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

Meeting Minutes

Event:	Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Paris Pit CAP # 12 Water
Date & Time:	Tuesday June 24, 2014 7:00 - 9:00 PM
Place:	Paris Golf Country Club, River House
Chair:	Linda Smith, Facilitator
Participants:	Jeff Broomfield, Neighbour Robb Edwards, Neighbour Michael H Fox, Neighbour Gary Strauss, Neighbour Elizabeth Norris, Neighbour Fred Natolochny, Grand River Conservation Authority Marilyn Sewell, Neighbour Kevin Mitchell, Dufferin Aggregates Bill Galloway, Dufferin Aggregates Richard Erdmann, Dufferin Aggregates
Guests:	Richard Murphy, Conestoga Rovers & Associates Gary Lagos, Conestoga Rovers & Associates
Minutes:	Courtney Somers, Facilitator
Regrets:	Shirley Simons, Councilor Murray Powell, Councilor Steve Schmitt, Councilor Cyril Parsons, Neighbour Dale Lukas, Neighbour Alex Faux, Neighbour Bill Telfer, Neighbour John McAllister, Neighbour Jake Vandenburg, Neighbour

Minutes

Linda Smith brought the meeting to order and asked the CAP to the review the minutes from March 18th. The CAP reviewed the minutes and changes to statements from Bill Galloway and Jeff Broomfield were added and/or edited. Changes were reflected in the March 18th minutes and they were approved by the CAP.

Question One: How is the testing done for silica?

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

- Richard Erdmann explained each individual employee wears a respirator while working and the respirator is tested.
- Kevin Mitchell said testing has shown no silica.

Question Two: Are the reports related to that testing available?

- Richard Erdmann said no, there is legislation that regulates the testing and the results are part of individual health records and cannot be made public to maintain employees' privacy.

Linda Smith reviewed the agenda for the meeting and introduced Kevin Mitchell to give the Paris Pit General Update.

General Update

PTTW & ECA (isw) application

- All MOE questions have been addressed
- Dufferin Aggregates is waiting on the MOE to schedule the technical agency meeting
- Paper copy of the application was given to all the appropriate agencies, the CCOB and posted to the Dufferin Aggregates Paris Pit website

Question Three: What is the technical agency meeting, exactly?

- Kevin Mitchell explained that when the PTTW was filed, it was reviewed with MOE, MNR, County of Brant, CRGA, two First Nations groups and CCOB. From there, the application was posted to the EBR for public comment for 60 days and Dufferin Aggregates will now be meeting again with the agencies to review the report and address any other questions.

Question Four: Is this agency meeting with the same group you met with initially? Is this the end process for MOE?

- Kevin Mitchell said yes, this is the same group and is the last step for MOE. This type of process is a little out of the norm from the regular process; they have added two more steps to our permitting process to ensure that people have the opportunity to be involved and are paying attention.

Kevin Mitchell continued with the general update.

Haul Route (Watts Pond Road)

- Road design details are being addressed and construction is planned for next spring.

Archeology

- Kevin Mitchell explained that stage 3 & 4 work is underway at the site and will be complete in June/July.
- Kevin Mitchell said to date an arrowhead and a pendant have been found but nothing of major significance. There was First Nations supervision during the investigations.
- Kevin Mitchell mentioned that there is ongoing work near the Miller house, where settler debris such as pieces of plates and buttons have been found.

Fencing and Site Preparation

- Dufferin Aggregates has selected a fencing contractor and they will start in July.
- Stripping, berm construction, and on-site access road construction will start in late July early August.

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

Earth Week Event

- Local soccer team came out to plant trees and wild flowers.
- Dufferin Aggregates donated $500 to the team.
- Company wide, about 1000 people participated in Earth Week events.

Paris Pit PTTW Application

Kevin Mitchell introduced the PTTW Application and Richard Murphy from Conestoga Rovers & Associates (CRA).

Question Five: Do you know how many comments you got on the EBR?

- Kevin Mitchell said that they were not told how many comments were received, but about 1,000 form letters were sent in.

Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates is coming to the end stages of the process for approval for the PTTW with the MOE and expect a decision in the near future.

