

Quarry EA Meeting Questions

There are 4 main questions related to the EA:

- 1) What are the steps in the process?
- 2) What, in detail, is included in the scope of the EA?
- 3) When does the community have an opportunity to provide meaningful input?
- 4) What is the timeline for each step? Are there any mandatory timelines?

There are several specific questions within each of those main questions, as detailed below.

1. What are the Steps in the EA Process?

MECP contact for the Public for the EA Process

- Why is an MECP representative not at the meeting? Can MECP be asked again to provide a representative at the public meeting to directly address the public's questions?
- Is Jenny Archibald the "Project Officer" for the EA?
- Who does the public contact at MECP with questions about the process? Will MECP ensure we receive answers in a timely manner?
- Can MECP please provide links to website documentation with details on the EA process, including timelines, requirements, etc.?
- Can MECP also provide a web link that will provide access to documents submitted as part of the EA, and have that website updated in a timely manner?
 - Is Section 30 of the *Environmental Assessment Act* applicable to the proposed EA, in that the Director must maintain a record for each proposed undertaking for which an application for approval under the *Environmental Assessment Act* is submitted? If so, the record is maintained at the Branch and is usually available within 24 hours of it being requested by any person.
- What is the effect of the EA on the JART process and schedule?
- What are the main deliverables that the proponent must submit to MECP?

2. What, in detail, is within the scope of the EA?

Terms of Reference and work plan

- Is O.Reg. 539/21 the "Terms of Reference"? If not, can the ToR be provided to the public?
- The ToR seem to be those studies listed in Subsection (2) of Section 7 "Studies". However, that subsection says "The studiesmust include, without being limited to," and then lists several studies the proponent must undertake. However, the "without being limited to" suggests that there could be others. Who has input into what other studies are done? Does the public have

input into what additional studies are done, and if so, how? Or, does JDCL determine the ToR via the preparation of their Work Plan.

- If an issue is “scoped out” of the Work Plan, can that issue be raised as a concern by a member of the public at a future date?
- How will the public be notified that the work plan has been submitted?
- Will this work plan be made available to the public?
- Can the public make comments on the work plan, and is the proponent obligated to address public comments?
- O.Reg. 539/21 states that the work plan must be approved by the Director of the EA Branch of MECP. Is there any opportunity for the public to comment on the draft workplan?
- Is the schedule of notice to the Director concerning completion of the work plan made public?

EA Studies

In the *Environmental Assessment Act*, environment is broadly defined to include the natural, social, economic, cultural and built environments. Do these categories apply to this EA?

- O. Reg. 539/21 states “The proponent shall ensure that studies have been conducted that address all of the effects of the project on the environment,”, then goes on to list “including” and several specific things. Is the intent that ALL EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT be addressed, or only the ones in the “INCLUDING” list? According to Section 8 (d) it sounds like ALL.
- What is the MECP’s definition of “cumulative effects” for this EA?
- The decision about what constitutes a reasonable range of alternatives remains the proponent’s responsibility, subject to the Minister’s approval.
 - An alternative that is typically included in the evaluation of alternatives is one that identifies the implications of doing nothing to address the problem or opportunity that has been identified. Will this alternative be included in this EA?

An EA is required to include information about potential cumulative effects of the project in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future activities where possible.

- How does MECP determine that reasonable foreseeable future activities are adequately addressed in the work plan and EA studies? Will this address the future widening of Hwy 401 in the area, and the associated increase in traffic-related noise, PM2.5, etc.?
- Are climate change impacts such as the effects of a warming climate on potential impacts to water quality and quantity taken into account when evaluating cumulative effects?

This document provides some useful info:

<https://www.ontario.ca/document/preparing-and-reviewing-environmental-assessments-ontario/environment-assessment-process-submission-and-evaluation>

- Include information about potential cumulative effects of the project in combination with past, present and reasonably foreseeable future activities where possible. Proponents are advised to consult with government agencies to identify any already-approved projects that will be built in the future, and to consider their potential cumulative impacts to the extent possible⁴.
- The federal government has published a practitioner’s guide that proponents may find useful in conducting cumulative effects assessments: Practitioners’ Guide.
 - 2.1 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS DEFINED Cumulative effects are changes to the environment that are caused by an action in combination with other past, present and future human actions.⁶ A CEA is an assessment of those effects (· “Actions” Include Projects and Activities). CEA is environmental assessment as it should always have been: an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) done well. In practice, the assessment of cumulative effects requires consideration of some concepts that are not always found in conventional approaches followed in EIAs. Specifically, CEAs are typically expected to:
 - assess effects over a larger (i.e., “regional”) area that may cross jurisdictional boundaries;⁷
 - assess effects during a longer period of time into the past and future;
 - consider effects on Valued Ecosystem Components (VECs) due to interactions with other actions, and not just the effects of the single action under review;
 - include other past, existing and future (e.g., reasonably foreseeable) actions; and
 - evaluate significance in consideration of other than just local, direct effects.

