

I am a Professional Geologist, with 40 years of experience in Exploration Geology, Consulting Engineering & Planning. I live in Fernwood Estates.

I must take issue with the Alternative Site Analysis (ASA) prepared by MHBC.

1. The authors state that “The main purpose of the ASA is to assess compliance with Policy 2.5.4.1 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)”. I would contend that, while such a report is *required* by the PPS, the main purpose should be the identification and evaluation of other potential sites.
2. No Geologist was involved in this analysis. Geologists are scientists who study the Earth: its history, materials and processes. We know what is under our feet, and how it got there.
3. The study area was actually defined by Walkers. Their “Market Area” became the “Study Area”. This is hardly objective.
4. The “study” is then further constrained by areas labelled as “Potential Resource Area – Stone”. And yet no sources are cited for the determination of these areas.

So, where did these shapes come from? Are they accurate? And are they really the only areas where such a resource might exist? They did not come from an Aggregate Resource Inventory Paper (ARIP), as one has never been prepared for the Region. It would appear that these areas were outlined around the time that the current Regional & City Official Plans were being developed. But again, no geologists were involved, and the source, or reasoning, for the creation of these shapes is unknown.

If we are looking for an alternative site, we must ask “What ‘Stone’ is Walkers looking for?” Based on reports that their consultants have submitted, they are looking to extract from the Lockport Formation. And where do we find the Lockport Formation? Almost everywhere! It is certainly, and absolutely, not limited to the areas shown in this report.

So what is wrong with the ASA?

1. It is constrained to a study area defined and limited by the proponent - who has no objectivity.
2. It is limited by areas labelled “Potential Resource Area - Stone”, the accuracy of which is disputed.

All of which falsely suggests that dolostone is a rare commodity – when it is ubiquitous in the region.

This is a perfect classic example of a study done with a known outcome in mind. A study designed to find no other suitable location, by unfairly and inaccurately limiting the scope of the work.