Richard Murphy provided an update on what CRA has been doing at the Paris Pit site and refreshed the CAP on the location of the wash pond, which the PTTW is for:

- PTTW is not for the general mining but for washing the aggregate to make specific products.
- Richard Murphy pointed out the streets and the locations of the Gilbert and Telfer Wellfields.
- The PTTW is for the south central area of the site and this location was chosen because of the ground water flow (northwest to southeast) and because it is outside the current capture zones and the future predicted capture zones (Wellhead Protection Areas, WHPAs) of the Gilbert and Telfer Wellfields

Richard Murphy explained the WHPA zones (capture areas for future consumption) that are conservatively estimated to be far greater than current pumping and corresponding capture zones. There are four areas:

- WHPA A (pink line): 100 metre radius around the well.
- WHPA B (yellow line): Water that is expected to reach this area has about a 2-year travel time after infiltrating the ground.
- WHPA C (blue line): Water in this area has about a 5-year travel time.
- WHPA D (dark blue): This area corresponds to a 25-year travel time.

Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates chose to put the washing and processing area outside of the current narrow water capture zones, outside all of the WHPA's. Richard Murphy said with the plant in this area, there is no risk of water from washing and processing to get into the wells that feed Paris.

Richard Murphy explained that the water taking application allows for:

- A maximum pumping rate of 18,000L per minute.
- Pumping can occur for a maximum 12 hours a day.
- Pumping can occur for a maximum of 200 days of the year.

Richard Murphy explained that the water is recycled in a closed loop system and very little water is lost, approximately 160L/minute which is about the equivalent of 4-5 garden hoses running.

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

Richard Murphy explained the precautionary approach Dufferin Aggregate has taken to ensure the protection of the environment, including water resources:

- The location of the wash pond and settling pond is outside of the WHPA and far from current capture zones; therefore there is no risk to the Gilbert or Telfer Wells.
- The soil and water sampling did not identify any significant presence of pesticides.
- The monitoring program will be ongoing during the operations. The reports will be submitted to MOE, MNR and the County of Brant.
- The County of Brant also has its own monitoring program, which includes wells on the Paris Pit lands.

Richard Murphy explained that the MOE requested that Dufferin Aggregates accelerate its plan to update the well survey so that it is complete for review before issuing the PTTW. The work was completed in the spring, presented at a high level to the CAP and submitted to the MOE, who were satisfied with the results.

Richard Murphy explained that the well survey report is not available for public review as it is a confidential document related to property owners. If there are any issues with the wells in the future, or the land comes under new ownership, the owners (or agencies) can reach out to Dufferin Aggregates to provide additional information.

Paris Water Well Survey

Richard Murphy outlined the map on slide 8 and explained that the yellow shading area shows the general locations of the wells that were surveyed. Richard Murphy provided statistics on the well survey:

- 61 properties were surveyed
- 21 of the those properties had a sand and gravel well
- 5 had limestone
- 17 are on municipal supply
- 7 are municipal and well
- 10 properties do not have a house/resident
- 1 did not participate

Question Six: Will the amount of water taking Dufferin Aggregates is doing change the WHPA? How much water is the municipality taking compared to what Dufferin Aggregates is taking?

- Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates' actual consumption of water is a small percentage of water relative to the amount of taking from the municipal wells. The municipality takes about 3 to 4 thousand liters of water per minute and the limit is 13 thousand liters per minute.

Question Seven: But Dufferin Aggregates is taking 18,000L, correct?

- Richard Murphy responded yes, that is correct, in terms of the maximum allowable pumping of water; however the water is recirculated and therefore not lost to the groundwater flow system or environment. The net loss from the aggregate washing is only 160 liters per minute.

Question Eight: Doesn't all water in Paris flow to Grand River?

- Richard Murphy said yes, all water does eventually go to the Grand River and some water from the Grand River eventually goes back into municipal use.

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

Question Nine: Will Dufferin Aggregates water taking affect the WHPA lines? How does Dufferin Aggregates water taking compare to everyone else in the community?

- Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates is using a closed loop system and recycling the water locally. The water comes out of the wash pond, into the wash plant and back into the pond, so 18,000L/minutes is not being taken out of this groundwater flow system because most of that water is going right back into the pond. The net loss from the aggregate washing operation is 160 liters per minute.

Richard Murphy gave an example of filling a bathtub, pumping water out of one end and pumping it back in at the other end of the bath tub, to illustrate how the pond will work.

Question Ten: Isn't there a hole in the flow? Dufferin Aggregates is taking the water out but it is not going to go back to where it was taken from.