Gov’t and public review of the EA documentation

- How does the public effectively object to any issue in the EA, such that the proponent is required to make changes to the project; is this something that is better dealt with through consultation directly between members of the public and MECP? If direct government consultation is the required route, who is the MECP contact person?

3. Public Notice and Consultation

What is the definition of an interested person? Is it any member of the public, or only those residents within the 500m of the property?

- Does the proponent determine who qualifies as an interested person
- Are interested persons required to demonstrate that they will personally be affected by a particular undertaking?

Is Section 30 of the *Environmental Assessment Act* applicable to the proposed EA, in that the Director must maintain a record for each proposed undertaking for which an application for approval under the *Environmental Assessment Act* is submitted? If so, the record is maintained at the Branch and is usually available within 24 hours of it being requested by any person.

- The public record file must contain the proposed and the approved terms of reference, all notices given, the Minister’s decision, and such other documents as the Minister or Director

considers appropriate. As a matter of practice, the Branch also includes all information submitted by the proponent during the preparation and review of the terms of reference and all comments received by other interested persons during the preparation and review of the terms of reference.

- At what points in the process will there be communication with the public?
 - From MECP
 - From JDCL
 - How is the public informed (e.g., direct mail, newspaper)
- At what points in the process will the public have an opportunity to provide comment?
 - It appears only at the draft EA stage, and only 30 days, with report posted on JDCL website, so unlikely to be user-friendly
 - Will MECP commit to providing publically accessible, downloadable, and printable documents on a website, or require the proponent to provide them in such formats
- “Notices” in O.Reg 539-21 appears to simply refer to a notice, with no opportunity for comment or input. Is that correct?
- Notice of Commencement of the EA process
 - Notice given to “every assessed owner of land within the larger of (A) an area that is 500m surrounding the site and (B) the study area of the EA”.
 - How is the study area defined?
 - Any person who, in the opinion of the proponent, may be interested in the project.
 - How does the proponent determine the list of “who may be interested”? Can MECP mandate that all interested persons be included, or require certain people to be included (e.g., everyone who made a submission to the ERA Posting
- Notice also is given by publishing in newspaper on 2 days, and on the JDCL website.
 - Where on the JDCL website notice will notice be given, so that it can be monitored regularly?
 - Can MECP post notices on their website as well?
- Notice of Publication of Draft EA, and Draft EA
 - Since the draft EA only has to be published on the proponent’s website, it makes it very difficult for anyone to review it. The proponent makes it impossible to download, or to print. Can MECP require a version be provided that is downloadable, searchable, and printable (e.g., a pdf that allows printing)?
- Can MECP post the draft EA on their website?
 - The public is to get “at least 30 days” for comments. Because the EA is expected to be sizable, and the reports historically have been in a format designed to make review difficult, could additional time be given, and a user-friendly version made available to interested parties?
 - To whom are public comments submitted (JDCL? MECP? Both?)

Consultation

In the EAA (RSO 1990, Chapter E.18), it says, with respect to the Obligation to consult

5.1 When preparing proposed terms of reference and an environmental assessment, the proponent shall consult with such persons as may be interested. 1996, c. 27, s. 3.

- This chapter and section (C. 27 s.3) does not appear to have a link to an electronic version, so it isn't possible to find a definition of "interested person".

The proponent will be required to consult with interested persons when preparing the environmental assessment. (Section 3 of the Bill, sections 6 to 6.2 of the Act). <https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/bills/parliament-36/session-1/bill-76> (however, no definition given)

Consultation with interested persons during the preparation of the environmental assessment is mandatory (section 5.1 of the *Environmental Assessment Act*). Consultation is not a negotiation process nor is it just placing notices in newspapers, having a website or handing out flyers. These are tools to help inform and make the public aware of a proposal. A good consultation plan should engage the public and incorporate consultation methods that encourage two-way communication.

