

Meeting Minutes

Event:	Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Paris Pit CAP # 7 PTTW
Date & Time:	Tuesday, April 30, 2013 7:00 - 9:00 PM
Place:	Paris Golf Country Club, River House
Chair:	Joanne Kearney, Facilitator
Participants:	Robb Edwards, Neighbour Elizabeth Norris, Neighbour Shirley Simons, Councilor Alex Faux, Neighbour Murray Powell, Councilor Marilyn Sewell, Neighbour Jake Vandenburg, Neighbour Fred Natolochny, Grand River Conservation Authority Bill Galloway, Dufferin Aggregates Kevin Mitchell, Dufferin Aggregates Richard Murphy, Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA) Gary Lagos, Conestoga-Rover & Associates (CRA)
Guests:	Nishat Ahmed, Dufferin Aggregates
Minutes:	Courtney Somers, Facilitator
Regrets:	Steve Schmitt, Councillor Michael H Fox, Neighbour Gary Strauss, Neighbour Dale Lukas, Neighbour Cyril Parsons, Neighbour Bill Telfer, Neighbour John McAllister, Neighbour Jeff Broomfield, CCOB member and neighbor Ross Moore, Neighbour

Minutes

Joanne Kearney brought the meeting to order and welcomed the CAP. Joanne introduced Nishat Ahmed from Holcim Canada who sat in on the CAP meeting.

The CAP took a few minutes to review the minutes from the Feb. 26th CAP meeting and approved the minutes.



Update: Paris Pit PTTW Application

- Kevin Mitchell explained that the Permit To Take Water (PTTW) application has been submitted and is open for comment on the EBR until June 18th
- Kevin Mitchell explained that the public is able to comment on the application. If the CAP has any issues submitting a comment they can forward it onto Kevin Mitchell or Courtney Somers and they will ensure the comment gets submitted

Site Plan Notes

Kevin Mitchell explained that Dufferin Aggregates worked with MNR and MOE to add two new notes to the Paris Pit Site Plan to address concerns from the community regarding below water extraction. MNR has approved the site plans with the new notes.

NOTE 1:

"Extraction below the water table for the source water pond for the washing of aggregate products will not occur until the Ministry of the Environment has issued a Permit to Take Water for the purpose of aggregate washing."

Prior to commencing below water table extraction in Phase 8, the licensee shall submit for review and approval to both the District Manager, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Permit to Take Water Director, Ministry of the Environment, a comprehensive hydrogeological assessment that has been completed to the same criteria specified in the Provincial Standards under the Aggregate Resources Act, as may be amended from time to time."

NOTE 2:

"Prior to conducting any below water table gravel extraction operation (excluding the source water pond), the licensee shall conduct groundwater monitoring for both water levels and water quality as established in an updated Groundwater Monitoring Program which has been pre-approved by the Ministry of the Environment under the Aggregate Resources Act Licence and the Permit to Take Water, for the purpose of assessing possible effects of the operation on groundwater."

The results of the Groundwater Monitoring Program and the Annual Permit to Take Water Report (required by the PTTW Permit) shall be combined and submitted annually to the both the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Ministry of the Environment as the Combined Annual Monitoring and PTTW Report. A copy of the Annual Combined Groundwater Monitoring Report shall be sent to both the District Manager, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Permit to Take Water Director, Ministry of the Environment by March 31st of each year following start up of the operation for their individual review and approval."

Kevin Mitchell explained that Dufferin Aggregates has updated its Site Plan and will no longer be extracting within Wellhead Protection Area A. Kevin Mitchell explained that the area has been removed from the limit of extraction and will be converted from agriculture to a natural area.

Question One: How do the notes differ from what is required of Dufferin Aggregates today?

- Kevin Mitchell explained that prior to the addition of these notes, Dufferin Aggregates was not required to do a study prior to below water extraction for the source pond or Phase 8 below water extraction..
- Kevin Mitchell explained that these new notes now bind Dufferin Aggregates by law to get a PTTW before excavating the source pond and to do a study and submit it to the MNR and MOE for approval, before extraction below the water table.
- Furthermore, Dufferin will no longer be allowed to extract within the WHPA-A for the Telfer wellfield whereas the past approvals allowed above water table extraction in this area.

