



AIR QUALITY AND WATER PEER REVIEWS AND RESPONSES COMPLETED

Peer reviews of Capital Paving's air quality and hydrogeology technical reports for the proposed Shantz Station Pit have been completed, as have responses by Capital's consultants to the peer reviews.

The peer reviewers were hired by the Region of Waterloo to provide independent analyses of the technical reports prepared by Capital's consultants, with their fees covered by the company.

In addition to the peer review of Capital's hydrogeology report, the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) also reviewed the report and provided its comments and questions.

Below are highlights of the air quality and hydrogeology reviews, along with responses to the reviewers' comments from Capital's consultants:

● AIR QUALITY

The peer reviewer hired by the Region of Waterloo to review the air quality report prepared by Capital's technical consultants found that: "In general, the methodology followed in this assessment appears to be reasonable and may follow industry standards... However, there are areas where assumptions and information have not been provided, and therefore it is not possible to fully assess the completeness and appropriateness of the report."

Capital's air quality consultant prepared a "Best Management Practices Plan for Dust" in response to many of the questions raised by the peer reviewer, and also made arrangements to transfer to him the large quantity of dispersion modelling files.

The peer reviewer also wondered about a house that was leased and would be kept vacant during the operation of the pit. If not, he indicated that the house should be treated as a receptor for air quality modelling.

Capital's consultant clarified that while the pit lands would be leased by Capital for aggregate extraction, the home on the site would continue to be occupied by the owners. He noted that government guidelines indicate that the house need not be treated as a receptor since it is on the same property as the source of where the air emissions would occur.

● HYDROGEOLOGY

Waterloo's peer review of Capital's hydrogeology report raised some questions about the methodology used to prepare the data in Capital's report and requested additional information. The GRCA also asked for clarification of the data and more information.

Capital's hydrogeology consultants responded by providing additional and revised data which continued to demonstrate no anticipated impacts to the features or functions of the nearby wetland or Hopewell Creek.

The peer reviewer wondered why wells within 500 metres – and not 1 kilometre – of the site were surveyed as per the Region's guidelines. Capital's consultants noted that since the proposed pit would be above the water table, the additional surveying or sampling was not required. They noted that "there is no potential to generate a zone of influence that may cause interference to nearby domestic wells."

Capital's consultants did confirm to the Region's peer reviewer and the GRCA reviewer that a comprehensive testing regime would be added to the pit's hydrogeological monitoring program and the site plans.

The air quality peer review and response, and the hydrogeology reviews and responses, have been posted on the Shantz Station Pit website www.shantzstationpit.com.

Highlights of the remaining peer reviews, comments from provincial agencies and responses from Capital's technical consultants will be published in future issues of this news bulletin as the work is completed.