- Does this definition of consultation apply to this EA?
- O.Reg. 539/21 states "the proponent shall consult with....any persons who may be interested in the project".
 - At least 3 public meetings, with advance notice of the Public Information Meeting (PIM) being published in the newspaper. Q: Are there minimum requirements for the PIM? Is the public allowed to make comments, and is the proponent required to address them?

4. EA Schedule

- Submission of work plan by proponent – is there a defined period of time, or maximum time limit for the proponent to submit the work plan?
- Minister's decision on the work plan – What is the anticipated review time for approval of the work plan by MECP? Is there a maximum timeframe, or legislated time frame for this review?
- Public meetings – how many public meetings will there be during the entire EA process, and at what times during the EA would these occur?
 - How do we ensure that we are contacted re the public meetings
- Draft EA submission - What is the anticipated review time for the EA by MECP? Is there a maximum timeframe, or legislated time frame for this review? How much time is given to the public to review the EA?
 - <https://www.ontario.ca/document/preparing-and-reviewing-environmental-assessments-ontario/environment-assessment-process-submission-and-evaluation>
 - The above website says 7 weeks for Interested Person review. Why does O.Reg.539/21 say only 30 days?
 - How do Interested Persons make comments on the EA?

Community Questions and Comments for MPP Parm Gill regarding the Environmental Assessment

Introduction

Rather than send a list of all the questions and comments, they are grouped around thirteen themes for clarity . The longest section is a set of very specific technical questions about the Environmental Assessment (EA).

Several of the other themes pose questions about whether an EA will fulfill Premier Ford and MPP Gill's promise to stop the quarry; why other methods are not being pursued; and whether an EA is a 'fair' process. Many people asked for specifics about the EA timeline.

All of the comments and questions are verbatim from the submissions with a few minor corrections for typo's and grammar.

Will Ford fulfill his promise?

- When is Doug Ford going to keep his promise to "stop the Quarry one way or another" ?
- Will MP Gill stand behind the premier's statement to assure us that this won't happen?
- Provincial governments recent track record is to ignore environmental protections, regulations and processes; why will they act differently in this case? Why should we trust them?
- Perhaps this is more of an observation, but are the promises made by Doug Ford and Parm Gill now off the table
- How does this process guarantee the quarry will not proceed, as was promised by the Premier and MPP Gill?
- Why is the assessment necessary if our premier indicated that the quarry won't happen?
- Why should we have to keep funding this fight to protect our water and environment when they could stop this now. What is really going on? What are they hiding?

Why an EA and not an MZO or other method?

- I think that all of us realize that the Environmental Assessment will only delay the process. My question is that we were told that one way or another the quarry is not going to happen. We need Parm to reassure us that it is not going to happen. We need government intervention immediately to notify James Dick that this is not going to happen. There is no compromising here! Ask Parm why he and the Premier can't make this happen. Nothing else that I say matters.

- As I understand it an EA does not guarantee the quarry is stopped. It adds more hoops for the mining side to jump through cutting into profit margins but does not stop the quarry. An MZO on the other hand stops the quarry in its tracks, as both MPP Gill and Premier Ford have previously promised over a year ago now.if the people don't want it.....then it won't happen. On one hand I am thankful for MPP Gill's hard work in getting an EA started but would not an MZO have been much less a burden to our community and the tax payer? My question as a community member dealing with this and COVID for the past months and months and a taxpayer, would it not make better sense to just grant the MZO?
- All related questions regarding this quarry have been addressed many times in the past years; it's time to tie up the bull and let the politicians show their true colours. What happened to the MZO?
- Why can Doug Ford and Parm Gill not issue an MZO and stop the quarry?
- On what basis was the decision by Club Link to withdraw the application to develop Glenn Abby golf course? There had to be political interference and some technicality used. What was it and can we use it to support our case? What was the reason the quarry was denied in Flamborough a few years ago. The then MPP implied he was instrumental in the decision to stop the quarry. IF this was true why are Gill and Ford dragging their feet and not using the same or similar rational to stop this proposed quarry?
- Can Parm explain precisely why an MZO is reckless or what we don't understand about it, since to the community it seems the only mechanism to truly guarantee your promise will be kept?
- Why doesn't the province just buy the land from JDCL, just tell them nobody wants it in the community. Buy the lands and donate it to conservation or have them donate it for tax breaks.
- What exactly is "dangerous" about asking for an MZO to protect the land from becoming a quarry?
- If ACTION is "uninformed", why do you (Parm Gill) not correct that by providing us the information necessary to stop the quarry?
- I would like to know why Parm's office reacted in such a negative manner when asked if he could request an MZO. It was very effective against the quarry fight in Flamborough a few years ago and more recently as pointed out against the Glen Abbey development.

