

Attachment 4. Summary of Public Comments and Responses

Comments	Township Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petition (dated Nov. 2, 2021) with 62 signatures received opposing pit expansion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Received.
<p>Planning Context and Approvals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm the current land use designation in the Region Official Plan (OP) and Township OP. Which Planning Act approvals are required? Why consider rezoning application before decision on Regional OP Amendment? How does Township make decision to approve extraction operation in an active agricultural/rural residential area knowing it will adversely affect residents. What factors are weighed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lands are designated Prime Agricultural Area & Major Open Space Area and identified as an Area of High Potential Aggregate Resources in Regional & Township OP. Lands currently zoned Rural (RU) & Environmental Protection (EP). An Aggregate Resources Act License Application is being processed through MNRF. Regional OP Amendment & Zoning By-law Amendment applications required. Township needs to provide input to the Region on the proposed Regional OP Amendment application. The Zoning By-law will not be brought back until a decision has been made on the Regional OP Amendment. The land use planning process must take several factors into consideration including public consultation. Recommendations are based on planning principles and the planning context as outlined in Provincial, Regional and local planning policy documents.
<p>Studies and Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBM paid for studies and they're biased. Should be completed by independent consultants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The following studies have been completed: Planning Justification Report & ARA Summary Statement, Natural Environmental Report, Air Quality Impact Assessment, Water Resources Report, Archaeology Report, Noise Impact Assessment & GHG Assessment Technical reports & studies have been carried out by qualified professionals bound to a professional code of conduct. All reports have been reviewed by MNRF, MECP, LSRCA, Region and Township, and peer reviewed by consultant(s) retained by the Region.

Comments	Township Response
<p>Environmental Concerns & Climate Change</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why does the proposal include environmental area? Are there plans to remove wooded area/wetlands for aggregate operations in the future? • How will wetlands be protected? • Expansion will impact environmentally protected lands, cause disturbance to wildlife habitat, wildlife corridor and affect natural heritage features with a loss of biodiversity. • Aggregate extraction will endanger the environment and release more carbon into the environment. • Consider noise impacts to wildlife and birds. • It is not possible to restrict vegetation removal during the active season for breeding birds. • How often will erosion and sediment control be reviewed/maintained? • Neighbouring property participates in Conservation Land Tax Incentive Program (CLTIP) for portion of their property with a PSW. Proposed expansion will impact significant environmental area and PSW. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no changes proposed to lands currently zoned EP, which includes wetlands and wooded area. EP zone will be maintained and no extraction activities are proposed or will be permitted within the EP area. • The existing environmental area will be protected and continue to provide for wildlife habitat and a habitat corridor. • Natural Environmental Report (NER) submitted and reviewed by MECP, MNRF, LSRCA, Region and Township. NER identifies significant environmental features, potential impacts and mitigation measures to minimize impacts on the environment (including minimum setbacks from the wetland), ESC controls to prevent run-off and restricted vegetation removal during breeding bird season. • Rehabilitation plan designed to produce a net ecological gain with the final land use providing a greater diversity of habitat than the current agricultural pasture area. • Sites are inspected by MNRF to ensure compliance with approved plans, including rehabilitation. • Restricting vegetation removal at any time is possible and a common condition on ARA Site Plans. Operations can continue in areas where vegetation previously removed. • A GHG assessment was provided and reviewed by LSRCA and the Township showing the proposed extraction operation will be below the reporting threshold for GHG and the proposed rehabilitation plan will be better from a carbon perspective than the current agricultural pastureland that exists. • Proposed aggregate operation will not impact CLTIP on neighbouring property.

