

Agency	Comment	Response
	<b>General TORs</b>	
Peel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Background Section: "...significant woodland has been identified along the valley of the tributary". Should note that the area is also a significant wildlife habitat and although unevaluated, the wetlands are a significant hydrological and natural heritage feature under the Greenbelt Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on wetlands will be included.</li> </ul>
CVC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It should indicate that the JART is retaining the consultants (since Brampton provided the entire JART Committee with the peer review docs), rather than City of Brampton retaining the services of Peer reviewers.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The JART is an advisory stakeholder group administered by the City of Brampton, to discuss/share knowledge on the application to the benefit of all the participating Agencies. The JART, therefore, aids decision-making. Each participating Agency remains independent and provides their comments on the application separately.</li> </ul>
Halton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Terms of Reference should allow peer reviewer consultants the flexibility to comment on matters that they feel are relevant based on their professional opinions. However, some guidance does need to be provided to ensure that all pertinent matters are addressed and appropriately captured in the proposals submitted by the consultants.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City will provide guidelines for the peer reviewers to inform how they will conduct their assessment. The City will provide guidelines for the peer reviewers to allow this flexibility. These guidelines will be appended to the TORs</li> </ul>
Peel	<p><b>Requirements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Second bullet point: "the policy framework (provincial, regional and area municipalities) and the requirements of the ARA Ontario Aggregate Standards, the Planning Act, other relevant legislation and regulations and accepted best practices".</li> <li>The peer reviewer should note if Agency concerns are taken into account in the technical reports and in a manner adequate for this type of submission.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Comment on Policy framework will be included. The policy framework which the peer reviewers will have to consult in their assessment will be strongly outlined in a document appended to the TORs. The Brampton OP/ Peel Regional OP will be included among these policy documents.</li> <li>Agency comments, as expressed as part of the JART process in order to share</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Fourth Bullet should clarify “Team” refers to JART</li> <li>· Add new bullet: Peer reviewers are to evaluate materials and reports for technical completeness and provide an assessment of proposed mitigation measures.</li> <li>· Amend Sixth bullet: to provide advice on the appropriateness of short and long term viability of any proposed mitigation measures related to the specific topic area.</li> </ul>	<p>information, and, to aid decision-making, will be considered in this peer review. The peer review will evaluate the technical study supplied by Brampton Brick. A review of previous technical reports/materials is beyond the scope of this exercise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Team will refer to JART</li> <li>· The peer review will explore if the technical report is “complete” and will assess whether the proposed mitigation measures (short term and long term) are satisfactory.</li> </ul>
Halton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· It has been stated that a further iteration of the preliminary technical studies is required and it is assumed that this will mean one iteration. Given the complexities of aggregate applications, it is anticipated that more than one iteration may be required and that supplementary information may need to be exchanged back and forth with the applicant that would require analysis by the peer review consultants.</li> <li>· It is difficult to predict how many JART meetings may be required that the peer reviewers may be required to attend. To address the financial impacts, it is suggested that wording be included in the Terms of Reference that asks the peer review consultants to provide their hourly rates, by staff person, in the work plan budget to account for any additional review work, technical meetings and preparation of comments.</li> <li>· The peer reviewer is asked to participate in the consultation process outlined in municipal documents including Official Plans that would need to be followed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The purpose of the peer review is to identify any data deficiencies or concerns with the approach, content and applicability of the specific study supporting the planning application. The peer reviews will be undertaken from the studies submitted with the rezoning application. For budgeting purposes, it is difficult to anticipate should more than one iteration be required. Approval from the City is required prior to proceeding with any work beyond the budget.</li> <li>· Will include note that peer review consultants are to provide their hourly rates, by staff person, in the work plan budget to account for any additional review work, technical meetings and preparation of comments</li> <li>· The results of the peer reviewers will be presented in Council reports. The peer reviewer will also participate in other meetings, as required.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The first paragraph should be revised to include the following text at the end "...and provide recommendations for additional work/studies (i.e. inventories) of deficiencies in data collection are identified as part of the peer review".</li> <li>Second bullet of the requirements should specifically mention that the Greenbelt Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement and continue to reference other relevant legislation and accepted best practices.</li> <li>Under peer review requirements, "the draft terms of reference for all peer reviewers are attached..." need to clarify whether the draft terms of terms are attached, or found below in the document.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be revised.</li> <li>This section will be expanded to reflect this comment.</li> <li>The City will provide guidelines for the peer reviewers to inform how they will conduct their assessment. These guidelines will be appended to the TORs</li> </ul>
Halton	<p><b>Deliverables</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Terms of Reference should indicate that format the consultant should use to provide feedback to the City of Brampton and to JART (Report, letter, memo).</li> <li>The City/ JART may want to specify a digital copy as well as the number of hard copies that may be required (for example, in case each agency in JART needs a hard copy).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peer reviewers are required to provide two presentations for Council and a report setting out final conclusions on the application.</li> <li>The peer review consultant will provide a digital copy of the final report, which will be distributed to JART members via Email. Drafts will only be available electronically.</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>		
Peel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ID specific areas of review with respect to natural heritage system and influence of groundwater. Consult with CVC to ID a list of the main natural heritage concerns and issues that could be identified. This list would not limit the review, but would capture the main elements to consider.</li> <li>Amend the third bullet point: the reviewer is to provide advice to the City on the completeness and acceptability of preliminary reports "in terms of the <u>identification and evaluation</u> of potential effects on terrestrial and aquatic ecology. The reviewer should provide an assessment of additional studies/work that are required and to identify measures that can</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CVC will provide their info/conclusions based on their mandate.</li> <li>The peer review will identify the gaps in the supporting studies (the work undertaken and presented for Brampton Brick). Mitigation measures that are not considered in the original studies should not be proposed.</li> </ul>

