

**Denise Holmes, AMCT**

---

**From:** Garry Hunter [ghunter@hunter-gis.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 16, 2010 7:06 PM  
**To:** Denise Holmes, Melancthon Township; Debbie Fawcett  
**Cc:** NDACT; Dale Rutledge; Karren Wallace; Rob Uffen; Nanci Malek; Dennis Sanford; Carl Cosack  
**Subject:** Preliminary Comments Melancthon Rough Draft Official Plan (no Schedules)

I understand that the Township asked for comments before Mar 12 on the Draft Master Plan which became available on about Mar 5 on the Township web site.

However on closer examination it is apparent that although comprehensive, this document is a 'cut and paste version' assembled from diverse sources and has not been tightly edited to remove conflicts between individual policies or fully adapted to specific Melancthon conditions. Most significantly the all important Schedules have not been included for review. This incomplete plan appears to have been prematurely released.

It is difficult to provide detailed comments without access to the full document. However I do provide the following preliminary overview comments to try to constructively advance the policy debate. Individual members of NDACT may have different concerns which they no doubt will express.

Melancthon has World Biosphere resources and provincially significant heritage, water, wind, agriculture and aggregate resources. The Draft Official Plan must find an appropriate balance between potentially conflicting land uses.

**AGGREGATE FRIENDLY DRAFT**

The vision of this plan may be described as 'aggregate friendly' and mainly focussed on processing of Aggregate Licences. For example **S 2.4(c) permits the extraction of mineral aggregates as an interim use in all prime agricultural areas (Land Capability Classes 1, 2 and 3) throughout all of the Township.**

**The notion that Aggregate extraction up to 300 ft or more below the ground surface is an interim use that will not cause irreversible impacts on Agriculture and Water Resources is far fetched and far from proven.**

**Sec 2.5 (a) lists as an objective the protection as much as realistically possible of the Townships known or potential existing mineral aggregate resources to supply mineral aggregate resource needs.**

The Province of Ontario has requested that specific bedrock aggregate potential areas be designated in the Township of Melancthon. The province has also mapped Amabel formation bedrock resources in adjacent Grey and Simcoe Counties to the north and in Mulmur Township to the east. There are literally billions of tonnes of resource with less than 25 ft of overburden designated in the Provincial ARIP mapping in the County Road 124 corridor from Hornings Mills to Duntroon.

There are more billions of tonnes of accessible Amabel resource designated adjacent to the proposed rail corridor from Shelburne to Owen Sound and in Halton Region.

The Provincial ARIP mapping did not designate Guelph bedrock potential in Grey County because the Guelph resource potential in Melancthon Township was considered sufficient. The designated Guelph bedrock resource areas in Melancthon Township are also underlain by the Amabel bedrock at shallow depths in the east with depth increasing to the west.

**Why would Council want to encourage even more aggregate applications in deeper overburden outside the provincially designated areas?**

**Have adjacent municipalities incorporated the provincial bedrock aggregate designations into their own Official Plans as Melancthon is proposing ? If not, why not?**

Notice for quarry applications, considering the depth of the resource and the extent of unmitigated groundwater interference should be increased to 4,000 m from 400 m.

A minimum 500 m 'nuisance' buffer of applicant owned land or negotiated easement should be required around quarry cells in excess of 60 ft deep and 100 acres in extent.

## **AGRICULTURE UNFRIENDLY DRAFT**

**This draft plan treats agriculture as second or third class. Despite NDACT's prior efforts, there is no recognition of the special status of the Potato and Vegetable growing lands and major agriculture infrastructure and technology investments within the Township and the importance of this industry. This draft does not represent good planning and does not provide an appropriate balance.**

**This draft plan is oblivious to the fact that the Honeywood Foodbelt centered in Melancthon produced and delivered in 2008 the equivalent of 25 lbs of fresh potatoes to each of the 6,000,000 residents of the Greater Toronto Area. In addition, this Foodbelt area is producing increasing quantities of other specialty crops including rhubarb, broccoli, brussels sprouts, cabbage, peas, beans and strawberries. Not all specialty vegetable crops may be grown on organic soils.**

Agricultural and AgriFood Canada (2007) reported that on average each 12 acres of potatoes grown in Canada generates one employment position. Therefore it may be estimated that **the Honeywood Foodbelt creates overall employment for about 500 persons**, many of these in Melancthon and adjacent municipalities. Food production is a significant local industry with many economic spinoffs.