Question Two: How does this differ from the requirements for the PTTW?

- Richard Murphy responded that the PTTW application specifically deals with the source water pond on the property.
- Kevin Mitchell explained that, for instance, the first new note (Note 1) outlines that Dufferin Aggregates cannot extract the source pond below the water table unless a PTTW is issued and cannot extract below the water table in phase 8 until a report done to the standard of the day is submitted and approved by both MNR and MOE.

Question Three: Is it only in Phase 8 that below water extraction will occur?

- Kevin Mitchell responded yes, below water table extraction will only occur in Phase 8.

Bill Galloway explained that if the Paris Site were a dry pit Dufferin Aggregates would not need the PTTW but because water is required for washing of the materials, the PTTW is required.

PTTW Application

Joanne Kearney introduced Richard Murphy, Dufferin Aggregates consulting hydrogeologist, from Conestoga-Rovers & Associates (CRA).

Richard Murphy explained he would be reviewing the hydrogeological characterization of the Paris Pit and Dufferin Aggregates' PTTW application.

Richard Murphy explained that Paris is underlain by outwash deposits that are an important source of aggregate and municipal water supply. The grey area is the outwash sand and gravel deposit.

Richard Murphy outlined the surficial geology and water in Paris. The orange is the outwash deposits where water can permeate – not a lot of runoff or creeks and wetlands at ground surface. He explained that where they are present, is commonly where the groundwater is at the ground surface.

Richard Murphy explained that there have been significant investigations going back to 1974 to look into water quantity and quality in Paris. He provides a timeline of the monitoring:

- 1974: Paris Pit Studies
- 1970s-1990s: Municipal Supply Investigations and ongoing monitoring
- 1988/90: Paris Pit additional investigations and installation of monitoring wells

- 1988 to present: Ongoing monitoring of levels and quality
- 2012: PTTW additional investigations

All the dots on the map are test pits, boreholes or monitoring wells that are monitoring the water below the ground. There are over 100 locations that these test have taken place.

Richard Murphy explained the cross section (Slide 11) and shows that where the Pit is located. The image shows that sand and gravel is below the ground water table where Dufferin Aggregates is licensed to extract. The line of the water table (blue and white) is where the ground is saturated. Richard Murphy explained that the brown shades are the till units – tight units where water has issues flowing through.

Richard Murphy explained where the monitoring wells are located (black lines running vertically on image on slide 11).

Richard explained that ground water in this area of Paris flows southeast. The ground water lines (slide 12) show that ground water is moving down the water table surface (down). Richard Murphy pointed out the area where the water taking will take place, southwest of the pond. Water in this area is moving past Gilbert Creek and to the corner of the site.

Richard Murphy explained that in addition to the information the County and Dufferin Aggregates collected, additional information was compiled for the PTTW application. The work was done last summer (2012), and CRA came on to the site to determine where the bottom of the aquifer was and determine how much aquifer depth there was in the area. CRA also looked at the ground water flow and the existing on-site pond to confirm if they are connected. Richard Murphy explained that to conduct the investigation, 6 boreholes were drilled and 2 monitoring wells were installed (red dots).

Richard Murphy explained that this information was added to the cross section (slide 15). He explained that the aquifer is indeed in that area and is about 5-7 metres thick. Richard Murphy explained that the investigations confirmed that sand and gravel extends into the area of the pond and that ground water levels lined up which confirms a connection between groundwater and the on-site pond.

Richard explained that the groundwater elevations were confirmed. The additional investigations confirmed that groundwater is flowing southwest to the Grand River.

Richard outlined the water level variations (slide 17). Each dot indicates when the water level was taken and the graph shows that there is no trend but that there are seasonal elevations; recharge in the spring when the water levels rise and dry conditions in the summer when the groundwater level drops. The chart concludes that ground level variations vary by about 2 metres each season.

Question One: When you dig, how far will you be above the ground water?

- Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates has to be at least 1 metre above the highest level of groundwater. The historical data shows the highest level and Dufferin Aggregates must ensure that there is at least 1 metre of untouched space above that.

