



**Dufferin Aggregates
Teedon Pit Community
Liaison Committee Meeting
Minutes**

Date:	Monday, March 5	2:00pm – 4:00pm
Location:	Wyebriidge Community Centre, 8340 County Rd 93, Tiny, ON	
Chair:	John Matheson	StrategyCorp
Participants:	Peter Anderson	CLC Member
	David Barkey	CLC Member
	Jessica Campitelli	CLC Member
	Judith Grant	Federation of Tiny Township Shoreline Associations
	Richard Hinton	Township of Tiny Councillor
	Christopher Williams	CLC Member
	Richard Erdmann	Dufferin Aggregates
	Jessica Ferri	CRH Canada
	Kevin Mitchell	CRH Canada
	Mohamed Mousa	Dufferin Aggregates
	Dan O'Hara	Dufferin Aggregates
Minutes:	Alicia Sinclair	StrategyCorp

Introduction of StrategyCorp and Dufferin Aggregates/CRH Canada

- StrategyCorp gave a brief introduction of itself. Suggested “norms” or ground rules for the session were presented and endorsed by all participants.
- Introduction of Dufferin Aggregates/CRH Canada staff

CLC Participant Introduction

- StrategyCorp led the CLC participant introduction by allowing the CLC members to introduce themselves and explain their reasons for joining the CLC, their concerns, and their expectations of the process. This discussion generated a list of concerns that Dufferin Aggregates will address throughout the course of the meetings, which vary from specific, short-term concerns to larger, long-term concerns. The list includes:

Macro Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several participants asserted that they recognize the importance of aggregates but urged their opinion that the value of the aggregate resource did not justify extraction at this site given the potential for damage to the water resource. • Does surface rehabilitation matter compared to the holes in the aquifer?
Legacy Trust Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the opinion of participants: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the community did not enjoy a positive relationship with the previous operator of the Pit. ○ concerns and complaints were ignored by the previous operator ○ questions asked during public meetings were left unanswered, such as questions about tree cuttings and hydrogeology ○ the fact that the original approval for the site was from the 1970s raised concerns that it might have been outdated. • In the past, some immediate neighbours experienced issues with their wells, which they believed were attributable to the operation of the pit. • The previous operator built a wash pond on the site. Some expressed concern that this pond may not have been properly authorized. • <i>As a result of these issues, in the opinion of participants, there is a legacy of concern and mistrust between the community and the Pit that Dufferin must now manage.</i>
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the opinion of participants, the potential impact of the Pit on water is the biggest issue. • Generally, the view was expressed that this aquifer is the “world’s purest” aquifer, and, therefore, the water resource is more valuable than the aggregate resource • Accordingly, they are of the view that if there is any doubt about the hydrogeology, Dufferin should use the precautionary principle. • Other projects have caused the community to be very interested in water. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For example, public concerns about links to Site 41 and the Alliston Aquifer. <p>The following specific questions/concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking the water: Do levels of water taking run the risk of “running down” the supply of water? • Returning the water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does the wash pond contaminate the rest of the water? ○ Does the work in general contaminate the rest of the water? ○ Is the silt in suspension contaminating the aquifer? ○ Is there a risk of spills arising from the operations of the pit? • Does the Pit have an impact on neighbouring wells? • Methodology/sufficiency of the well tests:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Some expressed dissatisfaction with the MOECC well conclusions ○ Some questioned if there should be more test/monitoring wells other than PW1009 ○ Some questioned if a new well survey should be done as the last time done was in 2010. ○ Some questioned if the tests were too localized. ○ Should the receptor radius be larger than 5km? ○ Should the domestic well survey have a larger sample size (n = 5)? ○ How was the water table established? (Concerns with Ross Campbell's assessment) ● Is the 1.5m buffer between the water table and the extraction floor sufficient to protect the water table? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dufferin representatives explained that the water table measurements are conducted over time to account for varying precipitation and water levels by year. ○ Dufferin is currently operating more than 20M above the water table. ○ Dufferin has retained GHD as its Hydrogeology Consultant.
<i>Impact on Neighbourhood</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Noise and vibration and their impact on use of property (e.g. sitting outside) by immediate neighbours. ● Does geometry of the pit exacerbate sound issues (“creates an echo chamber”)? ● Is noise considered an “adverse effect?” ● Is there an “air, noise, and vibration” permit?
<i>Operations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● “Aquifer over aggregate”: Some participants expressed the view that operational improvements (e.g. noise attenuation buffers) were welcome, but were secondary to overarching concerns about the sustainability of the water resource: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bylaws and hours of operation as a tool for minimizing ○ Dust and their impact on plug filters on wells ● Future rehabilitation during and after extraction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dufferin shared its track record on rehabilitation.
<i>Safety and Haul Routes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some concerns were raised about potential safety risks arising from traffic and road alignments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are certain roads/intersections safely designed for gravel trucks? ○ Darby Road is not wide enough and lacks sidewalks and shoulders. ○ Do trucks have an effect of the safety of pedestrians and school busses?
<i>First Nations’ Issues</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Concern was expressed about the lack of First Nations representatives on this committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inquiries about the process Dufferin undertook to secure First Nations representation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participants asked what consultation protocols were required with First nations, having regard to Treaty/Legislative rights and entitlements.
--	---