## **PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT NON CONFORMITY**

**The Plan objectives do not conform to the Provincial Policy Statement (2005). The PPS (2005) contains clear provincial policy direction that aggregate extractive uses are to be preferentially directed to lower capability agricultural lands. On this basis the Honeywood silt loam soils north of 15th Side road in the Old Survey would be one of the last lands on the Amabel Formation north of Highway 401 to Manitoulin Island to be developed for extraction.**

The plan should recognize that **perpetual pumping, dewatering and perimeter recirculation and recharge is not a sustainable long term strategy for agriculture or even lake rehabilitation in areas with steep natural water table gradients.** Steep gradients will result in severe upgradient drawdown interference impacts on the inevitable abandonment of the quarry. These site selection tests should be undertaken prior to a site specific licence application being submitted.

## **WIND RESOURCES**

The plan does not articulate a Township position on development of wind resources. Melancthon farmers (but not necessarily rural residents) appear to have accepted that wind energy development is compatible with agriculture. The Province appears to be mandating potential wind energy development as a primary policy wherever there is a 500 m buffer from residential use areas with high wind energy potential such as

Melancthon.

**This Plan does not address the compatibility of wind development and bedrock aggregate potential. Is wind development an interim use which protects the aggregate resource or is it sterilizing?**

**Are quarries a threat to nearby towers and wind flow stability?**

**Do wind development applications take priority?**

## **WATER**

**Melancthon's hydrogeological function is similar to that of the Oak Ridges Moraine with high recharge and aquifer storage potential to sustain aquifer flow and supply to groundwater fed streams.**

The Plan does not recognize that the Noisy and Pine River headwaters contribute about 30 % of the base or summer flow to the lower Nottawasaga River to Wasaga Beach. This base flow is essential for ecology, agricultural irrigation, fisheries, waste assimilation, recreation and other riparian uses.

Due to robust groundwater discharge and extensive forest cover, the Pine River arguably supports the highest quality coldwater fisheries habitats of the four major Nottawasaga Escarpment tributaries.

Salmonid recruitment from the Pine River not only supports the local angling events such as the Wasaga Beach Rainbow Derby but may also play a significant role in supporting the sport fishery in Georgian Bay.

Water from Melancthon also contributes recharge to the deep regional Alliston Aquifer in Simcoe County and to the provincially significant Guelph / Amabel Aquifer which extends far to the southwest to Lake Erie. **Most importantly the local Guelph / Amabel aquifers are the only high quality drinking source water supply for all Melancthon residents.**

The Plan does not appear to have incorporated the Town of Shelburne Production Well Source Water Protection Zone. This protection zone is mainly in Melancthon.

There are no policies in the plan for protection of sensitive brook trout habitats and existing fish hatchery uses.

There is no environmental recognition of karst including caves, sinkholes, collapse basins and trenches, sinking and underground streams and stream resurgence areas and the continuity of these features which often do not conform to traditional Conservation Authority water course definitions.

The words 'fish' and 'karst' seldom appear in the draft except when excerpted from other documents.

## **NIAGARA ESCARPMENT UNESCO WORLD BIOSPHERE RESERVE**

The Plan is silent on the Niagara Escarpment UNESCO World Biosphere Reserve and the important natural and cultural heritage resources of the Niagara Escarpment and the re-entrant vallies including the Noisy, Pine and the Boyne River headwaters and the historic significance of Hornings Mills and the River Road.

County Road No 124 is a linear cultural heritage corridor from Masonville to Maple Valley which together with side roads provides access to this world significant Niagara Escarpment resource.

The wall to wall quarries and aggregate processing areas contemplated by this draft plan on County Road 124 are not compatible with tourism and recreation uses.

## TRANSPORTATION

The Plan anticipates reconstruction of the former Streetsville to Owen Sound Railway. However it does not anticipate the potential need for a related industrial area in continuation of the aggregate friendly theme of the current draft. A Highway 10 / Railway industrial area might include aggregate processing (with conveyor access from quarries) to avoid running aggregate trains across the Township. This would require establishment of a Highway 10 Bypass north of Shelburne. Quarry haul routes should be on provincial highways not County or Township Roads.