Question Two: What if the water level rises?

- Kevin Mitchell explained that Dufferin Aggregates is working off 25 years of data and the data shows where the water table will be. Kevin Mitchell explained that other aggregate companies do not have this much information to work off of.
- Kevin Mitchell explained that the data shows the elevations across the site and Dufferin Aggregates is able to ensure, from this data, that they stay 1 metre above.

Richard Murphy outlined the existing on-site ponds (slide 18). Richard Murphy explained that water levels fluctuate in the ponds but that because of the nature of the pond, there are smaller seasonal variations. The photos show that the water level naturally moves up and down.

Private water supply wells

Richard Murphy explained the surveys done around the Paris Pit site (Paris Plains Road to Golf Links Road). Surveys were done in 1974 and 1988 to determine and what kind of wells they are; domestic use or farm use.

Richard Murphy explained that there are major irrigation (and backup) wells on the golf course with a PTTW limit of 2,270 L/m. He also explained that municipal water is available on Golf Links Roads but Dufferin Aggregates is unsure if/which private wells may still be in use. Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates will conduct another private well survey to be updated prior to any water taking (subject to access). The survey will include:

- Inspection
- Record of water use and conditions
- Water level measurement (subject to well construction)
- Water quality sample

Paris “North” Municipal Water Supply

Richard Murphy explained that there are several wellfields in the Paris north area, which is the primary source of water for Paris. The Gilbert Wellfield is along Gilbert Creek and explained that the water is flowing in the southeast direction and the pink line indicates the capture zone (direction of flow). Richard Murphy explained that the Telfer Wellfield is the backup water supply for the County and its capture zone goes up to northwest.

Richard Murphy explained that the water supply in Paris is sufficient for Paris subject to existing water quality issues.

Richard Murphy provides details on how much water the County is using (water taking):

- +/- 3,500 L/min with a PTTW limit of 11,280 L/min

Richard Murphy explained that under the Source Water Protection (SWP) studies completed for the Grand River Source Protection Area, it was concluded there is a low risk of water quantity stress. Richard Murphy outlined that the study considered:

- Current demand – based on actual pumping rates
- Future demand – based on projected 2031 population
- Drought scenario

Richard Murphy explained the current water supply capacity in the County is limited by current water quality concerns. Considerations include:

- Nitrates: agricultural activities (fertilizers, livestock), septic system
- Sodium and chloride (Gilbert Wellfield only): road salt application
- Sulphate and iron: naturally occurring from bedrock
- Hardness: naturally occurring

Richard Murphy explained that these are considerations the County is monitoring and working to ensure levels stay below the water drinking criteria.

Richard Murphy explained the WHPA and capture zones areas. He outlined that under the SWP programs, they have been able to identify the capture zones (pink lines). The pink lines are areas where precipitation falls on the ground and infiltrates down into the ground area and flows to the well.

Richard Murphy explained that water outside of the capture zones travel in a southeast direction and discharges to the Grand River. These capture zones represent the current pumping conditions for the water supply in Paris.

Richard Murphy explained that SWP Programs have conservatively established WHPAs based on potential capture zones for projected future flows. Richard Murphy explained that the SWP Programs are based on 2 ½ times the current flow plus additional safety factors.

Richard Murphy explained that there are 4 different categories of WHPAs:

1. WHPA A: 100 metre radius around production wells. This is the most protected area and has the highest set of precautions set out by the MOE.
2. Yellow Line – 2 year capture zone. This is an area where water can flow to the pumping one within a 2 year time-frame.
3. Blue Line – 5 year capture zone
4. Dark Blue Line – 25 year capture zone. Any water that could eventually get pumped and flows to the wellfield.

Richard Murphy explained that the area in the middle of the image (slide 23) is an area that has water that will never end up in either wellfield, which is why this area was chosen for the PTTW activities.

Potential Influences on Groundwater Flow – Extraction

Richard Murphy explained that the Paris Pit is primarily an above water extraction site. Dufferin Aggregates will not be lowering the groundwater levels or pumping them down.