	<p>be taken, where appropriate. In addition, I would likely be of assistance to have the reviewer provide an assessment of additional studies/work that are required and to identify mitigating measures that can be taken, where appropriate.</p>	
Halton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· From a qualification perspective the peer reviewer or peer review team should include a terrestrial ecologist or professional with similar qualifications, familiar with woodland issues, including criteria for significance and current conservation biology science regarding appropriate woodland buffers and the requirements for woodlands within the Greenbelt.</li> <li>· From a qualification perspective, the peer reviewer or peer review team should include a qualified wetland evaluator (per MNR standards regarding the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System for Southern Ontario) and be qualified to ensure the requirements of the Greenbelt Plan are addressed.</li> <li>· Third bullet of the requirements section is recommended to be revised: "Provide advice to the City on the completeness of the preliminary reports and their acceptability in terms of potential reports on natural heritage features and functions including terrestrial and aquatic ecology, conservation biology and hydrogeology and identify any required additional data collection and/or analysis together with advising on recommended natural heritage enhancements to the applications were appropriate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Will request for this detail with the staff profiles that are requested with the work plan and budget.</li> <li>· Will be revised.</li> </ul>
Susan Jorgenson (Brampton)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To understand the Natural Environment Report, I would suggest that this reviewer will also have to review (but not necessarily comment on) the hydrogeological report and possibly Heritage Report. This may be covered off by Bullet 2 on Page 3; however, not sure.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Will encourage collaboration among peer reviewers.</li> </ul>
	<b>Hydrological, Hydrogeological and Quarry Design and Operations</b>	
Peel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Peer review studies should provide an assessment of report findings related to previous agency comments and requirements. In previous comments regarding Hydrogeologic Workplan for the Proposed Norval Quarry and the Preliminary Hydrogeological Assessment of the Proposed Norval Quarry, the Region provided a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Agency comments, as expressed as part of the JART process in order to share information, and, to aid decision-making, will be considered in this peer review. The peer review will evaluate the technical study supplied by Brampton Brick. A review of previous</li> </ul>