There may be a long term requirement for widening County Road 124 to about 50 m versus the existing right of way width of 30 m. The Plan should recognize the requirement for specific County land takings in future development applications.

## SEVERANCES

Policies for granting multiple severances are not consistent with the proposed Aggregate Resource Protection Designations.

The Draft Official Plan document is Melancthon's submission to the Province. The Township should not presume what the Province may or may not approve but state its own position and those of the ratepayers.

Melancthon ratepayers should recognize that the regulations which will emanate from this proposed draft plan version are much more onerous than those of past Official Plans.

Yours truly,

**Garry T. Hunter M.A.Sc. P.Eng.**  
President

Hunter and Associates / Hunter GIS  
2285 Dunwin Drive, Unit 18  
Mississauga, ON L5L 3S3

Tel (905) 607-4120

Fax (905) 607-1132

Email [ghunter@hunter-gis.com](mailto:ghunter@hunter-gis.com)

Website <http://www.hunter-gis.com>

*This message contains confidential information intended only for the use of the person or entity named as recipient. The distribution or copying of this e-mail by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us and delete your copy. Thank you for your cooperation*

---

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: [dholmes@melancthontownship.ca](mailto:dholmes@melancthontownship.ca) [Remove this sender from my allow list](#)

From: [ghunter@hunter-gis.com](mailto:ghunter@hunter-gis.com)

*You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.*

---

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 4950 (20100316)

---

9/14/2010

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

**Denise Holmes, AMCT**

---

**From:** Garry Hunter [ghunter@hunter-gis.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 10, 2010 4:01 PM  
**To:** Debbie Fawcett  
**Cc:** Bill Hill; John Crowe; Janice Elliott; Darren White; Denise Holmes, Melancthon Township; Dale Rutledge; NDACT; Jerry Jorden  
**Subject:** Official Plan Schedules / June 2010 Draft / Comments

I provide the following comments on the Township of Melancthon Draft Official Plan Schedules (June 2010) and Provincial Policy Statement Review (Aug 11, 2010). These comments have not been reviewed or endorsed by NDACT or friends who indeed may have opinions at variance.

**Provincial Policy Statement Review**

**I endorse the Township's Comments on the Provincial Policy Statement Review** as prepared by Mr Jorden. I look forward to the next OP version embracing these planning concepts.

**Graphics:**

The Draft OP schedules are easily read, clear, crisp and well organized. Compliments!

**Aggregate Bias / Lack of Balance**

**The failure to include a Specialty Crop designation to balance the Plans Aggregate designations demonstrates a profound aggregate bias in this Official Plan. The Draft Plan and Schedules are silent on the estimated 250 + million dollar investment in land, employment, technology and infrastructure by the Townships specialty potato and vegetable growing industry. As you are aware the infrastructure is located mainly in the north eastern part of the Township but growing areas are spread throughout and beyond the Township into Mulmur and Grey Highlands.**

The failure of the Province to provide evaluation criteria or the public interest groups to sponsor a formal Official Plan Amendment can not be used as an excuse to ignore the Specialty Crop reality on the Honeywood soils of Melancthon Township. Not all vegetable crops can be grown on organic soils such as the Holland Marsh.

**The omission of this agriculture / aggregate potential balance is simply poor land use planning and frustrates the equitable and balanced application of the PPS (2005). I trust that this omission is Council's intent at this late stage of draft plan preparation.**

**Amabel Bedrock Resource Area**

The Township on Draft Plan Schedule D has limited the Primary Bedrock Resource designation area to the Amabel bedrock with less than 8 m (25 ft) of overburden with boundaries as published in Dec 2009 by the Ontario Geological Survey. This mapping was prepared from legacy geological information, from Ministry of Environment water well databases and incomplete test pit and drilling data provided by the Highland Companies. The Ontario Geological Survey emphasizes (pers comm July 2010) that the Bedrock Resource Mapping is regional scale and the boundaries of the mapping are not precise.