Richard Murphy explained that when the limited extraction below the water table is done to create the source water pond, water will naturally replace that aggregate that has been removed to create the pond. This is a one-time excavation for the pond.

Richard Murphy explained that water levels in the pond are managed by limiting the amount of material that is removed. Limiting the rate the material is removed and seasonal timing ensure that the water level does not decrease.

Potential Influences on Groundwater Flow – Washing

Richard Murphy explained that another potential influence on groundwater flow is aggregate washing. Aggregate products used in concrete and asphalt is required to be washed to remove the naturally occurring fine sand, silt and clay.

Richard Murphy explained that washing will be done a lot at the Paris Pit but that the actual consumption of water is very small because it is re-circulated.

Paris Pit Permit To Take Water (PTTW) Application

Richard Murphy explained that a PTTW application is an assortment of documented materials, studies and an actual application form for the permit, which all get submitted to the MOE for review.

Richard Murphy explained that the actual PTTW application is to 'take water' (MOE term for pumping water) and is used for aggregate washing and dust control on the site. The work for the PTTW is located outside of the WHPA D. This is a more stringent requirement than the proposed SWP requirements. The protection plan has been submitted to the MOE for review but has not yet been approved.

Richard Murphy reviewed the map on slide 27, explaining that the source pond and settling will both be located outside of WHPA D.

Question Three: The settling pond is above the water table, correct?

- Richard Murphy responded that yes, the settling pond is above the water table.

Richard Murphy walked the CAP through the closed-loop image (slide 28) and explained that washing on the site will be a closed loop system.

Question Four: Will the settling pond be lined?

- Richard Murphy responded no, the pond will not be lined. The pond will silt itself up rather quickly with the settling of fines so that will reduce the rate that water can leak out of the bottom of the pond.

Richard Murphy explained the source pond is excavated down to the base of the aquifer, which is done slowly to ensure the water level does not change. A water metre is used to measure the water level. The water is used in the wash plant and it comes back to settling pond and the fines will settle out (silt, clay, etc). The water from the settling pond will over flow into the source pond. This is what creates a closed loop system.

Question Five: Are the water meters used to measure how much water you are taking as opposed to putting back in?

- Richard Murphy explained the water meter is used to keep a record of how much water has been taken. The MOE will have a limit on that water-taking amount.
- Richard Murphy went onto explain that based on the measurements, Dufferin Aggregates can calculate how much water is lost as a result of the washing. Some is shipped off site as moisture in the aggregate products, some drains from the product stockpile into the ground and some is lost to evaporation

Richard explained that 'water taking' is the maximum pumping circulation rate. The rate that has been applied for this application is 18,185 litres per minute, based on 12 hours per day.

Analysis was complete for the application under two scenarios:

- 5 days/week and 70 days/year
- Maximum 6 days/week and 200 days /year

Richard Murphy explained the MOE sets the maximums on water taking and that no more water than that maximum can be taken. The MOE will also set how many hours/minutes a day water can be pumped at that rate and how many days per year/week. The consumptive use is less than the water 'taking', rather the loss of water is about 100 times less than the water 'taking' limit: only taking 160 L/minute compared to over 18,000 L/minute.

Richard Murphy explained that of that 160 L/minute, it is broken up with the following uses:

- Water retention on washed aggregate: 133 L/min
- Dust suppression: 7 L/min
- Increased evaporation over pond area: 19 L/min

Richard Murphy provided an analogy to better explain the water 'taking':

- The water taking or pumping from the source pond is like a pump in a pool – recirculating
- Water retention is the water that evaporates off of you when you leave the pool
- Dust suppression is the water that is splashed onto the outside of the pool
- Evaporation is like any water naturally evaporating (being removed to the air) from a pool

Assessment of Potential Groundwater Impacts

Richard Murphy explained that CRA looked into the potential impact on groundwater from the water taking. They looked at 3 scenarios to evaluate this potential impact:

1. Experience demonstrates aggregate extraction operations, including wash ponds, have limited potential to influence groundwater systems

2. Calculated potential groundwater drawdown and change in existing pond elevation using a groundwater flow model – several scenarios considered
3. Checked model results (zone of influence) by evaluating and comparing the observed influence of municipal pumping on surrounding groundwater levels

Scenario 1 – Influence of Source Pond

Richard explained the results from the groundwater modelling analysis. He explained that they looked at the influence of creating the source pond within the aquifer. He explained that this shows that the up gradient side is showing draw down and the down gradient side is showing mounding (groundwater is higher). The image shows that there is a drop in the existing pond level of about 15cm/6 inches.

