

Skelton Brumwell

& ASSOCIATES INC.

93 BELL FARM ROAD
SUITE 107
BARRIE ONTARIO
L4M 5G1

TELEPHONE:
(705) 726-1141

FAX:
(705) 726-0331

email mail@skeltonbrumwell.ca

**CONSULTING
ENGINEERS
AND
PLANNERS**

To: Miller Braeside Quarry
Tom Jones

Date: January 3, 2007
Revised January 24, 2007

From: Trudy Paterson, RPP
Gary Bell, RPP

Subject: Pre-Application - Municipal
and MNR Meeting
Miller Braeside Quarry
P/N 05-2033

Minutes of a pre-application consultation meeting held at 1:30 pm, December 12, 2006 at the Quality Inn, Arnprior.

Please advise of any errors or omissions as soon as possible.

Item

Purpose: Pre-application meeting review with MNR, Municipal and County staff on the direction of the studies, preliminary findings and discussion to work toward the a complete application meeting staff requirements. *regulatory / agency requirements?*

for purpose of discussion of "completeness of inventories + supporting info"

1. Introductions

Everyone introduced themselves and their role in the project or process:

- Tom Jones - Property Manager Miller Paving Limited - responsible for this application
- Keltie Milloy - MNR Aggregate Resources Officer
- Daryl Coulson - MNR ~~Biologist~~ *Ecologist*
- Joanna Gaweda - MNR District Planner
- Paul Moreau - MNR Acting Supervisor
- Elmer Raycroft- Deputy Mayor Township of McNab/Braeside
- Noreen Mellema - CAO/Clerk Township of McNab/Braeside
- Charles Cheesman- County of Renfrew Planning on behalf of Jim Hutton, Director *(also Township Planner)*
- Jennifer Gorrell - Hydrogeologist Gorrell Resource Investigations - responsible for Hydrogeology Report
- Hugh and Suzanne Williamson - Hugh Williamson Associates Inc. - responsible for Noise Impact Report
- Moose Morin - Explotech Engineering - responsible for Blast Design and Report
- Dan Brunton - Brunton Consulting Services - responsible for alvar study
- Gary Bell - Skelton, Brumwell & Associates Inc. (SBA) Principal - responsible for municipal planning
- Trudy Paterson - SBA - Project Coordinator, responsible for Site Plan preparation and Licence Application
- Kyle Fleming - SBA - Environmental Planner/Biologist - responsible for Natural Environment Reports



TO: <i>ATG</i>	TO: <i>GLB / RP</i>	TO:	TO:
INITIAL:	INITIAL: <i>[Signature]</i>	INITIAL:	INITIAL:

This was not discussed during real session

are there issues with the current haulage route?

Item

2. Applicant's Objective - Tom

Miller Paving's objective is to utilize the property, outside the existing quarry for a future quarry within the constraints of the studies. No change to tonnage or haul route are proposed. The haul route will be formally identified. Accessory uses including an office/maintenance facility, and permanent asphalt and concrete plants are also required.

3. Municipal Planning - Gary

No applications are proposed for the existing quarry. The only accessory uses of that site will be those permitted by zoning.

An Official Plan Amendment (OPA) is required to add a permanent asphalt plant on the property as there is need and market demand for a commercial plant.

A Zoning By-law Amendment (ZBA) is required to rezone the lands to be licenced from Extractive Industrial Reserve to the Extractive Industrial zone and to include the permanent asphalt plant as a permitted use. A portable asphalt plant for public projects is permitted.

Paul asked how will MOE C of A be handled. Gary replied that work will be done prior to licencing, however the actual C of A will follow licencing.

Paul stated that the sooner MOE is involved the better. Gary responded that he agreed that MOE contacts should be involved in pre-application as soon as possible and requested County assistance with contacts, etc..

→ worthwhile to follow up on this.

