes given the current volume of traffic on the local roads seems viable**. *Response from Paradigm: I don't have an exact answer to that question. Whether or not we've consulted with the MTO on a new interchange, I could tell you that the Quarry's position relative to the existing interchange would be too close for MTO standards for a new specific interchange to Highway 401.* *Further response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Essentially Reid Side Road is according to its legal description the Springbank Haul Road. That's essentially exactly what Springbank Haul Road or Reid Side Road is. It was a purpose-built road directly from the quarry entrance directly to the 401 ramps and there were safety improvements that were made at the time. That was an agreement that was signed between the Quarry operator who paid for the road and the township and the region. MTO is also a signatory of that deal. So, in essence, that's exactly what you described. A purpose-built road directly from the quarry entrance to the 401 is exactly what Reid Side Road was.* *Now since then, the Guelph Junction Industrial Park has grown up, and those trucks utilize that haul road to get to and from the businesses that were situated at the Guelph Junction Railway Industrial Park. And then obviously it's also used as a road to bypass Campbellville as well. But that's exactly what we started with a short three or four decades ago and it's evolved to what it is today, and this is not a long-lived Quarry.* *We just want to get this high-quality rock out to the 401. But this is one of the best haul routes I've certainly seen in my career. You never get a quarry that's like a hop skip and a jump away from the 401 on a dead straight road, but we have to assess these alternatives in order to fulfil our obligations under the EA.* **16. How will vehicle clear access to Woodbine be secured as part of the traffic study? Currently, the access from the 401 Guelph line is the main source for vehicle access and it turns for patrons to attend the site are a concern.** *Response from Paradigm: Vehicle traffic being generated by the Quarry would not affect access to Woodbine.* **17. The answer given tonight on the impact of trucks on vehicle traffic seems incorrect. There were frequently significant backups on the westbound exit ramp of the 401 for both south and northbound traffic that we even made worse with trucks turning left over the bridge. Can you please reconsider your answer and provide a**

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.12. About Traffic Work Plan and assessment of Alternate Haul Routes (continued)	**fuller explanation as to why you think the Mohawk traffic will not be impacted? Is this something that you would consider in reviewing as part of the work plan that you're doing?** *Response from Paradigm: Maybe I misunderstood the earlier question. Vehicle access to Mohawk would not be impacted by the quarry. People attending Mohawk would still be able to get there. There may be some additional delays associated with the additional traffic that's generated by the quarry at the interchange. So that touches on the backup from the exit ramp. Part of the traffic study, we look at what mitigation measures would have to be implemented to manage future traffic volumes and those are typically improvements to traffic control. So right now, the westbound off ramp there is a stop-controlled intersection. So, we would look at whether or not it might need signalization.* **18. The work plan states up-to-date information will be collected about traffic volumes. However, the traffic study was conducted in June 2024. How can this study be considered up-to-date related to traffic volumes when it's almost 18 months old and back to the office four or five days per week? Work orders were given to many employees only in the fall of 2025. In addition, the work plan states Ontario regulation 539/21 requires the Director of MECP to review and approve the work plan before the proponent can commence their studies for both of these reasons, shouldn't the traffic study be redone in 2026?** *Response from Paradigm: There may be the need for additional data collection for those reasons just stated, the data collection is just an ongoing measurement of traffic volumes to help form a basis for the analysis. So yes, we did collect some traffic counts in June of 2024 and it's now, well, we've gone through June of 2025 already, so we may need to collect additional traffic counts in the new year to reflect changes in traffic volumes. Traffic studies typically rely on traffic volumes that are about two years old. That's about the shelf life for a traffic count.* **Facilitator: Are you able to confirm that the updated traffic study work would look at updated numbers to determine if there are changes due to individuals being back in their offices and traveling to work.** *Response from Paradigm: Yes* **19. How is dust, noise and truck traffic going to be controlled so that we can still live here? And who is going to monitor how bad it gets?** *Response from MHBC Planning: There are two parts to the study. One is the assessment of the alternative methods and the alternative haul routes, and the second part is looking at the preferred methods and recommending mitigation in order to make sure that the level of impacts is not unacceptable, that there's standards for noise, there's standards for dust, there's standards for truck traffic. And that all remains to be determined through the studies as to what forms of mitigation are required to ensure that there's no adverse effects from the operation on the neighbourhood. So, those are all things that have to be determined, and the Aggregate Resources Act application from several years ago would give a good indication of the types of mitigation that would be considered, but that's all*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.12. About Traffic Work Plan and assessment of Alternate Haul Routes (continued)	*going to be updated and reviewed as part of this environmental assessment.