Scenario 4A – Influence of full water taking with recirculation for 72 days

Richard Murphy explained that this scenario used a 72-day period. This analysis shows the full rate of pumping and recognizes that when the water goes through the wash plant, some will leave the site on the aggregate or used for dust control. Richard Murphy explained that the remaining water is put back into the settling pond. The CRA calculated how much water is going to infiltrate through the bottom of the settling pond and the remainder of the water will come back to the source water pond. This study also represents the natural evaporation that will occur. The analysis shows that the existing pond depth changes by +3cm (recharge) to -1cm (varies seasonally) and around the source pond there is 20cm of drawdown. These changes are relative or incremental to the changes from Scenario 1.

Question Six: In scenario one you said the pond level would reduce by 15 cm, is that the new permanent height of the pond on site or will it fluctuate? In the process of creating the wash pond, the level of the pond is dropping?

- Richard Murphy explained that the pond will continue to naturally fluctuate but there is a net reduction of 15 cm.

Scenario 4B – Influence of full water taking with recirculation for 204 days

Richard Murphy explained that scenario 4B shows drawdown further from the source water pond. Richard Murphy explained that the existing pond is changing in height by +3 to -3 cm. +3 to -3 cm change.

Summary: Assessment of Potential Groundwater Impacts

Richard Murphy explained that other studies were included, in addition to the ones shown here, which all showed an influence of less than 30 cm at the existing pond. Richard Murphy provided an overview of the study findings, including municipal pumping:

- Potential groundwater drawdown and change in existing pond elevation using a groundwater flow model:
 - Drawdown of 20 cm ($\pm 10\%$ of seasonal variation) was limited to less than 350m of Source Pond under worst-case (200 days operation)

- Drawdown was less than 24 cm in existing pond under all scenarios (<30 cm in sensitivity analysis)
- Model results (zone of influence) are consistent with observed influence of municipal pumping on surrounding groundwater levels:
 - Observed influence was limited to local area of supply wells
 - No influence of Gilbert wellfield at boundary with Paris Pit (400+ metres)
 - Little, if any, influence was identified at a distance of 230m from the Telfer Wellfield

Richard also outlined Stantec's research finding that were done as part of the County's annual report and their findings came to the same conclusion:

"Despite this localized impact on water levels immediately adjacent to the production wells, no long-term decline in water level in the overburden are noted at any well, indicating that the withdrawal of water is being balanced by recharge over the course of the year." Stantec, February 2013.

Richard Murphy explained that relative to the municipal supply, there is no impact:

- Gilbert Wellfield: 550 metres upgradient/cross-gradient
- Telfer Wellfield: 1700 metres cross-gradient

Richard Murphy explained that there is no impact on the private water supply wells as they are primarily upgradient and none are located within 350 metres of the wash pond.

Question Seven: When you say that there is no impact on the wells because they are upgradient, you mean because they located at a higher elevation than the Dufferin pond, correct?

- Richard Murphy responded yes, these wells are located up on Watts Pond Road and we are not aware of any other wells in use from previous domestic surveys, but that is something that we would be checking as we move towards the PTTW.

Richard Murphy explained the ecological features of the Site as evaluated by MMM Group. The findings to date:

- No species at risk (SAR) observed
- No fish present in pond
 - *"Overall, potential water level drawdown... are not anticipated to adversely impact the form, function and productive capacity of the aquatic habitat present."* MMM Group, March 2013

Water Quality

Richard Murphy explained that as part of the PTTW the MOE would review quality aspects and the current conclusion of analysis when looking at quality, showed that Dufferin Aggregates will not have an impact on the water quality for municipal and ecological use. Richard Murphy explained that the operation will not include any provincially significant drinking water threats:

- No prescribed threat activities are planned within the WHPA

- Water taking/aggregate washing operations are located outside the WHPA (potential future capture zones)
- Aggregate operations will not contribute to existing water supply quality issue with nitrate or other concerns (e.g. sulphate, salt, iron)

Richard Murphy explained there is no evidence of atrazine based on monitoring results at Dufferin Aggregates wells and the County water supply.

