

# **Failures of St. Marys Is Our Success**



**Margaret McCarthy**  
**Ward 15 Councillor**  
**Flamborough**  
**905-546-2713**  
**mmccarthy@hamilton.ca**

## **AUGUST, 2007**

Ever heard the old song “another day older and deeper in debt”

Well that should be the mantra of the St. Marys people who have yet to make any successful inroads towards their application for a quarry on the 11<sup>th</sup> Concession (thankfully). Their failures have been our successes!

When you put it all together there is absolutely no logical reason how this application could ever see the light of day.

Let’s take a walk down memory lane and count the ways.

First we have an application for the 8<sup>th</sup> largest quarry in Canada in an area that is already established residential development all around. In normal cases what one would find with a new quarry application is very little residential use if at all in order to minimize the impact to the residents. A classic case of what you see is what you get - and if you decide to purchase a home in the area of a quarry you will know ahead of time what to expect. Not so in this case, where my whole Carlisle community up to Pushlinch and over to Milton would be impacted by a quarrying operation that comes in after the fact - hardly fair, and certainly challengeable. Which brings me to my resolution passed last year and supported unanimously through Council that new aggregate mapping be done in order to identify what

we all know as completely inappropriate land for a quarry operation. A technical piece of evidence that identifies inappropriate land use.

Now let me proceed to our next item of business which is the proposed haul route transportation corridor. At the Royal Botanical Gardens this summer St. Marys endeavored to devise and support a traffic route that had all experts from Milton, Halton, and Hamilton scratching their heads in wonder. The CART team professionals from all three municipalities identified as the “Combined Aggregate Review Team” identified seven pages of deficiencies, with the **one** meeting. In their letter they list everything from:

1. Notification not being done properly.
2. St. Marys went against generally accepted consultation practices and principles.
3. Presentations were required in the terms of reference but not done by St. Marys.
4. They did not identify themselves as working for St. Marys
5. They used in many cases print size that was too small to see.
6. Staff was not given appropriate time to respond to the information -only two days before the (PIC) meeting took place.
7. The agreed terms of reference were ignored.
8. They excluded areas for their haul route that they are not allowed to exclude at this stage.
9. They did not distinguish between municipalities.
10. They did not justify how the route can be considered reasonable or acceptable.
11. Milborough Line was shown as a Hamilton Arterial (which it is not) and a major Milton road, when there is no such classification. The section of Milborough Line between Derry Road (Regional Road) and Kilbride should be identified as Halton Regional Road #24. Kilbride Street and Campbellville Road are not Regional Roads – these designations are based on outdated information. And since the panel shows municipal roads it should indicate municipal boundaries as well.
12. Incomplete maps, misleading maps.
13. Safety and operational review ignored.
14. Weight bearing load restriction roads not acknowledged (Derry Rd. has a load restriction, Milborough Line has a load restriction) “and these were their preferred haul roads”.

15. No valid rationale for aggregate demand. (Display Board #11) bottom of pg. 4.
16. And they had no agreements with other municipalities.

One would think that after all that going wrong that simply the law of averages would have enabled St. Marys to get something right - but it seems not. They recently had to fork over \$30,000 to the City of Hamilton for damages to our roads because of unauthorized road core sampling. First they cut up our roads without permission and secondly they did not back fill them correctly.

And the final nail in the coffin “their assumption on Water Recovery and Water Production” were not right.

This leads me to my next point of St. Marys “Water re-circulation proposal” it is **NEW AND UNTESTED. It is a theory – and has never been used on FRACTURED BEDROCK and there is no data to indicate whether or not it could ever be successful.** But they still want to test it, and in order to do that they want to take over 13 times more water a minute than what the whole Carlisle water tower can supply the community with. (8,800 LT minute for St. Marys water taking permit application compared to the Carlisle municipal well system of 650 LT minute). Important to note here is that this water comes from the very same aquifer. The very fragile aquifer that the entire rural community depends on. You know - the already established residential community that requires this basic need. To that end it looks as though we have support for our concerns and they come from the same government body that is charged with the authority as to whether or not the “theory of St. Marys should be allowed to proceed. The following is a letter sent to St. Marys by the Supervisor of Water Resources Mr. Paul Odom - in this letter he states why approval has not been granted to date for the permit to take water. The letter by the Ministry of Environment to Mr. Bill Marquardt Project Manager for St. Marys reads as follows: “Please be advised that the review of the application before us involves technologies which have not previously been applied in such a scenario. Consequently, we are proceeding with caution on this application to ensure that, should we allow it to proceed, the approach used will protect local water resources and have negligible

impacts on local water users. We view the test currently under consideration as no more than a preliminary step and well removed from a full scale operation". This paragraph is critical to us for several reasons. It clearly acknowledges that the application for recirculation of water is "untested and conceptual."

And this is the same ministry that turned down the Water Taking Permit Application from Flamborough Springs only 2 Km from the St. Marys application because of concerns.

Now lets top it all off with the recent discovery that only 2.7km away from the St. Marys site a property was involved in a high profile groundwater contamination problem that spanned from the mid 1960s into this decade and drew in every government official and ministry body from here to the province all acknowledging and confirming the seriousness of the problem. And it appears from the files that I have pored through that the extent to which the contamination has spread and may still surface would give even the most naive observer cause for concern.

So when is enough – enough? That is one question I don't have an answer for yet – but what I do know is that with every step we take - and every miss step that they make - puts us ahead and one step closer to our goal.

Stay with me - I believe we can win this one together.

Thanks to all who have worked with me.

Sincerely

Councillor Margaret McCarthy  
For more information visit my web site  
[www.margaretmccarthy.ca](http://www.margaretmccarthy.ca)