56 ① Keltie explained that all asphalt plants have a C of A, which will need to be amended to make it a permanent plant. In most cases this is not done until after the zoning and licence approval. Gary noted that Miller Paving will submit all studies to MOE and ask for their comment regarding feasibility of the C of A.

as it Tom added that Miller could opt to put in a new plant that will not have a travelling C of A, and that the C of A will not be finalized until the plant is in place and has been tested. There is no difference between portable and permanent plant. The plant on this site will likely going to be operated intermittently only as the market will not support continuous operation. *as per market demand*

Paul indicated that is the applicant's responsibility to ensure circulation /involvement of MOE, and suggested that Brad Eckhard in Ottawa office would be a good contact.

Tom noted that C of A's for asphalt plants are handled through the Toronto MOE office.

4. Overview of Preliminary Site Plan

Trudy provided an outline of the Site Plan and intended operations. Phasing and limits were described. End use will include rehabilitated slopes and a pond that will fill with precipitation and small amount groundwater.



TO:	TO:	TO:	TO:
INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:

Item

② 36.

Deputy Mayor Raycroft asked if the site would be fenced for security. Trudy responded that the site will remain private property and fences will be in place. Keltie noted that benches are usually required close to the pond edges at the bottom of the rehabilitated slopes. She suggested showing a detail for fencing and standards for slopes along the pond edge. Trudy responded that we have already shown a preliminary representation of the slope rehabilitation, but have more work to do in that regard (and fencing)

5. Overview of Natural Environment Studies

Kyle gave overview of study area, the site and 120 metres around the site, and field work. The features identified include Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) on and adjacent to the Locally Significant Wetland (LSW) on and near the site, and downstream cold water fish habitat.

Potential impacts include loss of SWH, loss of drainage to the wetland, and sedimentation and temperature change of drainage to downstream fisheries. Proposed mitigation includes protection of significant portion of SWH, and drainage area for the wetland, plus sedimentation control and quality control of discharge to watercourses. This

Dan advised that the SWH is an alvar with large populations of globally provincially rare (respectively) indicator species - Ram's Head Orchid and Cooper's Milk Vetch. Our protection objective of no net loss of natural heritage satisfies or exceeds the natural heritage protection test in the Provincial Policy Statement. The significant natural environmental features and functions of the SWH do not depend on what happens on adjacent lands, are not dependant on groundwater, and are remarkably tolerant of adjacent disturbances. A large area is not required to maintain the features and values. Dan described the area he recommended as a Significant Wildlife Protection Area. The area specified more than satisfies the PPS test and in natural heritage terms is defensible.

③*

Alvar is globally sign community, this community is locally sign

this should come out I did not hear this.

Paul asked if the indicator species are Species at Risk Act (SARA) designated Threatened or Endangered. Dan confirmed that they are not. ④

Keltie asked about the area to the east, what will happen to it? Dan/Gary responded that the existing subdivision dedicated the lands to the Township. They were cleared in the past. Noreen confirmed that the dedication was to maintain a buffer between the subdivision and the quarry.

Uncertain if before or after dedication.

Keltie asked if the adjacent area to the southeast (towards Braeside) was studied to determine if there any other similar features in the vicinity that should also be protected. Dan responded that while he has studied other areas in the general vicinity, he has not studied the adjacent lands in detail.

Keltie suggested that the alvar area that is to be extracted be used for collection of seed of significant species for rehabilitation etc. Dan agreed with that and suggested that the site also presents fantastic research opportunities. → this suggestion should be part of mitigation package / aspect of E.I. or Natural Heritage Report(s).

Paul asked what is the percentage of the populations of significant plants that will be lost. Dan stated that approximately 50% will be lost.



TO:	TO:	TO:	TO:
INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:

Current zoning specifies > 300m influence area / separation or dist. req't

Item

6. Planning - Gary

The site is designated Mineral Aggregate and zoned ~~Extractive Industrial Reserve~~ ^{Existing} for a potential quarry use. The Site Plan respects the 300 metre setback from residences now in the Extractive Industrial zone. The planning influences are shown on the Planning Factors drawing and in composite on the Development Influences drawing. The Township, County and MNR have a copy of these drawings for internal reference.