Richard Murphy explained that atrazine is a herbicide used for corn production and its use is in dramatic decline. Dufferin Aggregates has seen no evidence that atrazine is an issue on site and has not been used on the site for at least the previous two years. Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates also did some testing of groundwater samples for atrazine and did a full scan for other chemicals, concluding that none were found in the groundwater within the Paris Pit.

Richard Murphy explained that the County of Brant is also monitoring for chemicals and atrazine and have been doing so since 2004. Richard Murphy said that there is nothing to indicate that atrazine is present and that Dufferin Aggregates will continue to monitor the groundwater.

Monitoring

Richard Murphy explained that as part of the PTTW, an impact assessment must be done and then a monitoring program is proposed to the MOE, which gives Dufferin Aggregates the ability to track what is happening in response to taking water. The monitoring includes:

- Water Quantity
 - Water taking flow
 - Water levels
- Water Quality (chemistry)
 - Including nitrates, herbicides and pesticides
- Water Temperature
 - Source pond and down gradient monitoring well

Monitoring History

Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates has 12 monitoring wells at 8 locations in the Paris Pit and has been monitoring water levels and water quality in the area since the late 1980's. Additional wells and a surface water staff gauge were added in 2012. The County of Brant has access to the Dufferin Aggregates wells.

Proposed Water Quantity Monitoring

Richard Murphy explained that the monitoring will include:

- Water taking flow
 - A water meter will be used to show a record of how much water has been taken
- Surface water level monitoring at 4 locations
 - Source Pond

- Settling pond
- 2 existing ponds
- Groundwater level monitoring at 15 monitoring wells (10 locations)

Proposed Water Quality Monitoring

Richard Murphy explained that water quality monitoring will include:

- Surface water monitoring of the 3 ponds
- Groundwater monitoring

General Questions

Question Eight: How big in comparison is the pond? Is it half an acre?

- Richard Murphy answered the pond is about 4 acres and that the ponds are made relatively large for storage volume.

Question Nine: Can you give us an idea of the volume of water in the settling ponds versus how much the municipal wells are taking in any given day?

- Richard Murphy explained that about 3,500 L/min is coming out of the municipal wells and by comparison, the PTTW limit is a little more than 5 times that number, about 18,000 L/min but the water is being re-circulated.
- Richard Murphy went on to explain that the municipal wells are being used to supply Paris and 3,500 L is taken and put into the water distribution system.
- Richard explained that when Dufferin Aggregates is 'taking' 18,000 L, almost all of that water is coming back into the pond (re-circulated) and only 160 L/min is actually moving out of the area. The flow 160 L/min can be equated to about 4 or 5 garden hoses or filling most of a rain barrel (typically 200 L) in a minute.

Question Ten: How much silt will go from the settling pond into the main source pond?

- Richard Murphy explained that a little bit of fine silt may come into the area.
- Kevin Mitchell explained that the settling pond is quite large and if needed, Dufferin Aggregates will put a curtain across the pond so that the energy in the water will be slowed and the silt will settle.

Question Eleven: What will happen to the silt once it settles?

- Kevin Mitchell explained that the silt will be sub-excavated and used for rehabilitation.

Question Twelve: Does the PTTW get submitted to the MOE?

- Richard Murphy responded yes, the PTTW application has been submitted to the MOE.

Question Thirteen: Will the MOE duplicate this research to verify that your findings are correct, like a peer review?

- Richard Murphy explained that the MOE will review the application and they have experts that are assigned to review the technical detail in the report and compare that detail to other reports.
- Richard Murphy explained that the MOE will also review the comments submitted by the public on the permit application.

- Kevin Mitchell explained that the people assigned to reviewing the PTTW application are familiar with the area and it is indeed like a peer review.

