



FOUR REVIEWERS SATISFIED WITH TECHNICAL REPORTS

Capital Paving's technical consultants, peer reviewers for the Township of Woolwich and Waterloo Region, and other third-party reviewers have continued to move forward on the application for the proposed Shantz Station Pit during the global COVID-19 pandemic, since most of the work can be done from the consultants' and reviewers' home offices or during site visits while maintaining physical distancing.

Meanwhile, considered to be providing an "essential service" by the Ontario government, Capital's work crews have been on the job (while practicing social distancing and other infection control measures), with more projects upcoming in the months ahead. The company is building critical infrastructure and helping to keep a part of the provincial economy moving.

Projects over the winter and spring have included site

servicing for a large medical equipment company locating to Guelph. Upcoming work includes road paving projects for the City of Guelph, the reconstruction of a section of Erb Street in Waterloo, and repaving a section of Highway #401 in Halton – from just west of Milton to east of the Wellington County Line.

Capital's technical reports on hydrogeology and visual impact have satisfied the peer reviewers. The Grand River Conservation Authority has no outstanding concerns with the proposed pit, and the archaeology report has satisfied the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, Culture and Industries.

The reviewers did make some recommendations about the proposed pit operations and mitigation measures, to which the company has agreed. Highlights of the reviews include:

● HYDROGEOLOGY

The hydrogeology peer reviewer hired by the Region of Waterloo indicated he was satisfied with the answers to most of his questions about Capital's hydrogeology report, including why Capital's consultant studied wells within 500 metres of the site when the Region's guidelines indicate that wells be studied within one kilometre. The peer reviewer accepted the justification that since the pit will be above the water table, there is no potential to generate a zone of influence that may cause interference to nearby domestic wells.

The peer reviewer did make two recommendations, which Capital has accepted:

- 1) That there be monthly checks of any on-site fuel tanks or containers, and that documentation of the checks be included in the pit's annual report to the Township and Region.
- 2) That groundwater samples be taken for geochemical analysis from all five groundwater monitoring wells in the spring and summer on an annual basis, with background conditions established prior to the pit opening, in accordance with the Region's guidelines.

The hydrogeology peer reviewer has no outstanding issues with Capital's hydrogeology work in support of the pit application.

● VISUAL IMPACT

The visual impact peer reviewers hired by the Township of Woolwich indicated that "the potential visual impact for the identified views will be adequately mitigated by the proposed mitigation plan, and the existing landscape and topography." However, they did ask for an addendum or updated report to assess the potential visual impacts to the residence at 1224 Maryhill Road and the Merry-Hill Golf Club.

Capital's visual impact consultant agreed to do this. In the resulting addendum, the company agreed to plant vegetative screening north of the pit site prior to the start of extraction and to create a three-metre berm – and retain existing vegetation – between the pit lands and the property at 1224 Maryhill Road. The company also agreed to increase the berm height between the pit lands and the golf club lands from three metres to six metres, and retain the existing vegetation along the property line, as well as within the setback area where possible. Additional tree planting will also occur.

The peer reviewers followed up by stating they were satisfied their comments about visual impacts to the Maryhill Road residence and the golf club had been addressed, and concluded that the potential visual impacts to significant views will be adequately mitigated.

– continued on page 2.

● GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION AUTHORITY REVIEW

Officials with the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA) reviewed Capital's planning justification, hydrogeology and natural environment reports, as well as the site plan for the proposed Shantz Station Pit.

They visited the site and requested additional information about such things as the internal haul road, any impacts on the Breslau Wetland Complex and buffer enhancements (including phasing and proposed planting densities). They also made recommendations about additional water monitoring and requested further details be added to documents dealing with ecological mitigation measures.

Capital's consultants responded by conducting more detailed hydrogeology work, and by preparing an "Access Road Management/Ecological Enhancement and Compensation Plan." The GRCA reviewers noted they were satisfied with this plan, including that the work to upgrade the internal haul road can be done without negatively impacting the wetland/ecological features, as well as agreeing to the proposed ecological enhancements outlined in the compensation plan.

In early May, the GRCA indicated that all its comments had been satisfactorily addressed and that it had no further concerns with the pit application.

● ARCHAEOLOGY

Capital's archaeology report was reviewed by the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, Culture and Industries. The review was carried out "...in order to determine whether [Capital's] licensed professional consultant archaeologist has met the terms and conditions of their licence, that the licensee assessed the property and documented archaeological resources using a process...set by the ministry, and the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations are consistent with the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario."

It was concluded that "...the ministry is satisfied that the fieldwork and reporting for the archaeological assessment are consistent with the ministry's 2011 Standards and Guidelines...and the terms and conditions for archaeological licences."

The ministry's response to Capital's archaeology report was sent to Capital in what is commonly known as an archaeological clearance letter.

The hydrogeology and visual impact peer reviews and responses, as well as the GRCA review and the review of the archaeological assessment are posted on the Shantz Station Pit website www.shantzstationpit.com.

Highlights of the remaining reviews and responses from Capital's technical consultants will be published in subsequent issues of this news bulletin as the work is completed.

* Please note that during this COVID-19 pandemic, Capital will not be mailing out paper copies of our newsletter, however we will send out paper copies of this and subsequent newsletters in future. In the meantime, our newsletters will be issued electronically to those people whose email addresses we have on file, and also post them on our website.