- Richard Murphy explained that the water coming out is going back into the same pond it was taken from and that water loss is about 160L/minute.

Question Eleven: If Dufferin Aggregates is having such a minimal affect, why do they need the PTTW?

- Richard Murphy explained that this is how the MOE regulates water taking under the Ontario Water Resources Act (OWRA) for aggregate washing. They do not look at the net water taking from the system; they look at the pump and how much it is potentially taking per minute. When the MOE evaluates the significance of that taking, they look at what happens to that water; is it just removed from the system and impacting that local environment or is it coming back into the system?
- Richard Murphy said Dufferin Aggregates has a closed loop system and the water is coming back into the system, which the MOE concludes as a negligible affect of the ground water flow system and WHPA. Therefore it is acceptable to take 18,000L per minute.
- Gary Lagos from CRA explained that the current taking for the municipality from the combined Gilbert and Telfer well fields is 3,500L/minute and the municipality is permitted to take 11,280L/minute compared to Dufferin Aggregates' net taking of 160L/minute.

Question Twelve: But the water taking permit is 18,000L/minute, not 160L/minute, correct?

- Gary Lagos said the net amount is 160L/minute.
- Richard Murphy explained that is correct but the approvals also require Dufferin Aggregates to recirculate that water.

Elizabeth Norris commented that if Paris has a really dry summer and Dufferin Aggregates is taking 18,000L/minute out of the aquifer, that is going to lower the water table and wells. We will not have as much water to use because Dufferin Aggregates is still taking water out, so that will have an effect.

Kevin Mitchell said Elizabeth Norris was right and that figures in the PTTW report show the amount of draw down in the groundwater as a result of the taking. The circle like shapes show that the draw down is less and less the further out you go.

Elizabeth Norris expressed that she feels Dufferin Aggregates is down playing the amount of water taking and the fact that the MNR and MOE has taken this long to assess the PTTW application shows its importance and that the importance should be stressed more than down played.

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

Gary Lagos explained that the MOE has reviewed the application and agrees with the conclusions. They have asked many questions which have been answered and they agree with CRA and Dufferin Aggregates conclusions. The results are not being downplayed, both parties simply agree. Gary Lagos also said that Stantec, who also reviewed the report and conclusions on behalf of the County, also agree with CRA conclusions.

Elizabeth Norris said that she still feels it is being downplayed because the amount of water taking is being compared to a hose when it is 18,000L/minute.

Gary Lagos said that this conclusion is based on a scientific assessment and not just an opinion.

Question Thirteen: Do you measure how much water goes back into the source pond?

- Richard Murphy explained that it is very difficult to monitor the flow of water that comes back into the pond. Alternatively, the water levels in the pond are monitored to see if the pond level starts to drop.

Question Fourteen: Even if you don't have that much water going back in, the pond is still going to fill up isn't it? From rain, etc.

- Richard Murphy said yes, but not that fast.
- Richard Murphy explained that the level in the pond is being measured as well as the surrounding groundwater. If that water is not coming back in naturally, the pond and groundwater levels fall. The monitoring program measures these levels and ensures that they match the assessments and prediction.

Question Fifteen: So Dufferin Aggregates is not measuring how much water is going back into the pond, correct?

- Richard Murphy responded, not in a volumetric sense.

Jeff Broomfield commented that science is based on measurement not guesses.

Richard Murphy explained that they are measuring the water levels in the pond and Dufferin Aggregates will know if there is an affect on the water level. Richard Murphy said that in reality there is no where else for the water to go because there is no pipe that goes away from the site and there is only a very small amount of water that can be held on the aggregate after washing. Any water that drains off of the aggregate after washing drains back into the pit, which then recharges to the groundwater. It is a closed loop system, there is nowhere that the water is being sent off to, and it cannot physically leave the site.

Question Sixteen: That pond, it does leach out, you do lose water. There is an underground creek under the golf course and under the railway, so it must be coming from ponds and know where else, right?

- Kevin Mitchell explained that there was an old culvert that was dug when the railway was constructed and Gary Lagos and Richard Murphy from CRA have noted that. Kevin Mitchell said that when the water level increased, the culvert would prevent it from flooding the railway.
- Richard Murphy explained that the pond that currently exists on the site is being monitored for water level changes as well to ensure it is not negatively impacted. The source pond that Dufferin Aggregates will have is a constructed part of the mining process.