	<p>number of comments re: assessment of impacts to private wells and indicated that outstanding/further issues would need to be addressed as part of the Level 2 Hydrogeological Report, the licensing process, and long-term as appropriate. Will the existing technical sub missions and/or related commitments are to be reviewed against these previous comments?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Last statement on Pg 1 “One neighbouring private well that may experience an impact to water level, as a result of the Quarry operation, is Well #33 (located N/E of the proposed quarry border). This reference to one specific well should be removed because many more wells could be affected. The focus should instead be placed on review of the adequacy of the proposed mitigative measures involving the entire zone of influence.</li> </ul>	<p>technical reports/materials is beyond the scope of this exercise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The peer review will consider the entire area, however, well #33 was noted specifically because the technical report highlighted it as a potential concern.</li> </ul>
CVC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· How is Fluvio Geomorphology being addressed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· A geomorphology review can be addressed as part of the hydrology review.</li> </ul>
Halton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Background section, first paragraph remove and rephrase into bullet points: “assess the potential for future effects of dewatering on the local groundwater levels, to provide information to allow for the assessment of potential effects on surface water courses, and to establish a monitoring well network for the purpose of monitoring these effects over time”.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· This direction will be reflected in bullet points.</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Assessment</b>		
Halton Hills	<p>The Preliminary reports referenced in the TOR should also include a review and assessment of the following major transportation studies as background materials: 1) MTO GTA-WEST corridor Planning Study                  Halton-Peel Boundary Area TMP Study</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Major transportation studies that concern the subject area should be reflected in the applicant’s technical report. This will reflect with infrastructure that exists, or is part of, a municipality’s 10 year capital works program. The peer reviewer will evaluate if this has been completed satisfactorily.</li> </ul>

	<b>Air Quality Assessment</b>	No comments received
	<b>Heritage Assessment</b>	No comments received
	<b>Noise Assessment</b>	No comments received
	<b>Visual Assessment</b>	No comments received
	<b>Soil Assessment</b>	No comments received

Norval Pit-Stop Comments	City of Brampton Response
<b>General</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Terms of Reference (TOR) documents require site visits (usually 2). These site visits must be conducted so that seasonal effects are not lost. Two visits a month apart would tell a limited story. In fact two visits may not be sufficient.</li> <li>• The peer review teams are tasked with evaluation for completeness and identification of any gaps. It is not clear what benchmarks are being used to measure completeness. This should be more specifically addressed.</li> <li>• The various review teams are tasked to apply their expertise in reviewing specific areas, and this is good. However, these aspects of the study do not exist in isolation. The interrelationships among them, and the cumulative effects of several cannot be ignored. Inter-disciplinary reviews should be conducted for interdependent and cumulative effects that might otherwise be missed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peer reviewers are expected to become familiar with the site and vicinity. However, they are not expected to conduct new reviews, monitor or collect samples. Peer reviewers are encouraged to attend one initial site visit. However, if required for a further iteration, up to two site visits may be reasonable.</li> <li>• the peer reviewer will evaluate the compliance of the technical report with applicable Provincial guidelines</li> <li>• Peer reviewers will be encouraged to interact to establish interlinkages and collaboration.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will neighbouring residents and other concerned citizens be consulted by the Peer reviewers? How can local stakeholders check that their perspective and intimate knowledge on eh quarry impacts has not been over looked?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Following the completion of the peer reviews, City Staff will appear at Planning Committee to report on the findings and will seek direction to undertake public consultation with area residents/local stakeholders. The public may formally provide additional comments to the City at this time. Members of the public may contact the City at any time to discuss the status of the file.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there no need to study social impacts, rehabilitation plans, financial impact, alternative sites, or enforcing operation compliance (such as a weigh scale to make sure the government is getting it's share of the levy)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These aspects are considered strongly, not only by the City but also the additional Agencies (Peel Region, Credit Valley Conservation, Ministry of Natural Resources, etc...) who participate on the City-led Joint Aggregate Review Team.</li> <li>• Please note that Brampton Brick has provided details on an Operational Plan, Progressive Rehabilitation, Final Rehabilitation and Environmental Management, as part of their Nov 2008 Planning Report.</li> <li>• Although a specific report on social impacts has not been provided by the Applicant; the overall planning report (Nov 2008) will be reviewed and assessed for social impacts accordingly.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How much of shale will be exported and impacts compounded by the future Heritage Heights development?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beyond the scope of the Planning Act and Aggregate Resources Act. Need is a matter already addressed by the Provincial Government, through the Provincial Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>why has there not been application for a permit to take water, certificate of approval for air quality, or a quarry license?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant must apply for these provisions, at their prerogative. As these applications will not be made to the City, the City cannot direct when they should be made.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do two site visits (min.) include visiting neighbouring properties?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The site visits will focus on the site area specified in the reports provided by the applicant, Brampton Brick. Adjacent properties are a major consideration in assessing whether the application will impact the character of the existing area.</li> </ul>
<b>Aerial and Location Map</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the Norval Quarry Study and peer review of same are confined to the 500 Meter buffer from the site, the impact on transportation will not be properly addressed, and a larger buffer zone is needed to address the concerns re groundwater draw-down, noise and cultural heritage. If the map is part of the TOR, then it is too spatially restrictive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The study area will extend 1km from the proposed quarry boundary and along the proposed haul route.</li> </ul>
<b>Surficial Soil Study</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirements should include a specific task to review the Study for the soils aspect of the groundwater draw-down issue. Claims have been verbally made that shale quarries present lesser subwatershed impacts than, for example, limestone quarries. The technical report cannot be considered complete unless this issue is addressed and the conclusions quantitatively validated. This perspective is needed in addition to that of the Hydrological team.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This issue will be brought to the attention of the consultant retained to undertake the hydrogeological peer review study.</li> </ul>
<b>Hydrological, Hydrogeological and Quarry Design and Operations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The review should determine whether there are sufficient remedies available to the local residents if their water supplies are affected in quantity or quality. These remedies should include limitations on operations, excavation depth and/or area, and backfilling to restore water supplies. The provision of municipal water may not be deemed an adequate remedy by the residents, and this needs to be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peer review will evaluate if the technical report has identified sufficient water supply remedies to the local residents if there are impacts caused by the Quarry operation.</li> </ul>