Question Fourteen: Has the MOE given you any timing on the permit?

- Kevin Mitchell explained that the comment period is open until June 18th for public comment.
- Kevin Mitchell explained that Dufferin Aggregates does not know how long it will take the MOE to review the comments or the report. Typically it takes a few months, but could be longer.

Question Fifteen: You mentioned that a survey of private wells was done in 1974 and 1988; did you have to do another survey of the private wells for the PTTW?

- Richard Murphy explained that no, the CRA would do another survey before the water taking started so that the MOE would have a chance to review what's in the PTTW and if there are any changes required for the monitoring, that can get decided ahead of time and dealt with.

Question Sixteen: Wouldn't you need to look at the affects on the private wells in the PTTW report?

- Richard Murphy explained that no, the private wells are a receptor (a point to determine if they are susceptible to influence).
- Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates is not taking water from these private wells and they do not have influence on groundwater levels.
- Richard Murphy explained that there is enough information compiled from other surveys and the well surveys are up to date, so Dufferin Aggregates knows where wells are, or may be, located and can assess the potential for influence.

Question Seventeen: Is the source water pond going to be bermed?

- Richard Murphy explained that it will be bermed but not in the same way as the settling pond. The source pond will have a low berm/grading to ensure that there is not local run-off into the pond.

Next Steps

Kevin Mitchell outlined next steps:

- PTTW – last day for public comment is June 18, 2013
- ECA (isw) environmental compliance approval industrial sewage works
 - Filing in the next 30-45 days
- Earth Week Tree Planting Event – May 1st at the Paris Pit
 - Nishat Ahmed explained that Earth Rangers will be present at the tree planting. Nishat explained that Earth Rangers is a kids organization that educates on the importance of biodiversity. They are one of Holcim's national partners.
- Ecology – Work Plan is undergoing
 - Amphibian monitoring complete
 - Fish and bird monitoring in 2013
 - Working with Bird Studies Canada to install a song meter on property

- Meeting with County to discuss on-ramp at Bishop Gates Road
 - Meeting is scheduled for late May

Questions

Question Eighteen: What is the public's perspective on Dufferin Aggregates? Is the public coming to grips with what is happening?

- Kevin Mitchell explained that many people talk to him personally in the community about the Paris Pit.
- Alex Faux said that since Dufferin Aggregates moved extraction out of WHPA A, it shows the community that Dufferin Aggregates is making efforts and concessions to alleviate community concerns.
 - Kevin Mitchell explained that the area within the Telfer Wellfield will not be extracted the Site Plans will be modified to reflect this change.

Question Nineteen: Is Council in favour of the on-ramp at Bishop Gates Road?

- Shirley Simons explained that it hasn't come forward to Council.
- Murray Powell explained that the County wants to look at it to see if it will take some of the traffic off of West Acre Road.
- Murray Powell explained off-ramps are very expensive to build so the County would depend on the province to help fund the construction.
- Shirley Simons said County will likely know more next week.

Question Twenty: Is there anyway a CAP member can go on the property?

- Kevin Mitchell explained that he can take anyone anytime.

Joanne Kearney suggested that the next CAP meeting take place at the end of June and topic will be on the Cornerstone Council.

Bill Galloway explained what the Cornerstone Council is:

- The Council was formed through a merger of Socially and Environmentally Responsible Aggregate (SERA) and the Aggregate Forum of Ontario (AFO).
- Board of Directors – Ivey Foundation, Schaad Foundation, CEO of Green Building Council. More board members have been added since the Council formation on July 24, 2012.
- National mandate to explore certification for social and environmentally responsible practices and initially focused on develop certification for responsible aggregate siting, operation and rehabilitation in Ontario. www.cornerstonestandards.ca

Joanne Kearney said that members of the CSC can be made available to come speak with the CAP at the next meeting.

Joanne Kearney suggested June 25th or 26th for the next CAP meeting. Courtney Somers will send around date suggestions with the minutes.

Paris Pit



Dufferin Aggregates
2300 Steeles Ave W, 4th Floor
Concord, ON L4K 5X6
Canada

Meeting adjourned