7. Hydrogeology - Jennifer

Jennifer has been involved in hydrogeological study of the existing quarry because of revision to its Site Plan. Her work has been extended into the new expansion area. So far the results are comparable to the existing quarry which has a quarry floor of 125 masl and a static ground water elevation above that. This means that extraction will occur below the static water elevation but above the lower water bearing formation level.

② The upper aquifer is not contained and some wells using this aquifer have bacteriological contamination. The lower aquifer is more reliable and more secure. A door to door survey has been completed for wells within 500 m of the area to be licenced.

There is a Permit to Take Water (PTTW) for pumping the stormwater from the existing quarry that is good for 10 years. Work on the Certificate of Approval (C of A) for discharge is still in process with comments from MOE expected soon.

The Regional Groundwater Study identifies the area as a recharge area. This needs to be addressed in detail. However, the discharge from the quarry is to maintain existing drainage patterns, and the final rehabilitation will enhance recharge.

always a sign recharge area for Twp.
Not receiving the flow basin.

rad. impact (not)

Deputy Mayor Raycroft asked for confirmation the current discharge is of surface water only. Jennifer responded that this was correct.

Deputy Mayor Raycroft asked how far below the watertable will the quarry go. Jennifer explained that the upper 3 - 5 metres is weathered limestone. Precipitation flows through the crevices of the weathered rock so it is not truly ground water. The existing and proposed quarry will extract limestone this level. ??

within this upper level?

She explained that the lower aquifer is a layer of water in the competent (tight) rock that is under pressure. The ground water can only rise due to that pressure if a well is drilled into it. Her recommendation is to stay 5 metres (125 masl) above the water bearing formation to protect neighbouring wells and to avoid having to deal with the groundwater in quarry which is an operational problem to be avoided. Thus the quarry will not extract below the elevation of the water bearing formation but it will be extracting below the static level of the lower water table.

these terms are not being used consistently

The 5 metres is recommended to avoid "pop ups" which can occur where there is a combination of tectonic forces and water under pressure. The worst case Jennifer is aware of occurred when there was 4m of material

the quarry floor = 125m



TO:	TO:	TO:	TO:
INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:

Item

over the water table and a fault line through it. This effected local wells temporarily. There are no similar tectonic forces known in this area, and pop ups are not expected but have been considered by maintaining the 5m separation.

MOE is completely aware of the site and the application as residents have been very pro-active in involving MOE.

Keltie asked if quarrying will cause redirection of the flow ^{*6} away from the neighbouring wells toward the quarry. Jennifer responded that she we will assess the potential impact on the local wells including a calculation of the impact on wells at full extraction before the pumps are turned off.

Gary asked Noreen or Charles to check their files for any hydrogeological study for the Sullivan Subdivision development, as well as any comments or draft plan conditions, and provide copies to us of any relevant information.

Noreen asked if the residents have been advised of the condition of their wells. Jennifer replied that she has told all of the well owners where there are problems.

Jennifer indicated the location of the monitoring wells on the Site Plan at Tom's request. ⁷

Keltie asked if there are static levels for all wells. Jennifer replied yes.

8. Noise - Hugh

Hugh noted that the criteria that will apply are those that are used for C of A for the equipment. Their process is to identify sources and receptors, define the Class of receptor which dictates the allowable noise limits, modelling, and to design mitigation (stockpiles, lift faces) to keep noise impacts within MOE guidelines.

The main noise sources will be the crusher, rock drilling, asphalt plant, cement plant, trucks, loading. The receptors are all residences. ⁸

Joanna asked if the modelling takes in to account that vegetation on adjacent properties may be cleared. Hugh responded that vegetation not the most effective mitigation of noise, and that the MOE method does not allow inclusion of barriers and vegetation absorption.

Hugh will be reviewing traffic volume and obtaining background noise measurements on site.