examined.	
<b>Visual Impact</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Truck traffic is a visual impact that needs to be addressed under this section.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traffic study will assess the implications of truck movements on haul routes and road designated for truck movements.</li> </ul>
<b>Noise Control</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peer reviewer needs to ensure that the study addresses the noise impact of truck traffic between the site and the brick factory in addition to the noise impact of extraction operations at the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peer reviewer will be directed to evaluate if noise impacts for truck-traffic have been assessed.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural Heritage</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cultural heritage issues must include the haul route from the site to the brick factory. I believe the requirements cover this</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is expected that a Cultural heritage landscape assessment will be undertaken. The Haul Route may or may not be included.</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Environment</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on the tributary must be evaluated in the Credit River Watershed context, recognizing that the watershed can be destroyed, one tributary at a time.</li> <li>The impact of the elimination of natural environmental regeneration in the study area must be considered. One must look beyond the life presently supported in the area to include the species and populations that can potentially be supported by natural development in this greenbelt zone.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beyond the scope of the component study</li> <li>Beyond the scope of the component study</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Assessment</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This study must encompass comprehensive traffic studies with traffic projections up until operations cease and remediation of the site is completed. Also the aspects of safety of truck operators, motorists, pedestrians, neighbours must be considered. Will truck traffic be permitted at time that school busses are operating on the affected roads?</li> <li>Any road improvements (widening, turning lanes, etc.) must be included in the cultural, natural environment and heritage studies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This comment will be provided to the consultant undertaking the peer review.</li> </ul>

<b>Air Quality</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The air quality aspects of extraction operations will certainly be addressed. But the study must also address air quality impacts of machinery and vehicles including trucks over the full transportation route.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Normally, dust impacts are not an issue where trucks share external paved roads.</li> </ul>
<b>Archeology Assessment</b>	No comments received