* **20. Surely you can't even consider Haul Route 2 along Main Street.** *Comment noted.* **21. If one of the traffic proposals is to install traffic lights at the exit ramp and go off on interchange, will James Dick Construction be paying for it, or is this the expectation it would be paid for by the Ontario government, which by default would be taxpayers?** *Response from MHBC Planning: That would be determined between MTO and James Dick Construction.* **23. JDCL has not indicated that environmental assessments will consider the issue and impacts of idling and queued trucks along the haul route, including impact to air quality, ecology, local traffic congestion, and public safety. Will JDCL's environmental assessments consider this issue which has previously been raised by the public but remains unanswered?** *Response from MHBC Planning: As noted previously, one of the conditions of approval would be that trucks are not permitted to queue on the public roads. Additionally, the emissions from the trucks entering and exiting the site, whether they're driving or idling, will be included in the assessment.* **24. A public comment was previously made that haul route studies must also include the transport of recycled materials to the quarry area over the multi-decade life of the operation, without assuming that such material is only transported as backhauls of trucks for a load of aggregate. Will JDCL commit to assessing the transport recycled material to and from the quarry area within its Traffic Impact Study?** *Response from MHBC Planning: Yes, vehicles transporting recycled materials will be included in the Traffic Impact Study.*
2.13. Other General Comments and Questions Noted	**1. Will there be real time monitoring that we can actually see, want to be able to check online ourselves, whether you're meeting your limits for noise, dust, air quality, and water levels, not just trust that you're doing it? So, should the quarry be approved and you're building, would there be able to go online to check the monitoring**? *Response from MHBC Planning: That remains to be determined. There are different methods of auditing and confirming compliance. So, that remains to be determined based on the outcome of the studies and the recommendations that are made.* **2. If we start getting noxious odours or substantial noise at night, who do we call? Is there going to be a hotline? What is the expected response time? When we do contact you, what happens at your end? Does someone investigate and intervene if needed, or do we just have no response? Do you need to reply to the original complaint? (Question read out from email sent to Facilitator).** *Response from MHBC Planning: The time for the response depends on the nature of the complaint. The quarry operator is the first person you contact and a contact person at the site would be provided to the community. If that*

Topic	Verbatim Questions and Comment and Responses Provided
2.14. Other General Comments and Questions Noted (continued)	*doesn't bring people satisfaction then there's regulatory agencies, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ministry of Environment. Their phone numbers can also be made available.* **3. Does James Dick and family have hearts?** *Comment noted.* **4. Isn't James Dick simply being opportunistic? The Town of Milton should have rezoned this site after the use of it for a sand and gravel pit in the '70s for the sole purpose of the 401 expansions. It is surrounded by Niagara's government land and also has environmentally sensitive wetlands. It's very disappointing that one operator wishes to benefit itself to the detriment of the entire Milton community. What is James Dick's response to this?** *Response from Greg Sweetnam, JDCL: Our society needs this material, absolutely needs it, and this is a site which is currently zoned to permit quarrying. Not just crushing gravel, but quarrying. It's located immediately beside a haul route that goes right to the 401, so this is an absolutely ideal site with the highest quality material in Ontario on it. Are we being opportunistic? Well, I guess we are in that we're taking advantage of a resource which is here and it's zoned. It probably is in the public benefit to utilize this site.* **5. We are passionate about having the highest quality of life without a quarry in our backyard for a period of life and for our children, rather than you get quality of rock for your century-long structures. Our home is our most important consideration, and this garment should not be used for this purpose. It should be protected. We do not want addition to Milton. It's too congested currently, so you're not doing us any favours**. *Comment noted: Thank you for that, for the comment, and it will be included in the feedback report.* **6. People should not be exposed to the effects of these quarries. This area around the escarpment is one that should be protected for generations to come and not be negatively affected by private business ventures**. *Comment noted* **7. I am worried about trucks.** *Comment noted.* **8. We want to make sure there's safe water for aggregate and we feel that we have no real say in this matter.** *Comment noted.*