

"I have followed the history of the land in this proposal and the surrounding properties, as s.22 s.22

To even CONSIDER allowing this amount of blasting and extraction on a property which is Adjacent to NOT ONE BUT TWO contaminated properties is INSANE.

To consider it in an area where the residents are Dependent on the groundwater for our households as we do not have piped CRD water in Highlands is RIDICULOUS.

Who will pay the millions of dollars it would take to bring city water to our homes if this actually pollutes the aquifer we depend on?

Not OK industries, I'm guessing.

This mine is in the WRONG place.

Highlands does not want it.

DRINKING WATER IS NOT POLITICS IT IS A BASIC HUMAN NEED AND IT SHOULD BE PROTECTED. Please do not sell us out."

Concern: Omission of climate change implications in the biology and environmental assessments report. Specifically, with regards to the climate projections for our region as they relate to riparian areas and the consequences of runoff from extreme rain events.

Source data to back up concern:

- LEGISLATED RIPARIAN ASSESSMENTS IN BC - APEGBC/ABCFP/CAB PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES V1.1 July 2017 <https://www.cab-bc.org/file-download/legislated-riparian-assessments-bc-apegbcabcfpcab-professional-practice-guidelines?fbclid=IwAR2NWcHjEcBJKu3MFQODYVvFKnk9nHVeL1hMtTRBnMMhFW1Wi7hV1rcX-s>
- **3.0 Professional Practice in Riparian Assessments**
 - 3.4.2 Implications of Climate Change (page 27)

3.4.2 Implications of Climate Change

Members are expected to keep themselves informed about the changing climate, and to consider the implications of climate change impacts in their professional assessments by referring to recent qualified reports on climate change or retaining a specialist to render an opinion on the matter. In addition, the member should refer to climate change position statements and climate change content made available by his/her regulatory body and established tools to assist the member in accessing information as it relates to his/her field of practice.

The Qualified Environmental Professional should consider the implications of current regional climate change projections (1), as they could affect hydrological processes associated with the streams in the study area, and whether—and on what time scale—the streamside protection and enhancement area could be affected by the projected changes. For example, this could affect determination of the high water mark. For clarification on how this might be applied in a riparian assessment, see Appendix E.

The Qualified Environmental Professional should also indicate the uncertainties and unknowns associated with his/her judgment on this.

(1) Regional climate change projections are available on the Pacific Climate Impacts Consortium website. Link: https://www.crd.bc.ca/docs/default-source/climate-action-pdf/reports/2017-07-17_climateprojectionsforthecapitalregion_final.pdf

Appendix E: Quote, "When the Qualified Environmental Professional is determining the outer limits of the active floodplain and the position of the high water mark, he/she should consider local climate change projections and whether predicted increased peak flows and flood levels would affect the position of the high water mark."

Legal Implications: If the professional biologist does not include climate projections in their analysis and there is an issue that could have been mitigated for such as flooding, runoff, soil destabilization, mobility of currently contained contamination, or contamination of ground water that results from expected future precipitations patterns identified in the climate projections report, the approving jurisdiction (the provincial government), could be liable for damages.

Concern: OK Industries mine application doesn't not contain any significant plans for reclamation of the site after mining activities. Mine reclamation plan must restore the land to its current function.

Background: This site is zoned GB2, is fully forested with functioning wetlands. Current zoning allows for *Residential, Agriculture, Home-based Business, Accessory uses, and buildings and structures*. Potential for subdivision into two lots enabling one dwelling per lot.

Concern: As stated in the mining plan, rock extraction will occur as market conditions change. With the climate crisis, need for aggregate in building materials for concrete and road building is changing rapidly. It is highly likely that due to rising carbon taxes (provincial and federal jurisdiction), carbon offset fees (under municipal jurisdiction), and the scientific consensus that we have a decade to reduce emissions by half, will inevitably lead to reduced market demand for the highly carbon intensive production of aggregate from rock and the end use of this industrial process. Less road infrastructure combined with more recycling of existing aggregate and emerging methods of producing aggregate will significantly change the market conditions for a rock quarry. New technologies such as producing calcium carbonate aggregate from Ca and CO₂ will rapidly outcompete the outdated mining and rock crushing methods.

Concern: OK industries purchased the land from the crown for an inflated price of \$4.2 million and then had the land reassessed for \$2 million. There is certainly the appearance that the BC government is in a conflict of interest with regards to making a ruling on this mine application.

Concern: The mine application suggests that the rock will be crushed on site. The community is not in support of this mine application going forward. This application should not be assuming or depending upon a land use activity (rock crushing - municipal jurisdiction), that has not been granted. In order to allow this land use, the council would need to approve a rezoning or a temporary use permit.