Richard Murphy explained that the 18,000L/minute is a large flow of water and the fact is, Dufferin Aggregates is not taking that water of the flow system. The groundwater flow system will not see an impact like installing a

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

well would create and pumping out for some other use and not recirculating. The actual taking from the groundwater system is 160L/minute, which is quite small in this system.

Bill Galloway said, if the PTTW is approved, Dufferin Aggregates and the CRA would report to the agencies what happens to the groundwater levels.

Richard Murphy explained that the MOE has the authority to come on site and order a change in pumping, ask for more monitoring, etc. and if in fact there is an impact on a neighbours well, Dufferin Aggregates has an obligation to rectify that issue. Dufferin Aggregates cannot interfere with the water use of neighbours.

Richard Murphy explained that the posting of the PTTW on the EBR generated questions about the historical agricultural practices and the use of pesticides and herbicides on the Paris Pit land. Generally, the questions were:

- As a result of washing aggregate, will the groundwater became contaminated with pesticides?
- Will the fines removed from the aggregate by washing have pesticide concentrations that may cause contamination?

Richard Murphy explained that in the original PTTW application there was an assessment of the potential for impacts from pesticides, including testing of soil and groundwater, and it was concluded that no impacts are expected. The assessment included taking samples from 3 different depths; topsoil, sub soil and the aggregate layers. Wells were also tested to see if there were pesticide levels in the groundwater. All testing results came back with no detections of pesticides at low laboratory reporting limits.

Richard Murphy explained that the MOE looked at CRA reports and did not disagree with the findings but asked Dufferin Aggregates/CRA to go back and collect more data from more points on the site. Richard Murphy said that he is not aware of any other aggregate site that has had this much testing done related to pesticides.

Referring to slide 10, Richard Murphy provided details on the additional investigations that were done on site, as requested by the MOE. Five investigation events conducted between December 2012 and January 2014 included:

- 3 Test Pits (10 samples): TP-1 to TP-3
    - Upper (0 to 0.3 m bgs)
    - Intermediate (0.3 to 1 m bgs)
    - Lower (3 to 3.7 m bgs) soil samples collected
- 7 Boreholes (22 samples): BH-1-13 to BH-7-13
    - Completed to the top of the water table (depths of 5.5 to 14 m bgs)
        - Upper (0 to 1.5 m overburden)
        - Intermediate (halfway)
        - Lower (1.5 m above water table) soil samples collected
- 4 Monitoring Wells (13 groundwater samples):
    - MW1-12, MW2-12, BH88-5-II, BH88-4

Richard Murphy explained that slide 11 shows each of the investigation locations, including investigations near the Gilbert and Telfer Wellfield. After the investigations, it was concluded that any pesticides are at extremely low (trace) levels and no impacts related to pesticides are indicated or anticipated.

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

Richard Murphy summarizes:

- 3 Test Pits collected 10 samples
- 7 Boreholes collected 22 samples
- 4 monitoring wells collected 13 samples

Question Seventeen: When you send the tests to the lab, are they looking for specific pesticides? What are they looking for?

- Richard Murphy explained that the lab runs a standard pesticide scan of all the common chemicals used. It is a long list and CRA ensured that atrazine was on the list because concerns have been raised regarding atrazine and also added glyphosate, also known as RoundUp.
- Richard Murphy explained that 30 years ago, atrazine was widely used and did have a potential impact on groundwater. Over the last 30 years, the use of atrazine has decreased and the management practices have improved dramatically.
- Richard Murphy explained that the use glyphosate or RoundUp has significantly increased. RoundUp is typically not a concern for water quality because it bonds very tightly to soil.

Richard Murphy outlined the analytical soil summary on slide 12, explaining that the first column represents the different soil materials; grass, top soil, sub soil, over burden, aggregate. Richard Murphy outlined the results and the samples taken. Testing was done for atrazine and glyphosate:

- 26 soil samples were taken for atrazine, checking the lowest trace amount, and there was no detection of atrazine
- 32 soil samples were taken for glyphosate, which was detected in 3 samples but measured at a very low amount and was not detected in follow-up verification samples.

Richard Murphy explained that the glyphosate was found because the farmer sprayed the field 5 days prior to testing. Richard Murphy said CRA went back to the same location about 4 weeks later to do more samples and confirm real detection. New boreholes were drilled, samples were collected and the results were non-detect of glyphosate.