Will an EA actually stop the quarry?

- Can Parm please confirm if the EA will stop the quarry rather than simply impose limitations on the operation.
- I would be very interested in how an EA will fulfill MPP Gill's and Premier Ford's promise a year ago to stop the Campbellville Quarry one way or another.
- In the event the Environmental Assessment Branch should rule in favour of the proponent, what is your plan "B"?

- What will MP Gill and the premier do if the assessment is favourable towards the quarry application?
- If the environmental assessment is one way to stop the quarry, what is the other, if it fails?
- How does an EA help prevent the quarry to ultimately protect citizens' health & the environment?
- Can Parm please confirm if the EA will stop the quarry rather than simply impose limitations on the operation.
- What happens if the EA doesn't support the applicant moving forward?
- Does it still go to the ARA for approval? What happens if the ARA approves it with mitigation plans? What will the provincial government do then to stop it?
- If the ARA doesn't approve the license can the applicant reapply? How long before they can do that again?
- If the license is denied can the Town and Region along with the province work quickly to Rezone the lands
- If the Minister rejects the Environmental Assessment, does that mean the quarry can't go forward? And is that decision final? If no, how do we proceed to get a final rejection of a quarry in the proposed location? How do we ensure that this land is protected going forward? Just who makes the decision about a quarry license approval?

Why waste money on an EA?

- What is the cost of an EA versus the cost of issuing a MZO?
- Given that Doug Ford said the Quarry is "not going to happen" (or whatever his exact words were), why are you wasting taxpayers money conducting an EA?
- Given that Doug Ford said the quarry is not going to happen, why are you encouraging the Proponent to waste theirs and the taxpayers money finding an alternate way to carry out the project such as an open pit mine.

Is the EA a delaying tactic?

We understand it is unlikely that an Environmental Assessment would result in stopping the quarry, instead simply setting out criteria that would have to be met. Therefore, although we are grateful to see the application delayed & the process made more onerous & costly for the applicant, this process is also onerous & costly for the community opponents.

- How will Mr. Gill & the Premier meet their commitment to stop the quarry in a timely way?
- Have Doug Ford and Parm Gill changed their mind?
- The bottom line should be the wishes of those that will be affected. MPP Gill and Premier Ford gave lip service to the community's wishes. Are they now changing their stand because of outside pressures?
- If the EA will not stop the quarry, what hope do we have as a community that this is not simply a delay to the inevitable under the current legislative framework?

Is an EA fair?

- What financial contributions has James Dick made directly or indirectly to Gill/Ford and the Conservative party?
- How much money has the aggregate industry contributed to the Conservative and Liberal parties in Ontario over the past 3 years?
- Who will oversee the EA? Is it a panel or a single person? What hope do we have that they are qualified and are not simply there to push the quarry ahead in the way that an LPAT would?
- I would be concerned about how much weight is given to the applicant's reports and if all would be peer reviewed by unbiased consultants.
- From what I have read it appears the EA is written in a manner to help James Dick comply so that the quarry can go ahead. Not assessing whether or not it harmful to the environment. It seems biased in his favour.
- The letter we received from MECP and the regulation make it clear that the proponent drives the EA process, creates the terms and provides the studies. Is there a role for the community in this process, or do we essentially rely on the Director/MECP?
- The EA process seems to give the proponent a high degree of control over the process whereas the community may or may not have any voice/rights in the process. Is that correct?
- How fair will this process be with the applicant being supported by the OSSGA and their lobbyists meeting with ministries continuously? We were told early this year that the Campbellville quarry application was a target for this group.
- Why go through a process where the applicant is just going to try to justify through their pre-planned reasoning to operate close to market? The applicant has shown no regard for public safety with their communication, just on the haul route as an example. If they were sure that this wouldn't impact homes, they would offer to buy homes just like Dufferin Aggregate does. Instead, we got condescending letters about our grandfathers fighting in wars so we could extract rocks.
- I would be concerned about how much weight is given to the applicant's reports and if all would be peer reviewed by unbiased consultants.
- You should have some input on who is reviewing reports. We found that JDCL had too much influence on who was being hired. So how would you be involved with choosing experts.
- WHO DECIDES IF THE DICK RESPONSES ARE ACCEPTABLE AND ACCURATE.
- Is JDCL required to hire an objective third party to carry out further studies?
- Intervenor funding - I have been involved in many public processes where the proponent must provide funding so intervenors can pay for technical specialists to help ensure a thorough and fair processes. Will Parm undertake providing funding to the community either from James Dick or the Province?