“Thank you for putting on this Open House and presenting the range of information you did.

However, I’m afraid I am still not in favour of this proposed project.

It is too risky in terms of polluting or damaging the acquifer that could lead unusable or failed wells in the surrounding area.

It is too destructive of the environment including that contain the ecology of the area.

It has too many serious impacts on the thousands of neighbours that surround the proposed project area. Their daily lives will be totally changed by the noise, vibration, dust, and traffic this project would bring.

Hopefully this project will not go ahead. But if it does and something does go horribly wrong (eg Tevirta landfill breached, Milligan Meadows contaminated site breached, acquifer disruptions that damage resident’s well water and....., ...) WHO is going to be liable / responsible to mitigate the problems at no cost to ... residents.

This is the WRONG project, in the WRONG Place, at the WRONG time.

Build your quarry somewhere else where it will not impact so many people as negatively as your proposal will!!!”

“The original intent of the PLVG committee (South Highland Land Use) in 1990 was to have LIGHT INDUSTRIAL or commercial in the south Highlands. It was in 1990 or earlier. It was NEVER the intent that the property would undergo wholesale natural destruction.

I am concerned that the reclamation plan is INADEQUATE to return the land to its green belt 2 designation. The OCP says that Highland is intended to be zoned to commercial / industrial, but that is NOT the land use designation now.

I also found it very disingenuous and dishonest to cherry pick sections from the OCD (section 2.6) about areas.

You forgot to mention that in the same section 2.6, it states “ Industrial uses that have negative impacts on surrounding areas around resources and air quality are discouraged.

This quarry operation does NOT have social licence in the Highlands. If a quarry was proposed for the Sooke Watershed (source of the Capital Region drinking water) this would NEVER be approved. This industrial operation is in the equivalent of our Sooke Watershed.

Please say NO! It is time for the Minister to step in and stop this quarry based on public interest.”

"I am very opposed to this development.

The highlands, this property being zoned Greenbelt R2, is not the right place to do this.

#1 – water – aquifers, you cannot predict that these water sources for the Highlands will not get contaminated. I listened and no, no guarantee.

#2 Green belt – pristine wilderness forest, connecting all the way from Sooke into forest, right beside Millstream Creek and Teamooke lake

#3 Dust, Noise, Trucking for the community that lives around there.

#4 Reason for doing this = greed! "

" I am totally opposed to this scheme of blasting a wetland next to Thetis Lake and an existing contaminated soil site next door at Tervida.

This is unnecessary and will cause huge disruptions to the community who have clearly said no.

s.22 and my fear is this pit will eventually become a contaminated soil dump... hey theres already one next door so whats the big deal"

Highlands has said no just like Shawnigan did yet this is still looking to move forward. Do the people have no rights?

Aqua Tex is not credible in my eyes and my spidey senses tingled as soon as I learned s.22 is involved... I don't trust him for good reason as he s.22

Water is a basic human right + wetlands are the cleaners of water.

Wetlands sequester more carbon than trees.

This is a money making scheme and a potential contaminated soil dump.

Mines is not god!! Water is life"

“ *Don’t impose a strip min on the Highlands.

I oppose this strip mine/rock quarry.

1 Destruction of a natural property

2 quarries totally destroy a natural property

3 strip mine4s do not belong in the Highlands

Majority of residents oppose

4 blasting – drilling, truck traffic are all huge noise issues

5 concerns about ground water contamination

6 Adjacent to Thetis Lake Park + a corridor between Millstream Rd. + the park + a wildlife corridor

7 Totally inadequate reclamation plan

A rock desert – devoid of life

Note to: Ministry of Mines –

Stop this strip Mine / Blasted Rock Quarry destruction”

“Pave paradise & put up a parking lot” comes to mind.

The irreversible destruction of the natural landscape, loss of habitat, increased traffic noise & pollution (by dust) is absolutely DISGUSTING when the only reason is to make money at the expense of all else.

The arguments of “the land has already been heavily disturbed by previous occupants” that less than 1% of Highlands would be industrial, and the water testing are all WEAK! Where does it say that any contamination or breach will be fully remediated by OK Industries? Will OK Industries pay for everyone in the Highlands to go on CRD water in perpetuity?

Will OK Industries pay for all damages to property and life if/when there is an accident on Millstream due to increased heavy truck traffic?

There is no science to support what happened when you take a mountain that has taken millions of years to form, and obliterate in a matter of years to longer form a natural geological evolution.

