



April 15, 2013

Jason McLay
Ministry of Natural Resources
1 Stone Road West
Guelph, Ontario
N1G 4Y2

Attention: Jason McLay

RECEIVED
APR 18 2013
TOWNSHIP OF
GUELPH / ERAMOSIA

**Re: Proposed Hidden Quarry - 634745 Ontario Limited (James Dick Construction)
Class A, Category 2 Pit and Quarry License and Zoning By-law Amendment Application
ZBA 09/12 (Hidden Quarry)
Lot 1, Concession 6, Former Township of Eramosa
8352 Highway 7, Township of Guelph/Eramosa**

Grand River Conservation Authority staff are in receipt of an ARA application for a Category 2 Class A Pit and Quarry license. We have previously provided comments dated January 31, 2013 regarding a zoning by-law amendment application, the purpose of which is to change the zoning of the subject property from "A" Agricultural to "M3" Extractive Industrial to allow for an aggregate extraction operation. GRCA recommends deferral of the ARA application and zoning by-law amendment until our comments have been addressed and GRCA Staff are provided an opportunity to conduct a site visit to be scheduled between County Staff, GRCA Staff, OMNR and the proponents at the appropriate time of year prior to our support of this application.

GRCA staff are currently reviewing the GRCA Cumulative Effects Paper prepared by Harden Environmental and will provide comments upon completion of review.

Technical Staff had the opportunity to review the Comment Matrix Cuesta March 12, 2013 and Figures 10, 11 & 12. We can provide the following comments on the response matrix and plans:

1. Harden Environmental Services Ltd has satisfactorily addressed GRCA comments regarding confirmation of backwater elevations flood plain through response #85. Please update plans to demonstrate that excavation boundaries and proposed buffers are beyond this elevation.
2. With respect to response #86, the proponent and GRCA will discuss on-site the requirements for a fluvial geomorphologic assessment to establish the meander belt width and setback requirements.
3. Given the cold water fish habitat classification downstream of the proposed quarry site, the required completion of the fluvial geomorphologic assessment and given our concerns regarding a potential drawdown in the headwater reaches of this unnamed tributary of Blue Springs Creek, an appropriate extraction setback from the intermittent Tributary B on the subject property still needs to be determined.

4. With respect to responses #87 & 88, the GRCA's principal concern is wetland hydroperiod, which would include the depth, duration, and extent of ponding or flooding within wetlands both on and off the subject property. The proponent should examine if there is an increased downward gradient during extraction and provide results for review to the GRCA.
5. The silt barrier will only serve to prevent lateral groundwater flow out of the wetland. According to Figure 3.10 of the hydrogeological assessment (Harden 2012), the bedrock groundwater levels are just below the bottom of the southwest wetland. Figure 5.1 further suggests that there is groundwater flow out of both wetlands under existing conditions. How was the location of the silt barrier chosen? Will shallow groundwater movement into the southwest wetland be maintained? Again, we suggest that the location and design details be discussed at the site meeting and after the wetland boundaries have been verified in the field by the GRCA.
6. With respect to response #89, there is some concern that flows further downstream along Tributary B will be reduced further as a result of the maximum predicted drawdowns within the headwater wetland upstream of the site (see Harden 2012, Figure 4.3). The streamflow data for the last decade is for on-site conditions of the Tributary B only. The impacts downstream should be examined and results provided for review by the GRCA.
7. The context of the comment was clarified with the response #102; however, what are the implications to Tributary B within its surface catchment area? Will the surface water and shallow ground water movement be sufficiently maintained?
8. With respect to response #90, a pizemoeter would need to be installed upstream of the subject lands in order to monitor water levels and temperatures of the creek entering the site to be used for baseline measurements. Updated site plan and monitoring plan to reflect the two additional Water Quality monitoring locations and upstream monitoring locations should be submitted to our office for review.
9. Page 2 of the Operations Plan provides technical recommendations for the monitoring plan. Staff suggests that monthly measurements of groundwater levels, surface water levels, surface water flow will not provide a sufficient level of precision. Continuous monitoring using data loggers is recommended and should be submitted to the MNR (Guelph District).
10. The primary objectives of the requested site visit will be to verify wetland and creek boundaries on the subject property and to review setbacks from these features. The unevaluated 0.2 ha wetland situated along the creek corridor is located within 750 m of a portion of the Provincially Significant Eramosa River – Blue Springs Creek Wetland Complex. Given the apparent hydrological connection, we suggest that the wetland complexing rules outlined in the Ontario Wetland Evaluation Manual be applied to this unevaluated wetland and that OMNR provide comment directly on this point.

