

Participant Statement of Jeff Broomfield

My name is Jeff Broomfield and I live on Watts Pond Road a few hundred meters east of the pit entrance. I live within the Wellhead Protection Area and my home is on a private well. I am married with two children, 19 and 23 years old. We have lived here for 19 years and I've lived in this community all my life. Both my own and my wife's family can trace our roots back in this area for over

120 years I currently serve as the president of Concerned Citizens of Brant, the CCOB. Our mission is to protect source water & the environment now & for future generations. I'm also a part owner & worked in my family's printing business in Paris for most of my life.

Back when I first received notice that the pit was opening I called the company to ask about the safety of our water, the wetland, and Gilbert Creek. I was assured that they had done the science to ensure protection of these valuable resources. I took him at his word. I believed him. I believed that the MOE was doing its job protecting the environment, and so I didn't think it was necessary to attend their public meeting.

Shortly after the meeting though, a neighbor who did attend told me that no science was presented at the meeting. So I began asking to see the science for myself and I kept on asking without getting straight answers. So I joined CCOB because it was clear to me that there were no scientific studies to back up claims of safety for our water supply. I thought that by joining the Community Advisory Panel (CAP) I would get a better response but I was wrong. I found a lack of transparency and incomplete information provided to the CAP.

A great example is the ecological study by mmm group.

I have visited the pit property and have a recording of the frogs in the wetland. It sounds like a million monks in a monastery. It is an overwhelming sound that can be heard from the road 1/2 a kilometre away. This wetland is right beside the proposed wash pond and settling pond. Dufferin informed the CAP that the pond contained no significant life. They used a letter from MMM Group dated in March 2013 that said surveys of fish and other organisms show no sensitive features or functions. They also had MMM Group do a presentation in Sept of 2013 which basically confirmed what was in the letter.

The CAP members asked to see the MMM Group final report & Dufferin promised to post it on their website. However, CCOB only received it from CELA after they obtained it very late in the decisionmaking

process. Once I knew the report existed I asked Dufferin to send it to the CAP. They agreed but did not send it or put in online, as they also promised. The final report was dated Jan 2015 and unlike the earlier letter, the report says that the area should be given a sensitivity designation as "Very High" because of the many observations of "Species at Risk." It found "Significant Wildlife Habitat," (that's an MNR designation), because of breeding habitat for amphibians and marsh birds. It also found the potential for the site to function as turtle nesting and/or hibernation sites, snake hibernation sites, and as an amphibian corridor.

None of this information was disclosed to the members of CAP and the report is two years old.

This is just one example of a pattern we've experienced for 5 years. In my experience, the CAP meetings are not an open forum. We are called an advisory committee but we aren't. CAP meetings are presentations by Dufferin employees & their hired experts. They completely own the floor. Our purpose as a CAP member is to "learn" the information presented and spread it out to the community.

At the last CAP meeting we were informed that if we wanted to make a presentation to the CAP members to clarify our concerns, we could make the suggestion and the CAP would vote to discuss the possibility at the next meeting and if approved we would be slotted into the next meeting – that's about a 1-2 year cycle to present out concerns as an "advisor."

I have done my own research as have other members of CCOB. I have strong research skills and

expertise in data management, internet and Google. I have found that no science is available to support Dufferin's conclusions that our water will be unaffected. One of their "studies" I found by keyword searching their talking points is a telephone survey to water managers done in the 1960's asking them if they noticed any effects from the gravel pit.

The fact that very little science exists is quite worrisome. It's our drinking water!

We raised concerns regarding a Stantec report that misinterpreted an important study about atrazine binding to the soil and the fact that alternating wet and dry conditions will allow the atrazine to move into the water. The report described the results of this study incorrectly, saying the study found the atrazine would stay bound to the soil. CCOB has raised this error with the Ministry several times and they have not acknowledged nor corrected the misunderstanding.

I have many more examples I would like to add but 10 minutes is hardly enough time so I'll sum up my experience as a citizen quickly.

My own research has revealed that there is a fair amount of science indicating that atrazine causes breast cancer, and since atrazine has been sprayed on the property for decades, it's very likely it will be remobilized into our drinking water and released into the air we breathe. I have a lot of friends and family who have been stricken by breast cancer and I'll bet most people here are in the same boat... and if there's even a slight chance that this gravel operation could release Atrazine into our drinking water causing breast cancer, that alone makes it well worth our efforts to find out the truth.

As a community member asking to see the science that proves our water will be safe I have faced tremendous hurdles. I am very concerned for the long term future of our water supply and the sustainability of our community and our environment. As a citizen I find that I am forced to take a stand and protect my community, and my drinking water from the very ministry with the job of protecting our drinking water.

My mission is to protect source water and the environment now and for future generations. And in that quest I find myself in legal proceedings against the MOE.

I thank you for the opportunity to voice my concerns and I appreciate your consideration of our findings.