Shame on OK Industries for trying to navigate around the Highlands District & local land managers to do a dirty-hands deal with the Province, who sold the land in the first place!

This is #NotOK! “

"There is no benefit to the District of Highlands or to the nearest residents of the Highlands in having this project proceed. There is only risks + negatives.

Noise, dust, blasting, 500 trucks a day.

If the aquifer is impacted will OK Mines pay for all Highlands to have water trucked to their homes?

If the mine complaints can't be addressed, will OK mines compensate Hghlands for the loss of value to their homes when they have to sell for their mental health O?

Where does public support on social licence fit into the decision making process. No one in the Highlands wants a gravel pit on that piece of land.

No one asked for this and got it seems like no is not an option."

"This project is the antitheses to all. It Be in the Highlands today.

We are concerned regarding the health and safety of our community.

The health of our water aquifer, will thebeing adjacent to Tervita site, unknown impact on aquifer!

The impact on safety on our roads. The effect (Wear and tear) on our roadways. We are to On Millstream with large trucks back and forth.

The property serves as a wildlife corridor, which would be lost if the mine were to proceed.

This connects wildlife corridors which the CRD has worked so hard to make.

The dust, noise, debris on roads (which we are already experiencing with the existing site) would be unacceptable.

The Highlands says NO to OK "

"The main concern is the issue with the communities well water system under ground.

Question: If a potential Frac happens below the water table and wells start to lose their GPM (Gallons per min) or the water gets to be contaminated, what is the plan to supply the residents with flowing/potable water.

Should an issue arise is the contractor, Provincial government, or CRD going to compensate the residents (IS) Piping water in the district, drilling new wells ETC.

Water is an essential Part of life and we need to keep our water clean.

Also I would like the opinion of Langford Residents Regarding more truck traffic on Millstream rd.

With two elementary schools near by and on the truck route, we should consider the impact on the children."

"We are in a climate crisis. This project is not in align with the measures needed to reduce our carbon footprint.

People need ecosystems like the one you propose to destroy.

Trees provide oxygen, habitat for wildlife, control water + run off, provide a substantial host of health benefits now documented + are what makes Victoria, BC and this island the special jewel it is!

The benefit to the community at large cab not be demonstrated by this mining proposal.

This is not what this generation or future generations need.

It's time to put the Eco back in Economics and rethink this entire proposal."

"If this proposal goes through, a lot of promises have been made on "monitoring" (ground & surface water and other characteristics – with no mechanism of reporting and accountability made clear. Therefore I'd like to see a "citizen oversight" committee to make sure all promised are kept. (maybe even a "hot line" to report excessive dust, or noise for instances.

I also feel the understanding of such surface water movement is not well understood (most concern is the CRD site. And Tervita with toxic contaminants supposedly contaminated."

“Concerns about increased traffic running down millstream all day every day, through millstream village. It is already brutal, no regards for speed signs. I can no longer walk the kids to school as is. Blasting, destroying old growth, right near a hazardous contamination site. What problems will that create?

We need parks and schools, not rock pits. Trees! We need them to breath!

Too many dump trucks!!”

"I am completely opposed to this quarry. Highlands community + council have said no to this + they are being ignored. It's adjacent to a toxic storage area.

The change in hydrology of the quarry could cause problems eventually with the toxic storage. The quarry is right in a residential zone. Huge Langford growth in this area has occurred residentially + commercially + it will be right next to this. All feeding one millstream road. Environmentally I oppose the loss of trees. Climate change needs these. It will border Thetis Lake Park which is a jewel. The noise, dust, traffic will be problematic. So many problems including the Highlands natural philosophy.

No to the quarry! "

“our water is currently drinkable – supplied by CRD no cost (under contract to do so – ending soon)
s.22

If water is contaminated (we are on well water) – sickness to us.

Further damage to streams, lakes, etc.

Who caused it? OK or Tervita?

Trucks & traffic on Millstream Road dangerous already. Dust, noise, sharp tailed snake, Frog – Blue
Lisked, loss of eco system. LOSS of Pristine LAND!

BRUTAL

Whose blasts causes contamination.

Accidents also happen”

"I appreciated Don Harrison, Hydrogeologist + storm water folks.

I was left thinking Robert Lucy was acting as an RP for hire rather than a professional RP Bio.

Concerns:

1 Biology report does not meet the existing professional standards of the College of Applied Biology to specifically address impact to climate change

2 I would like to see some 2" monitoring wells added to the North + South for more monitoring

3 Community is not impressed and I am personally not in support of this project"

“Thank you for arranging this open house.

Despite recent changes, this quarry is still the wrong land use for this site. There is no proof that blasting so close to the toxic waste dump at Millstream Meadows / Tervita is safe and won't contaminate our water supply.