Brampton Brick Comments	City of Brampton Response
<b>General</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 1 refers to “preliminary technical reports”. Only the Golder and Aercoustics reports are titled “Preliminary. Consequently, this word should be deleted from paragraph 1, in 7 of the drafts,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted. Will be revised as per suggestion.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discussion between report authors and peer reviewers should be open and confirmed in writing;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interaction between the peer reviewer and the report/study author is to be “open”, allowing the peer reviewer the opportunity to ask questions and to request additional information for clarification once their preliminary review is complete. Any interaction will occur via email and will be documented.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant will receive copies of all work plans, reports, presentation notes and report inputs;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In order for the peer reviews to remain objective and transparent, the applicant, Brampton Brick, will receive a copy of all relevant final information that is publically available. No draft reports will be distributed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The surficial soil peer review should be included in the scope of Natural Environment;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noted and will be considered in the Natural Environment technical report review.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where applicable, technical reports should be evaluated according to established Ontario standards;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peer review exercise will evaluate if the technical reports meet the legislative context.</li> </ul>
<p>Where the Applicant's consultants are preparing Level 2 or similar reports, peer reviews should be initiated when these reports have been submitted.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A peer review will be undertaken for all technical reports submitted in support of the planning application. Arguably, Level 2 reports build on the initial reports.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General Comments – Terms of Reference for Peer review Assignments                      “If our Client is to assume the cost of these peer reviews, we would appreciate 1 hard copy and 1 digital copy of the preliminary and final peer review reports, all presentation notes and inputs to Council reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To clarify, the primarily objective of the TORs is to assess the detail and mitigation measures proposed in the technical reports provided by the Consultants in order to assist the City in evaluating the planning application. Presentations to Committee and Council is meant for info-sharing and updating on the results of the peer review exercise. Final reports and materials will be available to the application, no draft versions will be available for public review.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It may be inappropriate to specify “a minimum of two site visits”. Peer reviewers are expected to become familiar with the site and vicinity. However, they are not expected to conduct studies, monitor or collect samples. Consequently, in all cases, one initial site visit should be sufficient. In the event that a “further iteration is required, it may be appropriate for the natural environment and water resources peer reviewers to return to the site. None of the other peer review assignments should require more than one site visit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peer reviewers may ask questions of the report authors once a preliminary draft of their review is complete. The applicant will have to coordinate having the report authors attend site visits.</li> <li>Peer reviewers are encouraged to attend one initial site visit. However, if required for a further iteration, up to two site visits area reasonable.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft ToR provide that site visits will be “conducted by the applicants”. To this, the City should add consistent with our Peer Review Protocol comments above, “and accompanied by the report author”.</li> </ul>	<p>The applicant will have to coordinate having the report authors attend site visits.</p>
<p>Bullet #3: Meetings and Discussions between Authors and Peer Reviewers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The third bullet point indicates that meetings and discussions: “are not required prior to the completion of the preliminary peer review report”. Consistent with our recommendations with respect to site visits, and with Item (c) of the City’s draft Peer Review Protocol, discussions between our Client’s report authors and the City’s consultants are essential to fostering an objective, professional review relationship.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As indicated in the draft TORs, meetings and discussions among the peer reviewers and the report authors will not be required prior to the completion of a draft report. This is necessary to ensure that the results of the peer review are independent and transparent.</li> </ul>
<p>Bullet #4: Gaps and Mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The text should indicate that gaps “may” rather than “will be identified. Consistent with Protocol Principle (c), open interaction between the authors and the City’s peer reviewers should not preclude: “mitigation measures that are not consistent in the original studies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Text will reflect gaps “may” rather than “will” be identified.</li> <li>As indicated in the draft TORs, the peer reviews will not consider additional mitigation measures that are not in the original studies.</li> </ul>
<p>Work Plan and Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph 4 – Submission Copies: Since our Client is expected to assume the cost of these peer reviews, we would appreciate one hard copy and one digital copy of the work plans submitted by each peer reviewer.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant will receive one hard copy and one digital copy of the work plan by the selected peer reviewer. The City will make a determination on the appropriate peer reviewer.</li> </ul>
<p>Air Quality Terms of Reference</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term “compete” is vague and undefined, It should be revised to “the peer reviewer will</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bullet 4: will be revised as suggested.</li> </ul>