The Township has not backed out the sensitive Noisy and Pine River headwater tributary resurgence (spring) zones and cold water fisheries habitat from the Amabel Bedrock Resource Area. **Does anyone really intend to quarry in these areas?**

The Draft OP Prime Bedrock Area (less than 25 ft overburden) designation especially in the expanded area from the 1998 to 2009 ARIP mapping is known to have a minimum of 20 to 25 ft of overburden and often more especially south of the Lot 17/18 boundary in Con III OS. At the E 1/2 Lot 16/17 Con III OS boundary a Highlands borehole indicates almost 80 ft of overburden. The area south of Lot 17/18 boundary in Con IV OS is unexplored, overburden in three adjacent wells varies from 21 to 38 ft.

**The Old Survey Bedrock Resource Area designation is clearly exaggerated in the south and should be removed from 15th Sideroad northerly to about Lot 18/19 boundary in Con I and II OS and to about Lot 17/18 boundary in Con III and IV OS.**

Overburden depths in the Melancthon Amabel Bedrock Resource are significantly greater than in other proposed but unapproved quarries adjacent to the Niagara Escarpment including Flamborough, Nelson, Dufferin (Acton), Rockfort and Duntroon. Weathered bedrock will add additional waste materials to overburden stripping quantities.

The consequence of deep stripping (10 m +/- ) in addition to earth movement costs is that major dust prone and visually intrusive high above ground stockpiles will be required to store the overburden surplus to berm construction until full extraction depths are achieved over a sufficiently large area to permit initiation of rehabilitation of the quarry floor.

The requirement for perimeter groundwater recirculation infrastructure and visual berms, stockpiling of stripping and construction of the aggregate processing, trans-shipment area and rail access means that as much as 400 to 500 acres will be taken out of the Specialty Crop agriculture area on initial quarry establishment.

### **Primary Granular Resource Areas**

Schedule D shows the Primary Granular Resource Area inside the Horning's Mills Community Plan Area. **Is this Council's intent?**

### **Guelph / Amabel Bedrock Resource Area**

The Draft Official Plan schedules do not recognize the shallow overburden Guelph / Amabel Bedrock Areas west of the Melancthon Old Survey 5th Line and the Shrigley Esker complex. The Guelph Bedrock Resource laps onto and overlies the Amabel Bedrock Resource. The thickness of the Guelph Resource increases to the southwest.

Ontario Geological Survey to date has refused access to Highland drill core descriptions and has

not assigned priority to updating bedrock surveys in North Dufferin. Even the location of the Guelph / Amabel bedrock subsurface contact presently mapped in the vicinity of the 5th Line OS is poorly known.

A quarry immediately west of the Shrigley Esker would be in closer proximity to Provincial Highway 10 and to the existing rail corridor providing potential rail access to distant markets. Exposure to both Guelph and the deeper Amabel Bedrock Resource provides for production of a greater variety of commercial aggregate products. The resource is also very deep in the Guelph / Amabel Bedrock Area.

The shallow overburden Guelph Bedrock Resource Areas generally are considered to have lower quality agriculture lands, smoother bedrock surface, more favourable low water table gradients for operation of groundwater recirculation systems and greater distance separation from resurgent Niagara Escarpment headwater streams and sensitive groundwater discharge headwaters.

A quarry in the Grand River watershed may be used to augment summer flows in the groundwater deprived upper Grand River drainage tributaries. These warm water municipal drain tributaries are less sensitive to prospective quarry discharges than the stable never failing groundwater streams to the east. **Quarries in the shallow overburden Guelph / Amabel Bedrock Resource Area west of the Shrigley Esker will more easily achieve PPS (2005) compliance.**

### **Guelph / Amabel OP Designation**

**The designation of the Guelph / Amabel instead of the Old Survey Amabel Bedrock Resource Area in the Melancthon Draft Official Plan would be consistent with the PPS 2005. This designation would maintain the existing and future growth employment potential dependent on the Specialty Crop Lands and still capture the additional Mega Quarry related employment and future rail line if Council so desires.**

**The use of Provincial Highways as Melancthon quarry haul routes would remove the burden of new construction and maintenance from County and Township ratepayers.**

**Alternatively and with improved conformity with the PPS (2005) new quarries may be located north of Maple Valley on lower quality agricultural lands. These quarries would be dependent on County Rd 124 as a southerly haul route.**

### **Agriculture / Rural**

The Township lot boundary defined Agriculture / Rural designations in the Draft Official Plan should be replaced with the Specialty Crop and Capability Class 1, 2 and 3 Prime Agriculture Land designations to provide compatibility with the PPS (2005) (see also Meridian commenting letter of May 21, 2010). These two designation areas will permit application of specific land use policies including more relaxed consent policies in the Class 1, 2, and 3 Prime Land area

### **Environmental Protection**

The Environmental Protection Schedule should be brought into improved alignment with current Ministry of Natural Resources Land Information Ontario LIO Natural Heritage Mapping.