OK Industries have already shown themselves to be bad neighbours at their existing site, with poor noise and dust management. They can't be trusted to run a new site with consideration for the community.

This is going to be another Shawnigan Lake.

OK Industries should respect that they do not have social licence to run a quarry in this location. They should not have bought the land from the province. Sell it back for a park extension and they will look good and gain social licence for quarries in better locations.”

"We do not want this in our beautiful Highlands Community.

The daycare that resides WAY too close to you will be impacted greatly. More than 80 families attend this daycare! The children do not deserve to breathe the polluted air, or deserve the risk to contamination of water!!

We do not want this!"

“My major concern is related to the proximity of the toxic dump site.

If the quarry was already there, would a toxic waster operation be approved? Next to a blasting site?

-Concern about traffic on Millstream

-Concern about ground water

-Concern about toxic waste leaching into ground water.”

“This is NOT what the Highlands had in mind when we designated the subject area as a business park.

There is a wonderful opportunity for a progressive developer to create a business development that if integrated with the environment – properly managed, this would be an excellent marketing tool!

Destroying a wetlandforest + displacing (or killing) the thousands of living beings that currently inhabit the land to produce gravel is unconscionable.

The proponent knows what Highlands vision for the property was when they bought it. They have an obligation to work within that vision not to bypass the community and exploit the land with no consideration for its inhabitants or its neighbours.”

"I am opposed to this application as it stands.

s.22

previous to this application.

The proposal is in opposition to our community vision as articulated in our OCP.

Detrimental effects:

- Impact on the existing wetland in the centre of the property – lost forever
- Noise pollution from the mining activity
- Traffic and safety concerns
- Loss of habitat

The days of resources extraction and waste dumpage should be over in the Highlands. We are should remain a rural residential community."

“Information displays – would have liked more on ...impacts, geological information and biological assessment information. Language didn’t really explain on share extent of habitat destruction, just salvaged portions.

Are these rare and endangered spp on site? What work was done to address?

Obviously this is work proposal to make a profit and impact is on local community + environment.

What is being offered to address these impacts.

Noise, dust, risk of water contamination, increased trucking on narrow twisty road, etc.

Generally I felt information was missing and could have been presented more objectively. Obviously here to win hearts and minds – best way to do so is be as clean as possible about impacts.”

"I do not think the proposed mine is an appropriate use of the land. This is not light industry.

I am concerned about the level of noise that we will experience if this is approved.

I am unhappy with the increase of heavy truck traffic to crushing facilities in road that did not involve Millstream Rd.

Would mitigate some of this.

I am concerned about ground water. I don't believe we can know for certain that contamination will not occur."

"I don't want the mine because....

One it will be dusty

Two it will be noisy

Three It's not pretty

Four I don't want to get sick – water

Five NOT COOL!!

Six the Frog and snake

Seven It's ugly!!

!!NO Mine!"

"I do not want a strip mine destroying the environment & ecology of the Highlands.

This type of activity is not acceptable in a rural residential community that affects the health, water supply and noise levels in the Highlands. There is nothing positive for the residents of the Highlands when there are unacceptable issues for this inappropriate, ill-thought use of this property"

Thank you to the Statutory Decision Maker for facilitating the open house and the revisions to the plan. While there are certainly improvements regarding buffers, depth of blasting and water testing, I am still very opposed to this project.

The area is surrounded by contaminated soil and blasting is a very risky activity to take place in this context.

The water table is an unknown to us all – scientists and lay people alike – and it needs to be protected.

We have less and less forest and unimpacted ecosystems and they need to be protected.”

"Thank you for the information today.

I would like to say I moved to the Highlands a year ago to get away from all of the building and new developments. I am saddened to see now there is a big project here in the highlands. I think we are too small of a district to lose this much green space.

Thank you"

“We just don’t want

- The noise
- The loss of the corridor to Thetis Lake
- The dust
- The blasting
- The home value loss
- The fauna loss
- The threat of contaminated water
- The dust
- The trucks

Once it’s gone it’s gone! “

“Thank you for providing experts in aareas. However, I remain unconvinced that this is a usable plan with minimum impact on the environment”

“Exploration of environment, wildlife and residents of Highlands that have unilaterally opposed your for profit disregard for all the thousands of generations upon whose shoulders you stand to gain by their desire to preserve & protect

Not OK!”

Thank you for your presentation. While very informative, Ive come to the conclusion that this project serves too big a risk to our ground water + environment despite efforts to mitigate these problems.

The community is not in support of this development.”