Question Eighteen: Was there any observation of cornfield spray of neonicatoids?

- Richard Murphy acknowledged that the media had recently reported concerns of neonicatoids related to bees and that he couldn't confirm without checking if those chemicals were on the list that samples were tested against.

Question Nineteen: Do you know how far down that spray can go? Does it stop at the soil?

- Richard Murphy explained that they would not expect that pesticide spray to move down through the soil column and that there are a number of parameters looked at in regards to testing for pesticides and herbicides.

The CAP would like Dufferin Aggregates and the CRA to confirm if neonicatoid compounds are on the testing list.

Question Twenty: Did you find out what was actually sprayed on that field? Did they spray atrazine?

- Richard Murphy said that atrazine was sprayed on the field in the past and 5 days prior to testing, glyphosate was sprayed on the field.

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

Question Twenty-One: If glyphosate binds so tightly in the soil, wouldn't zero detection raise some questions about where it went?

- Richard Murphy explained that the glysophate does not persist over a long period of time; it stays in a very shallow soil area and does not migrate. When the soil was sampled 5 days after the spraying, that was through the drilling program, no sample was taken from the shallow soil area because the deeper material was what the MOE asked for, following the earlier shallow soil sampling event.

Question Twenty-Two: Science related to atrazine says it remains present in the soil for over 20 years, so if the field were sprayed wouldn't you find some?

- Gary Lagos expressed that the research that says atrazine remains in the soil for more than 20 years has been refuted by the Stantec investigations.
- Richard Murphy explained that if enough chemical is applied, the more it builds up, the longer you will be able to detect it a number of years down the road. If it has built up to a very high level, it may still persist and be detectable for a long time.

Jeff Broomfield stated that atrazine was sprayed in Germany, where they "probably put lots of it on before they stopped."

Richard Murphy responded saying that the CRA is not arguing about pesticide rules in Germany, rather CRA is here evaluating the site against Ontario standards, not Germany's. Atrazine is in widespread use and is approved for use, there are guidelines for how to apply it safely, and the Province has established an acceptable criterion for long-term drinking water exposure. No concentrations associated with Paris Pit are detected or indicated to be approaching anywhere near as high as the Ontario standard.

Jeff Broomfield requested a copy of the science from Stantec.

Kevin Mitchell said that he believes he already has it and received it from the County of Brant.

Jeff Broomfield explained that the report from the County of Brant did not include science, it was simply commented on, it is a memo.

Gary Lagos explained that the memo from Stantec is an evaluation of how the atrazine degrades in the soil and the way it is tested is by using solvents, which is more aggressive than washing, which is what Dufferin Aggregates will be doing.

Bill Galloway said that there is nothing different in the report, other than confirming the data from the data the CRA is presenting, which has been evaluated by the County, MOE and will be discussed at the agency meeting.

Jeff Broomfield expressed that he would like to see the science.

Bill Galloway said there will never be an agreed upon conclusion for the information with some people. The information is publically available publically and was done as part of Dufferin Aggregates PTTW application.

Kevin Mitchell said that the report the County provided to Jeff Broomfield has includes all of the work done by Stantec on their review of the PTTW application.

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

Bill Galloway explained that there is a report that backs up all the numbers being outlined in the meeting from CRA, which is going to be discussed at the stakeholder meeting.

Kevin Mitchell explained that the Stantec report Jeff Broomfield has is a response to the original application Dufferin Aggregates made for the PTTW. It states in "Appendix H" that the process used by the scientist, using solvent to get the atrazine out, is not how it comes out when washing with water, there is no comparison to and it is much more conservative than what Dufferin Aggregates will be doing in the washing process.

Question Twenty-Three: Is that the report from the testing of the three test pits?

- Kevin Mitchell said the original CRA report filed with the PTTW application included the results of the three test pits and there is a new CRA report with the new results..

Bill Galloway said that the information being presented by Richard Murphy will be presented in more detail at the agency meeting.

Question Twenty-Four: Would it be possible to review that report prior to the agency meeting?

- Kevin Mitchell said the report will be posted on the Dufferin Aggregates Paris Pit website in the next few days.