<p>evaluate the compliance of the technical report with applicable Provincial guidelines for conducting air quality/dispersion modeling assessment and identify any gaps in the study.</p>	
<p>Archeology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the end of paragraph 1 in Background, the Ministry is Tourism &amp; Culture” and the archeological standards are June 2009, not 2006.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be revised to stake reflect archeological standards are June 2009, not 2006</li> </ul>
<p>Cultural Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the end of paragraph 1 Background, there is reference to a Stage 3 Archeological Assessment Report. This future report will not include a cultural heritage component.</li> <li>Bullet No 2. – the word “preliminary: can be deleted since the November 2008 Cultural Heritage Resource Report is complete.</li> <li>Bullet No 4 -the term “compete’ is vague and undefined. It should be replaced with a reference to recognized guidelines as set out on Pg 40 of the Nov 2008 ASI report: “the peer reviewers will evaluate whether the technical report complies with applicable Provincial guidelines, including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Guidelines on Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments, Ministry of Culture 1980;</li> <li>-Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments, Ministry of Culture 1992, and</li> <li>-Cultural Heritage Resource Report Standards, MNR, 2006.;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration must be given to built heritage and the cultural heritage landscape.</li> <li>Your further comments will be reflected in the TORs.</li> </ul>
<p>Natural Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The City recognizes, in the last sentence of Background, that the proponent is preparing a Natural Environment Level 2 Report. Therefore, the peer review process should not be initiated until the Level 2 report has been submitted.</li> <li>Bullet No. 3 – this is a different bullet from the other ToRs. There are explicit instructions for the peer reviewer to report on the “completeness of the preliminary reports”. As noted above, this may be inappropriate, given the recognition that the Natural Environment Level 2 report is in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The peer review will proceed to evaluate the Environmental Report, unless the Level 2 peer preview is ready.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-completeness of preliminary reports comment will be removed.</li> <li>- Surficial soil considerations will be considered by the Natural Heritage peer reviewer.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

preparation.	
<p>Noise Control</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Bullet No. 3 – I may be inappropriate to use the word “complete” because it is vague and undefined. This component should be revised to: “the peer reviewer will evaluate to determine if the report complied with applicable Provincial guidelines for conducting noise control assessments, including MOE Publication MPC=232: Sound Level limits for Stationary Sources in Class 3 Areas (Rural).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Revision will be made as identified</li> </ul>
<p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Bullet No. 1 – The traffic consultant will probably conduct a windshield survey of the proposed Regional road haul route, rather than a site visit.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· A windshield survey of the proposed haul route, rather than a site visit will be option for the traffic peer reviewer to consider</li> </ul>
<p>Visual Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The title of this ToR should be “Visual Assessment Peer Reviewer”. The word “Impact” is not included in the study title.</li> <li>· Bullet No 1. – The visual assessment peer reviewer will likely conduct a windshield survey of the neighbourhood, to assess views of the site, with limited onsite activity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· “Impact” will be removed from the title.</li> <li>· A windshield survey of the neighbourhood, to assess views of the site, with limited onsite activity, rather than/ or in addition to, a site visit will be option for the traffic peer reviewer to consider.</li> </ul>
<p>Water Resources, Design &amp; Operation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The proponent is preparing a Hydrogeological Level 2 Report in accordance with Provincial Standards under the Aggregate Resources Act. Therefore, the peer review process should not be initiated until the Level 2 report is submitted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The peer review will still evaluate the Hydrogeological Report, in advance of the Level 2, because arguably, the Level 2 builds on the work and has been identified in the earlier report.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The City notes that the rezoning application included a “Draft Site Plan” in accordance with the City’s application requirements. The proposed Site Plan, based upon the consultants’ studies, including the Level 2 reports referred to in these ToRs, will be included in the Site Plan Report which accompanies future Application For A License. “Feasible mitigation measures and contingencies”, referred to in the City’s 6<sup>th</sup> objective, will described in detail in the Site Plan Report and in the associated consultants reports.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· The City will peer review the latest studies that have been submitted by Brampton Brick in support of the rezoning application.</li> <li>· A more thorough review of the site plan will be conducted when the ARA license application has been received.</li> </ul>

NW Brampton Landowners Group	City of Brampton Response
<b>General</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NW request that the BARC (Internal City staff group) meet as soon as possible and regularly with affected landowners to ensure that they are fully engaged in the process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition to the statutory requirements for consultation with the public on the rezoning application, the City will develop a project website and update as new information becomes available.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Peer reviewers should provide for the City's "exclusive use" information they deem appropriate related to all potential mitigation measures; including those which may not have been advanced by the Applicant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In order to keep the decision-making process open and transparent, the City will release the final version of the peer review studies to the public.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While Peer reviewers are not retained to conduct original work (i.e., the nature of a peer reviewers is that of a reviewer of exiting, presented materials), they do often bring a new perspective to an application that can identify concerns and/or mitigation measures that may not have been considered fully by an applicant. The City should look to the Peer Reviewers to evaluate if the technical report is "complete" (i.e., peer reviewers will identify: any data gaps or apparent deficiencies; question regarding the interpretation of data; and queries regarding conclusions offered). The Peer Reviewer will assess whether the proposed mitigation measures (short term and long term) are satisfactory and whether the applicant has fully considered what might be considered to be a reasonable range of mitigation measures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agreed, this direction will be strongly conveyed to the Peer Reviewers.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Each TOR should make reference to the existing and proposed population of Brampton, it's urban character and the recent approved residential communities constituting Mount Pleasant, Credit Valley and the Bram West Secondary Plan Areas. There should also be a reference to the decision of Council to include NWB as an "urban area." NWB is intended to be developed for a broad range of residential, institutional, open space, park, commercial and other higher order employment uses. In addition, specific mention should be made to the importance of the Credit River Valley, the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant information that is specific to the subject matter under review will be made available to the peer reviewers.</li> <li>Each peer reviewer will be provided with existing planning policies to provide context.</li> </ul>

<p>Greenbelt, and the future anticipated Natural Heritage System.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would appreciate receiving copies of input provided by other stakeholders.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A table has been prepared, summarizing the comments from the JART and the Stakeholders, and the City's responses. This comment/response table will be released to the stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We would like to receive a copy of the final amended TORs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The final TORs will be released to all stakeholders.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Air Quality</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There seems to be a trend toward an increased level of consideration for the potential human health effects associated with the operation of aggregate facilities (i.e. MMAH decision on April 13, 2010 – concerns from the Medical Officers of Health for Hamilton and Halton Region resulted in a Minister's Zoning Order on lands owned by St Mary's Cement in Flamboroug, ON. This provincial action blocked the aggregate company's ability to advance their application for a license to operate a quarry. Given Provincial attention to potential human health effects, and given the proposed substantial community to be establish adjacent to and downwind of the proposed quarry in MWB, we recommend that the Air Quality Assessment Peer Review specifically include consideration for these human health related best standards</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The air quality and noise conditions will be reviewed based on current baseline measurements and regulations pertaining to air quality.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Archeological Assessment</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the Background Section, first paragraph, first sentence, the words "requiring industrial zoning" are missing at the very end of the sentence; whereas these words are included in the other TORs. These words should be inserted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be revised to reflect comment.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Cultural Heritage Assessment</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This TOR requires that the consultant "Provide a specific response to the Applicant's proposed haul road and any cultural heritage impact." We believe that the TOR should be revised to clarify that the consultant is to "identify concerns with the Applicant's proposed haul road and any and all associated cultural heritage impacts." The consultant should also be asked to help define the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be revised to reflect comment.</li> </ul>



<p>characteristics of an appropriate and suitable haul road/ route in the context of the local existing and planned community (we suspect that a suitable haul road/haul route will not be attainable).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figure 1 includes the area to be licensed, and the 120 and 500 metre buffer areas surrounding the application but not the haul road. We wonder whether or not the “haul road” should be included.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Map supplied to this peer review consultant will extend study area 1km from the proposed quarry boundary and along the proposed haul route.</li> </ul>
<b>Hydrological, Hydrogeological and Quarry Design and Operations</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This specific TOR is related to the Natural Heritage TOR; esp. as it relates to wetlands and aquatic habitat. While this TOR alludes to cooperation amongst the various participants in the review process, we believe this specific direction to integration should be included. To enforce this, there should be a requirement for meetings between the various Peer Reviewers with a view to facilitating collaboration on the characterization of relevant features and functions (biological and physical).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peer reviewers will be encouraged to interact to determine interlinkages and collaboration.</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation Assessment</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This TOR should include the need to comment on the adequacy of the Haul Road/Haul Route. It should also take into consideration the adequacy of the study in terms of potential effects on human health (as indicated in Air Quality Assessment TOR comments also).</li> <li>Given the attention being paid to the development of NWB as a Transit Oriented Development (TOD), the Peer Reviewer should consider the impacts of the application on the evolving urban community, and the existing and future proposed Transportation and transit Network.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Human health issues may be considered in a social impact assessment.</li> <li>The peer reviewer will review if sufficient detail is missing from the technical study and can suggest this is one area that needs to be better assessed.</li> </ul>
<b>Surficial Soil Study Assessment</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This TOR should be re-titled “Surficial Soil Study Assessment” (“Super” is a misnomer)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be revised</li> </ul>