

From: [Jessie Fehrman](#)
To: [Deputy Clerk](#)
Subject: Re: Notice of Public Meeting: Questions
Date: March 2, 2023 1:03:41 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

My apologies,
My previous email should have been addressed to the City of Port Colborne City Clerk.

Sincerely,

Jessie

On Thu, Mar 2, 2023 at 12:55 PM Jessie Fehrman [REDACTED] wrote:

Hello Office of the Regional Clerk,

My name is Jessie Fehrman, and I am sending the following questions and considerations for the public meeting for the Official Plan and Zoning by-Law Amendment on the lands legally known as Part of Lots 17, 18, 19 Concession 2 for the Port Colborne Pit 3 extension. **I want to state that our family has lived in this area, and on property surrounding the quarry for many generations, and we know better than most how accessible the rock is for an operation like a Quarry. We are supportive of the development of Port Colborne Quarries, Pit 3, and the progress this can contribute to. We have some questions to ensure the sustainability of the quarry project, our home, and farm business, but overall, hope that both the quarry operations and the surrounding residents can prosper.**

Please confirm that you have received these questions and if there is anything else that is needed to consider them.

Well Water Questions:

1. On page 20 of the Hydrogeological Impact Assessment section 6.3 it states "The closest water wells to the proposed extension are at five houses situated south of Highway No. 3 ranging from approximately 75 m to 110 m from the proposed extension (Figure 16). The predicted drawdown for the distances of 100 m and 150 m from the quarry are approximately 2.6 m and 2.8 m respectively. The potential for drawdown will be assessed based on the groundwater monitoring program, including monthly groundwater level monitoring of monitoring wells MW17-8 and MW17-9. Any complaints will be addressed by the complaint response program". With the proposed setback from the highway being 30 meters (instead of the 90 meters that the assessment was based on) would this change the distance of the 5 houses located south of Highway 3, and the predicted drawdown of the well water?
2. On page 88 of the hydrogeological assessment it states "A monitoring and response program is in place for the existing quarry to detect groundwater level drawdown at the monitoring well locations. A response program will be initiated, if required, to evaluate potential impacts and implement operational measures, or contingency measures, to prevent an interruption of the water supply or to restore the supply. This monitoring and

response program will include all residences within 1,000 meters of the licence.” Is there a phone number, email, or process for contacting PCQ to access their “water restoration program” or “complaint response program”? Has this process already been initiated for Pit 1 or 2? Have any residences worked through the “water restoration program from the extraction from Pit 1 or 2?

3. Within the Hydrogeological Assessment document in Table 6 – “Water Well Survey Summary, Port Colborne Quarries” is the list of wells on properties within 1km of the expansion property. Our wells are not listed on this list, and I am wondering if they should be and if others may be missing? On page 20 of the document it states that “Properties that were included in the water well survey by WSP were not included in this survey.” and we wondered why they were not included as we filled out this survey? With our wells not being listed, will this affect our ability to seek assistance through the “water restoration program”?

Blast Impact Questions:

1. In the Blast Impact Assessment Document, on page 7 it states that “Sixty-three (63) sensitive receptors near the Site have been identified. These are listed in APPENDIX C, Table C1 and displayed in Figure 2. Separation distances, from the receptor to the extraction limit, shown in Table C1 are based on a 15 m extraction setback within the Quarry property limits and a 90 m setback from Hwy 3 within the Quarry Property limits”. With the calculations of the blast impact on sensitive receptors (homes nearby) being done with 90 meters as the proposed setback from the highway, is there any data to show that reducing the setback to 30 meters will not affect the “sensitive receptors” /homes?
2. In table C1 on page 1, the distance that 1577 Highway 3 is listed at is 100 meters, which the document states include a 90 meter setback. Based on Figure 4 and Table 2 (page 10) in the Blast Impact Assessment, there is no listed safe “Max. explosive charge weight” for this reduced distance. What is the “Max. Explosive Charge Weight” that could be used at this distance, and is it possible to reduce the explosive charge weight this much and still effectively blast?
3. On page 12 of the Blast Impact Assessment it states that “Assuming a single hole per delay period, the maximum explosive weight per delay of 92 kg, the MECP guideline limit of 128 dBL may be complied with for all blasting beyond a minimum distance of about 284 m from adjacent receptor residences.”. It appears that our home and other residences are within 284 meters with the 90 m setback and even closer with the proposed 30 m setback from the highway. Will this mean that the guideline limit for blasting will be exceeded by blasting within this distance? The above quote states “assuming a single hole delay” but table 1 on page 6 of the Blast Impact Assessment states the number of holes per delay for Pit 3 is listed at a max of 4. Will this increase in "delays" affect the impact of the blasts?
4. On page 14 of the Blast Impact Assessment it states that “The termination point for the blasting operations will be governed by the results of the on-site monitoring program.” Will there be any monitoring of the residences off-site? Will there be any monitoring of the surrounding homes and residences that are built on the rock?

Planning Justification Questions:

1. In the Planning Justification Report on page 5 it states that the surrounding land uses are

“South: To the south is Highway 3 (Main Street) fronting onto the south side of Highway 3 are numerous rural land uses including farmland, non-farm rural residences, and light industrial uses (sales/servicing of farming machinery, kennel / pet grooming). Has the farm property and retail location at 1577 Highway 3 (called Fehrhaven Farms) been considered in the traffic assessment and decision to move the PCQ entrance to Carl road? With the Fehrhaven Farms sometimes seeing 100s of customers on busy days between the months of June – October we are wondering if this traffic was considered in the traffic study, and what the impact was on the farm operation. If the traffic assessment was done when our farm operation is not operational, the traffic from the business has the potential to cause issues with proposed travel from quarry operations.

Sincerely,

Jessie Fehrman