EA Timeline

- What is the timeline for JDCL to complete the requirements under the EA Act? (multiple people asked this question)
- Since the the proponent's two year notification and consultation period under the aggregate license application has ended and they have submitted their report. Can the Minister of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry make a decision under the aggregate resources act either approving, refusing or referring the license application to LPAT at the same time the environmental assessment is being conducted?

General Questions

- If the quarry sits on lands designated *as a Well Head Protection Area*, why would anyone consider allowing ANY BLASTING on top of the aquifers that provide local drinking water? The obvious answer is blasting is not allowed, period. Any such application should be rejected for this reason on its submission!!!! So why is the project still alive?
- I don't know what an exemption from the Terms of References means.
- What are the exemptions referenced in the Designation and Exemption document: "The project is exempt from sections 5.1, 6 and 6.1 and subsections 7 (4) to (7) of the Act, from any other requirement of the Act respecting terms of reference, and from section 2 of Regulation 334 of the Revised Regulations of Ontario, 1990 (General) made under the Act, if the proponent complies with sections 4 to 12 of this Regulation."?
- Who will JDCL be required to include on all the notifications mentioned in the Designation and Exemption document?

Technical Questions

- The letter from Kathleen O'Neill, Ministry of the Environment, stated that the project is "subject to the Environmental Assessment Act and exempting it from certain requirements of the Act so long as the project-specific requirements of the regulation are met." What does this mean? What parts of the Act are being considered "exempt" for this project?
- Ref 5. B: what is the study area of the EA?
- Who is considered to be "any other person who, in the opinion of the proponent, may be interested in the project"? Will this include everyone who objected to the quarry?
- What is the approximate timing of the public information meetings? Are they focused on establishing evaluation criteria and indicators? Or will they happen throughout the EA period?
- 5(2) "evaluation criteria and indicators" and "measures for mitigating potential negative impacts including any measures identified by the community" – is funding available to

support the expertise needed to facilitate meaningful public input on these detailed technical studies?

- ‘develop criteria and indicators to evaluate the effects of the project and alternative methods of carrying out the project on the environment’ – what is the nature of the review by the MECP? Is there a checklist that includes things like timing; or is it a critical scientific analysis?
- Which wells will warrant participation in the ‘door to door well survey program’?
- How can we be assured that the water quality monitoring program and assessment of the effects to groundwater from blasting below the water table will be robust?
- What is the scope of the social impact assessment? Will it include the psychological impact of politicians telling us the quarry will not proceed and then being subjected to another 2 years of proponent studies?
- The work plan is not a publicly available document? What does it mean for the proponent to consult with the Ministry on the work plan? Will the Ministry be, in effect, helping the proponent facilitate licensing of the quarry?
- What is the alternative to underwater blasting? Blasting is still required; so the risk to the water table would still be present.
- An evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages to the environment of the project. Are there advantages to the natural environment to blast it apart?
- How will the Ministry enforce the proponent’s compliance with its monitoring and mitigation program?
- Information on how to access a copy of the draft environmental assessment and copies of the studies conducted in relation to the project. Will these documents be available electronically in a manner which allows downloading to minimize the impact on the public? Will funding be available to the public to allow the hiring of consultants to aid in a review of the studies?
- Section 12 indicates that the Ministry must inform the proponent of any deficiencies in the EA submission; allowing the proponent the opportunity to correct the deficiencies. This appears to be a ‘getting to yes’ process where the Ministry is, in effect, coaching the proponent toward compliance.
- The Ministry can reject the EA if the proponent misses its timing for correction of deficiencies. Are there technical reasons the Ministry can reject the EA? It appears the Ministry ‘reviews’ submissions versus ‘approves’.
- What new studies are required now that we're not done previously?
- What’s the threshold that JDCL has to meet? Specifically how does JDCL meet the requirements (e.g. is doing a study enough, or does the study need to say there are no negative impacts, if there are negative impacts, are some ok, or is it just a mitigate scheme)?
- Do immediate neighbours get the opportunity to weigh in, considering this project necessarily impedes on those neighbour’s air quality, noise thresholds, peaceful enjoyment of property?
- How will impacts to the broader community be calculated? Things like property values can likely be quantified, but how do you quantify changing the character of a village?