Richard Murphy reviewed the soil testing conclusions on slide 13:

- Extensive testing was completed both horizontally and vertically
- Analysis done to very low laboratory detection limited
- No atrazine detection in 26 soil samples
- Only trace level glyphosate found in 3 of 32 samples. Samples were collected 5 days after glyphosate was applied to the fields. Results were not repeated in follow up verification sampling.
- Conservative (cautionary) analysis indicated there is no potential for washing to result in higher concentrations in sediment (settling pond fines) that could then pose a risk to water quality.
- No other pesticides were detected.

Richard Murphy reviewed the water quality testing results for Atrazine (plus metabolites) and reviewed the charts on slide 14:

- Concentration increases as you go right on the chart and decreases as you go left
- Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standard is 5 micrograms per litre
- City of Brantford testing found 0.37 micrograms per litre, 14 times lower than the provincial standard
- Brant County has had no detections at a detection limit of 1 microgram per litre
- Paris Pit testing was done to a detection limit of 0.1 micrograms per litre, which is 50 times lower than the provincial standard and ten times lower than the County testing limit. Very low concentrations were found in two samples from one of four wells tested. The test result was only 0.35 micrograms per litre in the first sample and it was retested a few weeks later and it had dropped about 25 per cent, to 0.27 micrograms per litre or about 18 times below the drinking water standard. The other three wells sampled (8 if total 10 samples) had no detections.
- Richard Murphy noted that if the County detection limit was used, the results would have been non-detect.

Richard Murphy reviewed the water quality results for glyphosate on slide 15:

- The City of Brant had no detections at the detection limit of 6 micrograms per litre
- Brant County had no detections at detection limit of 10 micrograms per litre

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

- The Paris Pit detected glyphosate in 1 of 13 groundwater samples at a detection limit of .1 micrograms per litre. The result was non-detect in a follow-up verification sample.
- Richard Murphy noted that if the County detection limit was used the result would have been non-detect.

Richard Murphy noted that no other pesticides were detected in any groundwater samples.

Richard Murphy reviewed the water quality testing conclusions on slide 16.

Question Twenty-Five: Is the Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standard going to change with the new Source Water Protection coming into affect?

- Richard Murphy explained that Source Water Protection is not changing the standards for water quality criteria. It is going to govern land use and activities on land that could pose risk to water. In regards to pesticides, Richard Murphy outlined that they can still be applied within a WHPA-A but the storing and handling of the pesticides will change. With WHPA-A and WHPA-B, best management practices must be in place. With WHPA-C and WHPA-D, the County will rely on measures like public education.

Richard Murphy reiterated that CRA and Dufferin Aggregates concluded that no impacts to water quality from aggregate washing are indicated or anticipated. Richard Murphy also reviewed related quotes in the water report from the County water experts, Stantec (slide 17).

Richard Murphy explained that Dufferin Aggregates will be responsible should any unanticipated issues occur with water. Dufferin Aggregates is responsible for implementing appropriate measures to maintain suitable water supply and water resource conditions. Richard Murphy outlined that:

- A comprehensive monitoring program will be undertaken
- Monitoring will include water quantity and quality, including pesticides
- Results will be reported to MOE, County of Brant and the public
- MOE has the enforcement authority to issues orders (additional monitoring, changes to monitoring, etc.)

Richard Murphy reviewed slides 19 and 20, outlining the long-term monitoring locations for water quantity and quality.

Richard Murphy concluded the presentation, outlining:

- Dufferin Aggregates has proactively designed the Site to protect water resources and diligently evaluated potential PTTW effects.
- It is clearly demonstrated that there is no buildup of pesticides in the subsurface and there will be no negative impacts to water resources.
- Municipal water supply wells and private water supply wells will not be impacted
- The PTTW application has been reviewed by technical experts from GRCA, MOE, and the County of Brant and they concur.
- Monitoring will be conducted during the life of operations.
- Dufferin Aggregates will remain responsible to address any unanticipated impacts should they occur.

Linda Smith reviewed the next steps for the Paris CAP:

- PTTW & ECA (isw) – MOE to make a decision on the applications
- Road design work will continue

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

- Entrance construction will begin in July/August of this year

Jeff Broomfield requested that additional information and reports be continually discussed and more information provided on silica.

Kevin Mitchell explained that all topics presented at the CAP since it was initiated are the technical topics that would be addressed related to a new license application. Additional topic ideas can be sent to Courtney Somers.

Linda Smith adjourned the meeting.