Melancthon contains important examples of karstic and focused depressional recharge terrain which should receive specific environmental protection. Focused recharge and sunken stream areas

are not protected under the current Conservation Authority definition of 'Water Course' and related setbacks. Significant areas include:

1. Leaders Caves (north of County Rd 17 and east of 2nd Line SW (Lot 289 Con II SW). Leader Caves has a known karst ecology and potential for rare and endangered species occurrence.
2. Karstic Trench / Sinking / Sunken / Resurgent stream valley from 20th Sideroad to 15th Sideroad and Mill Lane in Con I, II and III OS including important cold water fisheries habitat. This area has high potential for occurrence of rare and endangered karst ecology species.
3. Stream resurgence area from 4th Line to 15th Sideroad in Con III OS, includes important coldwater fisheries habitat area and existing fish hatchery.
4. Karstic trench / sunken stream from 20th Sideroad to the Townline and stream resurgence area from Town line to 15th Sideroad and Mill Lane, includes important cold water fisheries habitat.
5. Seasonal stream focused recharge area on E 1/2 Lot 14, Con IV (former McTaggart Farm) and underground stream to Hornings Mills Lake.

Areas 2, 3 and 4 above are already included on Schedule A-2 but need to be further recognized in the Plan.

The Mill Lane Dam, former Basket Factory ruins, and adjacent waterfall already included in the proposed OP Environmental Protection Area should be recognized in the Official Plan as significant natural and cultural heritage features (Schedule A-2 and B). This pioneer dam may have been constructed about 1850 and is therefore about 160 years old (see pg 11 NVCA Conservation Report, 1973).

The water fall and valley downstream of the dam exposes the geological contact between the Cabot Head Shales and the overlying Fossil Hill Formation in the basal aquitard area of the regional Amabel Aquifer. This contact is seldom exposed along the Niagara Escarpment.

### **Heritage Resources**

The Cultural Heritage Resources of Hornings Mills are a significant but poorly developed resource. Hornings Mills, established in 1830 because of its constantly flowing never failing streams and abundant mill sites, was the first settlement in the region (see Backwoods Life, W.F. Munro, 1869).

### **Source Water Protection**

Although Hornings Mills does not currently have a communal water system, much of the higher ground community depends on the Amabel aquifer discharge zones for domestic drinking water supply. The northwestern and northeastern quadrants are most vulnerable to surface quantity and quality changes.

The Draft Official Plan contemplates residential infilling of Hornings Mills. Hornings Mills appears to be one of the few areas in Melancthon where some modest population growth may occur. A source water protection zone should be established to the north and north west of the community

to protect the communal drinking water resource.

### **AEMOT Groundwater Management Schedule**

In my opinion the AEMOT schedule is based on flawed data. The protection area polygons are machine generated from geographically unevenly distributed Ministry of Environment unedited water well databases. The Ontario Geological Survey aggregate resource mapping also employed these databases in the 1998 and 2009 ARIP mapping.

In the alternative, if the Township wishes to have a Groundwater Protection Schedule, the Sand and Gravel Resource and the Shallow Overburden Bedrock Resource Areas from the ARIP 2009 mapping would provide a much better approximation of the groundwater contaminant risk areas. The finer textured overburden west of the Shrigley Esker reduces groundwater contaminant risks.

### **Wind Turbines**

The Draft Official Plan Schedules should contain some recognition of existing Wind Turbine resources. This Overlay Schedule might take the form of the Wind Turbine sites with the current Green Energy 550 m restrictive setback radii shown.

Please advise if any further clarification of my comments would be helpful. Also if the Township provides the OP base map templates, my staff can prepare specific exhibits in the OP style.