Presentation by CRH Dufferin Aggregates

Dufferin Aggregates presented on their company, their partnership with the communities they work in, and their license for Teedon Pit.

In questions arising from the presentation:

- Dufferin representatives explained that progressive rehabilitation is most effective once extraction has reached the exterior boundary of the site.
- Committee members noted that in their opinion, the previous operator did not follow through on promised rehabilitation.
- Committee raised concerns that rehabilitation is oriented to restoration of the surface of site and may not affect the aquifer.
- Additionally, it was noted that the Teedon Pit expansion is in a rural residential area and that Dufferin is legally able to extract 600,000 tonnes of aggregate per year.
- A participant requested that in future, drawings be presented to show what is known not only about surface features/conditions, but also about subterranean features relating to the aquifer.

CLC Terms of Reference

StrategyCorp led a discussion on the Terms of Reference for the CLC and the committee’s expectations. No specific recommendations were made to the Terms of Reference, although the following points of clarification were made:

- The purpose of the CLC is to serve as a kind of focus group.
- The CLC is not a decision-making body.
- Any proper complaints or concerns should be brought to the attention of the appropriate regulator.
- The CLC is not a replacement for open public meetings.
- Personal information will not be shared through the CLC.
- Transparency to the broader public will be guaranteed through the sharing of committee-approved meeting minutes.
- Participants requested that reports created by Dufferin will be written in plain text language to ensure accessibility for the general public.

There appeared to be consensus around these points of clarification.

Questions included:

<p>Q: How were Committee Members chosen?</p>	<p>A: Dufferin explained that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation of the CLC had been announced at the last community meeting. • Dufferin advertised the opportunity to participate in the committee in the local newspaper. • Dufferin sent email to all individual community members who had attended the community meeting.
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The six community representatives were the only six to communicate their interest in participating.
<p>Q: Why was there no First Nations participation at this CLC meeting?</p>	<p>Duty to Consult Committee members raised concerns about how this issue relates to the Treaties Act.</p> <p>A: Dufferin representatives explained that Dufferin’s license it acquired from Beamish for Teedon Pit is in place under the old legislation, and, as such, there is no duty to consult.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the expansion, there will be a duty to consult elected band officials.

Next Steps

The committee agreed that issues raised in the first meeting will guide the future discussions; however, in the immediate term, Dufferin will work to address some of the concerns regarding dust, traffic, and noise.

The group decided that the next meeting will take place on Tuesday, April 3 from 6:30pm-8:30pm.