Comments	Township Response
<p>Groundwater</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will affect aquifers, water table, water flow and private wells in the area. • Pits disrupt movement of surface and ground water and can lead to reduced quality and quantity of drinking water for residents and wildlife. • Some residents noted their wells weren't included in the study. What is the timing of the private well survey? • Within a high vulnerability area – has a detailed analysis been completed? • Unclear how inconsequential the impacts would be to the water balance. Are the proposed impacts a matter of concern? • Have runoff impacts to Beaver River been assessed? • How ensure that no water taking and no aggregate washing will take place on site? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Resources Report submitted includes a complete evaluation of potential impacts of the proposed below water extraction on groundwater quality and quantity in the area around the CBM pit, including private water wells within 500m and natural heritage features near the site. The study concluded that the proposed below water extraction can be carried out with no hydrogeological effects on groundwater use in area. • CBM's past and current operations extract below the water table and have not resulted in any well water issues for over 30 years since records have been kept. • When a well is drilled on a property, the well driller is required to submit a record of the well to MECP, which is then entered into a Water Well Record Database. It appears that some records of wells in the area have not been submitted/included in the database. A desktop review is also done as part of the Water Resources report and in instances where properties are likely to have a well, but there's no corresponding well record in the database, it is assumed that there is a well on these properties, so they're considered as part of the hydrogeological assessment. • A monitoring program is required which includes quarterly groundwater level monitoring and annual water quality monitoring by a qualified professional. A private well survey is to be completed at residences within 500m prior to any extraction below water. CBM will conduct a door-to-door survey of all wells within 500m prior to any below water table extraction taking place. CBM will also be required to have a well water response plan in place in the event an issue occurs.

Comments	Township Response
<p>Agricultural Lands</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will result in loss of fertile farmland. • Site currently farmed and should be retained for farmland. • Need to address impacts on adjacent agricultural uses • While aggregate resources are a provincial interest and should be protected from incompatible uses - agricultural lands are also a matter of provincial interest and should be protected. • Removal of farmland to extract gravel will release greenhouse gases. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmland is valued according to how productive it can be and placed into one of 6 classes with Class 1 having the highest agricultural capability and the most valuable and Class 6 having the lowest capability. • The proposed extraction area does not meet the definition of prime agricultural land being Class 6 based on the Canada Land Inventory (CLI) mapping. • The PPS and DROP permit aggregate extraction even within prime agricultural areas and do not require rehabilitation to agricultural uses where there is a significant quantity of material below the water table. • The rehabilitation plan is designed to produce a net ecological gain, with the final land use providing a greater diversity of habitat than current agricultural use
<p>Noise and Light</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider risk to health and safety from noise, vibration, odour and other contaminants from heavy machinery working close to rural neighbourhood. • Noise pollution – proposed area of extraction within 120m of 2 dwellings and within 500m of several others • What about lighting from the property and traffic lights on existing surrounding residential properties? • Noise pollution from heavy machinery and air quality impacts from dust will have social impacts on the residents living in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Noise Impact Assessment was submitted and reviewed by the Region’s peer review consultant. It addresses the potential noise impacts and shows that the proposed pit expansion will not exceed noise limits established by the Province (MECP). • Recommendations of the Noise Report are reflected in the ARA Site Plan and include buffers and/or setbacks from sensitive land uses. • Noise from the proposed operation will be mitigated through equipment controls and perimeter berms. • The pit operation will be designed to operate within the noise guidelines established by the Province. • CBM uses directional backup alarms on equipment on site (called quackers), which limits noise exposure. These alarms are designed to focus the noise to a certain area or only be slightly louder than the ambient noise in the vicinity of the vehicle and only those who are directly behind the vehicle will hear it.

Comments	Township Response
<p>Dust and Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No dust analysis has been done and no mitigation measures have been recommended. • The health of surrounding rural neighbourhood in jeopardy due to exposure to silica dust which is a serious health hazard. • Given existing issues with dust and noise from existing operations, no amount of mitigation can adequately address impacts on neighbours. • Concern with dust/air quality from machinery exhaust. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Air Quality Impact Assessment was submitted and reviewed by the Region's peer review consultant. It includes an evaluation of potential emissions of crystalline silica from proposed expansion. The predicted concentrations of respirable crystalline silica (RSC) over a 24-hour period will be well below the provincial air quality standard for silica. No exceedances of the Ministry's regulatory standards are expected and no significant off-site dust is expected. • The extraction of sand and gravel does not create significant amounts of RSC that would potentially cause risks to health. • In 2018 CBM commissioned a sampling program at Sunderland to determine whether workers on-site were being exposed to RCS. The sampling indicated that silica levels were below relevant criteria for the province and that personal protective equipment related to RCS for the workers was not needed. • If expansion is approved, CBM will continue to apply calcium and water to the internal haul roads to control dust. • The pit operation will be designed to operate within the air quality guidelines established by the Province.
<p>Neighbourhood Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will disrupt the rural nature in the neighbourhood. • Disruptive and will impact enjoyment of properties in the area • Will impact property values in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing CBM aggregate operation has been in operation since the 1960s and is an already established use in the area. • All the studies submitted have reviewed the potential impacts on neighbouring properties and sensitive land uses in the areas, with respect to groundwater, noise, dust, and traffic and provide recommendations and requirements that help to mitigate any potential effects.

Comments	Township Response
<p>Rehabilitation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation won't replace what's lost. • What is the life pit expansion and how many years will it take to rehabilitate? • What is meant by progressively rehabilitate? • The examples of the CBM rehabilitated area appear to have been destroyed and included in the north pit. • How is proposed rehabilitation compatible with the surrounding lands uses if lands not restored to agricultural uses? • How ensure rehabilitation plan will be implemented? • Concerns with 3 proposed ponds. Assume water will come from the aquifer. With climate change and hotter, drier weather – concern with water supply and pressure on groundwater resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation plan includes 3 small ponds, riparian and upland habitats, with plantings across the site to support species diversity and habitat enhancement. • The rehabilitation plan will create additional habitat to enhance the adjacent PSW. • Rehabilitation has been ongoing at the CBM site in accordance with the approved plans and existing license applications. Sites are inspected by MNRF to ensure compliance with approved plans, including rehabilitation. • The Aggregate Resources Act (ARA) sets out minimum rehabilitation requirements. The site must be progressively rehabilitated as extraction advances, which means once the resources have been extracted from a specific area, that area is graded and rehabilitated as the operation moves into another area. • The PPS and DROP permit aggregate extraction even within prime agricultural areas and do not require rehabilitation to agricultural uses where there is a significant quantity of material below the water table. • The predicted water levels in the ponds are based on a high-water table level and the side slopes around the 3 small ponds will provide additional storage in the event of a severe storm. The grading of the rehabilitation plan directs water from Concession Rd 2 towards the pond and there is no risk of flooding as a result of the proposed below water extraction.
<p>Spills and Contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern with contamination from spills, equipment malfunction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A spill prevention and response procedure forms part of CBM's Environment Management System (EMS). The Sunderland Pit is equipped with an onsite spill kit. Visual inspections and maintenance are done on a regular basis to minimize the chance of any spills.

Comments	Township Response
<p>Truck Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns with increased truck traffic. • Costs to Region and Township should be addressed with respect to damage to area roads related to truck traffic. • Aware of plans for road work on Regional Rd 13. Don't want to see pit truck traffic rerouted onto Brock Conc 2 during that road work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed expansion will use the existing processing plant, as well as the existing access and haul route along Regional Rd 13. There are no plans to increase current levels of production. As other areas of the existing operation are slowing down/coming to an end and the proposed expansion would extend the existing operation, so the associated truck traffic volumes will remain the same as they are currently. • Any planned improvements to Regional Rd 13 would be up to the Region as this is a Regional road. Regional Works' plans include ongoing improvements along Regional Rd 13 over the next few years. • CBM is assessed and taxed accordingly. Licensed aggregate operations contribute to municipalities through the TOARC levy which is assessed annually based on the tonnage shipped from the site.
<p>Aggregate Pit Operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 5000 current aggregate pit operations in Ontario that can meet future demand. No need to rezone this property for such use. • Will aggregates from this site be used in our region / country? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed expansion area is located within an esker that provides a specific type of sand and gravel, of which only 4 such areas exist within the Region. The resources found in this area are unique and produce a specific type of product that is needed. • The proposed pit will provide a high-quality supply of aggregate material to local and regional markets.
<p>Council Resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council supported motion for moratorium on aggregate operations directed to Province. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The resolution passed by Council on April 25, 2022 asked the Province to consider a temporary moratorium and review aggregate operation requirements as the Province has authority over aggregate operations. Township staff are not aware of any moratoriums imposed by the Province and are processing application(s) submitted to the Township and Region under the current policies and requirements in effect.