Gary asked MNR if there been MOE review of noise studies on circulation of any applications. Keltie responded that MOE will only comment on hydrogeology.

Paul asked if the municipality will undertake peer review. Gary noted that it is his understanding that the municipality will look to County for technical review including peer review if necessary. The municipality and the County will review the need for peer review.

yes.

Regarding noise impacts



TO:	TO:	TO:	TO:
INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:

Item

Keltie noted that municipal Council could request an MOE review.

9. Blasting - Moose

Moose advised that they will use MOE guidelines and Explotech's own extensive monitoring information. He will recommend that the extraction proceed toward the receptors as it is the over pressure, the impact in front of the blast, causes the greatest concern. The Separation distances proposed are adequate to control blast impact. On-going monitoring will allow for modification of blast design as the extraction proceeds. (9)

300m is adequate

via site plan amendment? now

Tom advised that Miller Paving dealt with the complaints on foundation cracking due to the "bad blast" in September 2005 noting that miller did not cause the cracks. Township has copies of the sign off letters. The problem with one well was also dealt with under Jennifer's review.

Moose indicated that while there cannot be a guarantee that there will not be noise and vibration observed, operations on this site should be able to meet MOE guidelines.

in Moose's opinion these are "liberal guidelines"

?) Keltie there are criteria in some areas of the people that have to be notified before a blast. Moose said he has projects where there are requirements for this notification. *can this be done here? I don't recall a commitment*

Tom reiterated that Moose is not the blasting contractor, but the blasting consultant.

Paul asked Moose to address the matter of the 5 metres from the water bearing formation relative to blasting. Moose noted that the location of the holes are calculated from the face to give the desired result. Limestone does not require the holes to be far below the area that is to be blasted. The effect of the blast into limestone is limited to 3 - 4 feet below the blast. Moose will recommend the charge rates. Monitoring will ensure that the impact of the blasts remain within MOE guidelines.

Keltie asked if the study will recommend when monitoring should occur? Tom advised that Miller monitors all of the blasts, as does the drilling blasting contractor.

Keltie asked that Moose' report include a recommendation that blast monitoring to be made available to MNR and that the recommendation be identified on the Site Plan.

Gary noted that SBA will work very carefully to ensure that all of the report recommendations are appropriately implemented through the Site Plan.

10. General Discussion

Gary asked the MNR and Municipal representatives for their comments as to whether they agreed with the direction being taken with the studies and the proposed quarry application, and if there were any matters to be addressed in the applications that we had not identified.

Daryl said that in general the direction on natural environment is appropriate. He will also seek direction



TO:	TO:	TO:	TO:
INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:

Item

(10) internally relative to PPS, however the two primary features have been addressed. *SWH + End / The app appear to be addressed.*

Paul and Joanna advised that MNR will discuss comments on the ARA and/or OPA application. There was further discussion about the whole process. (11) (12)

Charles indicated that he needs to review with the municipality the process regarding comments, and to discuss matters with Jim Hutton who will be handling the application for the County. *circulation to agencies (ie. OPA)*

Noreen asked if there will be a traffic study. Deputy Mayor Raycroft indicated that he is concerned about the volume of traffic. Gary responded that the traffic will be studied and the haul routes identified. While the tonnage limit of the quarry will not increased, there will be changes in traffic because, for instance, aggregate that is now shipped to two asphalt plants, will be utilized on site. The net change will be assessed. *ie) may circulate to MNR for techn. advice.* *Con behalf of County*

Noreen asked when will the application be submitted. Gary replied that there is still lots of work to do, and that the objective is to present complete applications. However, Tom wants it submitted as soon as possible. Gary outlined a process leading to possible submission of the application by March 2007.

Deputy Mayor Raycroft and Noreen indicated that they did not see any gaps in the study process.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm with thanks all around.

[Signature]
TTP/GKB/tpp

cc. All attendees by e-mail



TO:	TO:	TO:	TO:
INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL:	INITIAL: