TOWN OF CALEDON

CBM-Caledon Quarry

CAART COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE RESPONSE #1 – [Hydrogeology]

Please accept the following as feedback from the Caledon Aggregate Review Team (CAART). Fully addressing each comment will expedite the potential for resolution of the consolidated CAART comments and individual agency objections. **Additional comments may be provided once a response has been prepared to the comments raised below and additional information provided**.

Colour Code	Description
	Resolved
	Resolved subject to additional information being provided to CAART Reviewers (e.g, Implementation Guide, Report Addendums)
(no colour)	Response provided, but no further action taken or required by Project Team

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Reports: Hydrogeological Assessment & Maximum Predicted Water Table Report			**Author: Golder**				
1.	There are only two cross-sections provided with the geological model. They lack good reference points and are difficult for a reviewer to interpret. There is almost no discussion concerning what the cross-sections show in relation to the formations proposed for extraction.	Section 4.3.3					
2.	The conceptual site model (CSM) includes 12 hydrostratigraphic units. However, there is little to no discussion to support selection of these units and the significance of each one.	Section 5.10					
3.	Additional hydrogeological cross-sections, and maps (such as isopach maps for aquifer units and perhaps formation contact structure maps) would be helpful in supporting and improving the presentation of the CSM.	Section 5.10					

	Initial CAART Comments (Date)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	CAART Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Reports: Hydrogeological Assessment & Maximum Predicted Water Table Report				**Author: Golder**			
4.	A table showing potential impacts to surface water levels (not just flows) at the various surface water features in the area (including wetlands) would be a useful addition to the surface water impact assessment.	Section 9.1					
5.	Some of the proposed mitigation measures for adverse interference to private wells, such as deepening the well and lowering the pump intake, may result in a decline in water quality.	Section 9.3.1					
6.	The private well survey and engagement with local private well owners should consider methods that will encourage participation. Additional information (not just MECP water well record information) will be needed to ensure that adverse well interference does not become an ongoing issue when pit/quarry is operational and dewatering/water-control measures are occurring.	Section 9.3.3					