11. Page 2 of the Operations Plan currently provides for a 30 m setback from the southwest wetland but also suggests that a reduced 20 m setback may be established pending the outcome of archaeology review and clearance. The GRCA supports the 30 m setback illustrated on the plans. Rationale needs to be provided in writing to GRCA staff for a reduction in the 30 m setback and the areas examined in detail on-site.
12. The wetland boundary and development buffers confirmed by GRCA staff should be plotted on the Operational Plans.
13. With respect to response #95 & #96, we respectfully request a copy of the ELC data sheets as this would help support the ELC mapping information presented in the Level 2 report.
14. With respect to responses #97-99, the woodland on this site exceeds the County's size threshold for significance. Therefore, the GRCA recommends that this woodland be assessed for significance and any linkages with nearby woodlands in accordance with the County and Provincial guidance and be forward to the GRCA and County for review. County and GRCA to verify the limit of the significant woodland on the subject property in correlation with the Natural Environmental Report.
15. The limits of Significant Woodlands and development buffers confirmed by GRCA and County staff should be plotted on the Operational Plans.
16. The GRCA is satisfied with the response regarding the identification and protection of Significant Wildlife Habitat on this site but requests that the MNR be consulted regarding the potential presence of Little Brown Bat, which was recently listed as an Endangered species in Ontario and is currently afforded protection under the Endangered Species Act.
17. Generally, the GRCA is supportive of the progressive and final rehabilitation plans (Section 7.6) and supports the recommended wetland restoration and enhancement plans for the site. It is necessary to demonstrate that the alteration of an existing wetland could be consistent with the GRCA's Wetland Policy and demonstrated through an EIS addendum.
18. Proponent to provide culvert details of the proposed stream crossing for review by GRCA staff and details to be included on the site plan. The placement of the structure will result in the loss of stream habitat. This should be addressed in an addendum to the RIS.

The application fees are still outstanding. Invoice No. ²³³³2264 was forward to the applicant for a *Below the Water Table* Aggregate Act Application with features of interest within 120 metres of license limit, in conjunction with this Zoning By-law Amendment, being reviewed by GRCA staff.

Please contact Heather Ireland at 519-621-2763 ext. 2320 to schedule a site visit between the County, GRCA staff, OMNR and the proponents.

Yours truly,






























Fred Natolochny MCIP RPP
Supervisor of Resource Planning
Grand River Conservation Authority
FN/hi

- cc. ✓ Township of Guelph-Eramosa c/o Janice Sheppard
County of Wellington c/o Aldo Salis
Regional Municipality of Halton c/o Adam Huycke
Burnside c/o Carley Dixon
Cuesta Planning Consultants Inc. c/o Mike Davis – 978 First Avenue West, Owen Sound ON N4K 4K5
James Dick Construction c/o Greg Sweetnam & Leigh Mugford – Box 470 Bolton ON L7E 5T4

Hidden Quarry

LEGEND

-  WATERHEDED BOUNDARY (GRCA)
-  UTILITY LINE (NRVS)
-  ROADS-ADDRESSED (NRVS)
-  RAILWAY (NRVS)
-  CLASSIFIED STREAMS - NEW (NRVS)
-  COLD WATER
-  COOL WATER
-  UNKNOWN
-  WARM WATER
-  DRAINAGE-NETWORK (GRCA)
-  PARCELS-ASSESSMENT (MPAC)
-  LOTS (NRVS)
-  FLOODPLAIN (GRCA)
-  ENGINEERED
-  APPROXIMATE
-  ESTIMATED
-  WETLAND (GRCA)
-  SLOPE VALLEY (GRCA)
-  STEEP
-  OVERSTEEP
-  SLOPE EROSION (GRCA)
-  STEEP
-  OVERSTEEP
-  TDE
-  REGULATION LIMIT (GRCA)
-  DRAINAGE-POLY (NRVS)
-  ZMB CRTHO (CMT)

GRCA Disclaimer
This map is for illustrative purposes only. Information contained herein is not a substitute for professional review or a site survey and is subject to change without notice. The Grand River Conservation Authority takes no responsibility for, nor guarantees, the accuracy of the information contained on this map. Any interpretations or conclusions drawn from this map are the sole responsibility of the user.
The source for each data layer is shown in parentheses in the map legend. For a complete listing of sources and details go to:
<http://apps.grandriver.ca/Docs/Sources/Classification2.html>

The source for each data layer is shown in parentheses in the map legend. For a complete listing of sources and details go to:
<http://apps.grandriver.ca/Docs/Sources/Classification2.html>

0 110 220 330 440 m
Scale 1:8794
NAD 1983, UTM Zone 17