- Could the study require JDCL to make monetary payments to the immediate community?
- Could the study require JDCL to work with a citizens' advisory council and hold a minimum number of meetings a year?
- Could the study require JDCL to cease operations if certain negative impacts are in fact realized?
- Under effects of Consultation. With respect to submissions during the environmental registry consultation period, the Ministry determined that there are 7 key concerns about the proposed project to be reviewed under the Environmental Assessment Act. Will these concerns be reviewed with equal weighting and can the project be denied if any one of these concerns is not addressed to the Ministry's satisfaction?
- Since most reports will conflict with one another how will the final impacts be determined. What weighting does water have over flyrock...etc.
- THEY MUST BE ASKED TO **PROVE** THAT THE PROPOSED QUARRY WILL NOT AFFECT GROUNDWATER, ENVIRONMENT ETC ETC.
- Does the assessment take into account the effect of equipment issues , such as hydraulic line rupture, oil leak or diesel spill and the contamination this would cause to the water supply?
- Little attention has been given to endangered and threatened species in this area. We know that Blandings (Threatened in Ontario), painted (special concern in Ontario and Canada), and snapping turtles (special concern) can be found within 10 km of this quarry site. Other threatened/endangered species like the Jefferson salamander live in the area as well. Habitat fragmentation/destruction are among the limiting factors for these animals. Blandings turtles, like many other turtles, are slow breeders, beginning that phase of their lives between 14 and 20 years of age. Heavy traffic by quarry trucks present a clear danger to breeding turtles which must cross roads to access egg-laying sites. Will this be a consideration by the Minister or other person(s) involved in deciding whether to approve the quarry license?
- According to noted hydrogeologist Dr. Emil Freund, the layers of rock rise as one travels from Rockwood to Campbellville (i.e North to South). This includes the layer of rock that contains Campbellville's drinking water which is much closer to the surface. Due to this unique geology, Dr. Freund was of the opinion that Campbellville's aquifer was far more vulnerable to damage than the hidden quarry in Rockwood. Is the EA committee aware of this fact?
- Will the panel confer with Dr. Emil Freund?
- Will the committee be made aware of the negative environmental record of James Dick Construction Ltd. at its Guelph operation, the Dolime quarry? Currently, this quarry is pumping 11 million litres of ground drinking water per day and dumping waste water directly into the Speed River. The quarry has been identified as a major threat to Guelph's drinking water supply affecting 2 municipal wells. Additionally, James Dick Construction Ltd. has been responsible for fracturing the aquitard that protects the aquifer, the source of Guelph's drinking water. Will the committee be made aware of these facts?

- The reports submitted by the applicant claims that underwater blasting at Reid Road quarry will not require dewatering and that water usage will be sustainable. Will the committee be made aware that claims by company President Greg Sweetnam that the Dolime quarry has successfully used underwater blasting date as far back as 2015 despite continued dewatering at this site?
- Will the committee be made aware that underwater blasting magnifies the intensity of blasting due to the weight of the water resulting in powerful shock waves capable of damaging buildings and infrastructure? Will the committee be made aware of the increased potential for damage to the aquitard as well as adjacent infrastructure? Will the committee be made aware that the applicant has failed to address how shock waves will be mitigated?
- Will the Environmental Assessment panel get an answer from the applicant regarding how much water is to be drawn down in Campbellville? We have all asked and the company refuses to give this information.
- Will the report be made available to the public?
- Are the findings of the report binding?
- Will JDCL's plans for an Asphalt Recycling facility as part of their operating the quarry be included in the EA?