"This is the most "beautiful natural area" "

(Note: the hand written comments are unreadable beyond the start of the sentence shown above.)

s.22

I am disgusted at the choice for this site. It will effect our water, air, environment, traffic & quality of life up here

Possibly, predicted and hopefully are not good enough. Consider this a Firm No on this plan & handling of our future.”

"I am strongly opposed. I cannot understand how you would do this next to contaminated sites in a community that drinks the groundwater.

Do this where there is no risk no "low" risk! My family needs to be safe. Air quality, noise and increased traffic. I have seen the plans and I do not support this."

“Concerns

1 – increased traffic on millstream. Currently, engine brakes are being used at all hours of day and/or night.

2 – contamination of water

3 – noise pollution thru our residential areas

4 – blasting from ALL FUN/Western speedway has already caused cracks in our homes.

5 – are you going to take before and after pictures of our homes to address damage?”

"4 3 trucks per day on Millstream Rd – a very windy 2 lane with no pull off.

What about a wider road.

This is crazy!! You have blinders on!

2500 per acre for remediation to return it to a green belt - - a grader for 2 days will eat this up."

"It's just in the wrong location, from every angle and consideration. Hurting the community you intend to sell to, is a bad business decision, reputation is earned and can be lost with one unilateral move.

Please select a more appropriate location, surely, you wouldn't want to live across the street from such a project, neither do we!"

s.22

My family and I are very concerned about the noise, dust and impact to our health, general well being and effects of added heavy duty traffic on an already congested road.

I am also very concerned about the affect this will have on the environment. I do not believe we should allow trees and wildlife to be destroyed for something that will create more air and noise pollution.”

“Main concern:

The contiguous property contains toxic material, that at present has a liner.

The liner life is not long at best.

What guarantees have you to guard against the blasting causing leakage of the liner”

"I am very concerned about the impact of this proposed min on the community. I believe the noise – in spite of the proposed suggestion that it "meets standards" will be unacceptable. It already presents significant challenges with existing uses and will only be made worse."

“Concern regarding groundwater. The Highlands is totally dependent on this source and I question whether blasting over the Is will not be a problem.”

“This will destroy our buffer for sound that we have between us and Western Speedway – why can’t you take Western Speedway? I would support that.”

“Concerns over wildlife habitat destruction.

Concerns over water quality issues.

Concerns over noise issues.”

“Our areas of easily accessible green spaces are dwindling. Please don’t take away anymore.”

“Will have a list of technical concerns in the near future.”

“Don’t screw up the drinking water to destroy wet lands”

“Completely against this proposal.

Completely against Highlands municipality & residents

Stop destroying greenspace

Stop impact, traffic, polluting, blasting

NO NO NO”

“Thank you for the presentation.

I remain opposed to the project because the scale and degree of land change does not fit into the context of the surrounding and not within the vision of the community for the future land use”

“Forget it!

on all levels

Environmentally!

Water shed protection!

Fish habitat!

Green space!”

"OK industries has no right to invaid the highlands with this mine, Not one person that lives in the highlands is in favour. GO AWAY"

"I do not approve of this project. It is environmentally dangerous."

"I consider that a blasting operation is incompatible within a short distance of residential areas.

I am opposed to this operation. Adamantly opposed"

“no strip mines”

“We do not want the quarry in the highlands”

“please don’t”

“that’s a big no”

“As long as Quarry is located in south area of Highlands, near Langford border I think its ok. Now I see the finished elevation of quarry will be 40-50 meters higher than highest well the water issue doesn’t seem to cause a problem. Maybe taxes might come down a bit.”

"I think we should go for it!

Increased tax will help preserve the Highlands"

"All in favor"

“Perfectly situated between other industrial land.
Make total sense”

"I think the quarry is a good thing"

“Good use of the land.

With a buffer along Millstream Rd.

No one will even know it’s there.

Excellent tax income

I live in the Highlands and I am in favour”

"I am in favour of this rezoning application. The Highlands should approve it, thereby increasing their tax base with some industrial land in the south Highlands. This will compliment Millstream industrial park, and Highwest landfill. There is also many employment opportunities for local residents"

"Thank you for the presentation, I think this project will be well suited for the property. Only concerns are traffic on Millstream and dust control.

This is not an area for residential development so it would be a great spot for the Tech Park or light industrial upon completion.

Hope it goes well

Thank you"

"My main concerns have been answered.

Although I really don't want a quarry. We probably need it. The number of trucks travelling won't change. The contaminated site stays stable and Thetis hikers seem safe."

“There seems to be a serious lack of communication between those opposed and those FOR.
Gov needs more involvement.”