Town/Region/JART

- In terms of the Environmental Assessment, what are the responsibilities and costs of (a) our Region, (b) Town of Milton, and (c) the residents?
- The posted EA proposal indicates that it "will provide additional opportunity to assess potential impacts to the environment, including local groundwater, and ensure that local concerns are considered and effects can be mitigated or managed." What is the difference between this and the JART, which simply seems to be an effort to assist JDCL to document mitigations so that the quarry application can be approved? Who decides what level of mitigation and management is ultimately effective and safe?
- How does the JART process fit into the EA process? Will the public be required to resubmit its concerns that are to be addressed by the proponent?
- The regulation was developed to provide a project specific environmental assessment process which is to allow for additional opportunities for further public consultation and studies. Is James Dick responsible for these consultations and additional studies? Will the local community have to cover the costs of their own additional studies to counter James Dick's studies? At this point is the Town of Milton required to hire it's own consultants for these additional studies?

Traffic

- on Guelph line, with gravel trucks from the Rockwood pit using this route going south to Derry Road. Derry Road also has considerable traffic from the pit located west of Walkers line. There is another problem for Campbellville residents. We have a railroad crossing in the middle of the village. Picturing the fiasco that would ensue with a train hold up of traffic being tied up at Reid sideroad, a fire call.and an accident on the 401

and all the traffic trying to get off - where could these gravel trucks possibly fit into the picture? Twiss road would be the only choice but said train would also have the same train blocking it at that crossing. I am no expert but common sense prevails. Hopefully the myriad problems this pit would cause with traffic alone should not be allowed to go forward.

- Will the Environmental Assessment include in its study the issue of truck travel beyond the quarry gates to main routes, such as the 401, 403, etc.?
- If, against a community's wishes, a Quarry is allowed to operate in Campbellville, who is going to monitor and control the large number of loud, polluting and dangerous large trucks that run through our community on a daily basis?

Campbellville and Guelph Line have become very crowded and busy with traffic in the last few years. Large trucks barrel through on a daily basis. Guelph Line has become a major connection to the 401 for many shipping lines. It's not acceptable to allow more and more large trucks to run over the community.

This is not the place for a Quarry.

Miscellaneous

- With a number of environmental assessments being done evaluating the impact of various projects around Milton (the quarry & the CN Intermodal in particular) has anyone looked into the cumulative environmental impact? It's one thing for the federal government to state that the Intermodal will have an "acceptable" level of impact on air quality, but has the provincial body taken that already heightened level into consideration when accessing the additional stress that the proposed quarry will add?
- Why is the provincial government overriding environmental protections, regulations and processes however they see fit? (Provincial government's track record speaks for itself.)
- Why is the provincial government even allowing J "Dick" CL to reactivate the former Woodlawn Guelph Campbellville Pit that had its licence revoked by the MNRF in 2008 ?
- what are the plans for Fire Station No. 2 as far as traffic is concerned? Reid SR is only a 2-lane road. As trucks block the west-bound lane sitting in a queue heading into the quarry and block the east-bound lane sitting in a queue heading to the Hwy. 401 ramp, how are the EMS vehicles going to get out if there is an emergency. There is not enough space between east and west lanes to accommodate a fire truck. So what is the plan?
- Risk is inherent in a property vacated for so many years. Hundreds of people regularly access the property (primarily from First Line railway tracks) for swimming and other activities: what actions has the owner taken to prevent this illegal access? And given the failure of same, what procedures will be put in place for more effective monitoring and prevention to ensure the safety of all if the pit is re-opened? We don't want another death there.

ARA Policy Questions

- We have learned over the past two years how one sided the aggregate act is, placing undue burdens on local communities who have little hope of protecting themselves under this process. If the process is not corrupt, it is so one sided and non-transparent that is impossible to believe in the process being fair. Communities are isolated and while the aggregate act is the problem, each individual community is fighting the effects of that problem in isolation. Over and above his support for an EA, will Parm push the Conservative government to undertake a public review of the aggregate act with an eye to better managing the industry and protecting communities?
- I would like to see Minister Parm Gill to further challenge the MNR to change the industry. This industry operates with a one-hundred-year-old business platform of operating “close to market”, that is no longer viable. The government can eliminate all the challenges by forcing the industry to create a less competitive environment with a proper supply chain management system. After all Governments in this province are the largest users of aggregate (roads, schools and hospitals to name a few).

Major Reports, Public Engagement and Review Schedule for EA