Yours truly,

**Garry T. Hunter M.A.Sc. P.Eng.**  
President

Hunter and Associates / Hunter GIS  
2285 Dunwin Drive, Unit 18  
Mississauga, ON L5L 3S3

Tel (905) 607-4120  
Fax (905) 607-1132  
Email [ghunter@hunter-gis.com](mailto:ghunter@hunter-gis.com)  
Website <http://www.hunter-gis.com>

*This message contains confidential information intended only for the use of the person or entity named as recipient. The distribution or copying of this e-mail by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us and delete your copy. Thank you for your cooperation*

---

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: [dholmes@melancthontownship.ca](mailto:dholmes@melancthontownship.ca) [Remove](#) this sender from my allow list  
From: [ghunter@hunter-gis.com](mailto:ghunter@hunter-gis.com)

*You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5355 (20100810)  
\_\_\_\_\_

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

9/14/2010

**Denise Holmes, AMCT**

---

**From:** Garry Hunter [ghunter@hunter-gis.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 17, 2010 5:09 PM  
**To:** Baker, Cam (MNDMF)  
**Cc:** Brunton, Frank (MNDMF); Rowell, Dave (MNDMF); Laing, Craig (MNR); Mott-Allen, Nancy (MNR); Denise Holmes, Melancthon Township; Jerry Jorden; Terry Horner; Ron Mills; Chris Hibberd; Dale Rutledge; NDACT; Fyon, Andy (MNDMF); Kelly, Ross (MNDMF)  
**Subject:** Re: Dec 15, 2009 OGS Revised Bedrock Aggregate Resource Mapping North Dufferin / Request to Temporarily Withdraw

Mr Baker,

Thank you for your technical reply and clarifications to my request in your letter of July 21, 2010.

1. I recognize that the ARIP mapping is at regional scale and not intended as a proxy for site or property scale evaluations. However municipalities and agencies are seldom in position to make this technical distinction. Melancthon's Planner simply copied the Dec 2009 Prime 'Amabel' Bedrock Resource Area (<8 m overburden) into his draft OP Schedules without modification and excluded the Guelph Resource area

2. On the basis of your comments about accepting information from the proponent only on the condition that it can be released to the public, I again request the drill core information provided / prepared on OGS inspection even if in preliminary form.

I fully understand that there is an ongoing revision of the longstanding bedrock nomenclature for the Escarpment. However ratepayers have need for bedrock information now even if the nomenclature is not final.

3. The proponent overburden information provided to us did not carry any Professional Certification.

4. My evidence continues to be that the outcrop locations in your digital map files are double counted because of a technical issue related to coordinate transformations from multiple source maps containing similar 'root' outcrop information. Furthermore most but not all of the outcrops are in road cuts or stream valleys and should have associated overburden depths for the immediately adjacent uplands.

5. Thank you for confirming that 6 of the 14 (42 %) of the Test Pits in the Con III OS quarry cell (N 1/2 Lot 17 to Lot 20) did not encounter bedrock at backhoe depths (18 ft?). I also note that no test pits were located in the S1/2 of Lot 17 suggesting the proponent also recognized the deeper overburden in this area. At the E 1/2 of the Lot 16/17 boundary, overburden is greater than 50 ft deep.

6. My opinion continues to be that OGS, based on the information available at the time, has exaggerated the extent of the available Amabel Bedrock Resource in the Dec 2009 ARIP version. This is leading to inappropriate and inequitable over designation in Melancthon Draft Official Plan documents.

7. The lack of verifiable information on the location of the Guelph/ Amabel contact and thickness of the Guelph above the Amabel Resource to the west of the contact

9/13/2010

frustrates aggregate resource planning and the application of the PPS (2005). Considering -formation southwesterly dip(s), how far south west of the contact is there still potential to establish an Amabel quarry? How far south west until there is a significant enough thickness (say 20 m) of appropriate resource for a Guelph quarry?

I continue to look forward to the OGS soon providing field work updates in either legacy Guelph / Amabel terminology as employed in the ARIP and above or preferably in Mr Brunton's revised nomenclature for the Luther Lakes, Corbetton, Hornings Mills, Maple Valley and Lavender Falls areas.

Ontario Geological Survey has both the data and the unique expertise to address the above questions..

Yours truly,

**Garry T. Hunter M.A.Sc. P.Eng.**  
President

Hunter and Associates / Hunter GIS  
2285 Dunwin Drive, Unit 18  
Mississauga, ON L5L 3S3

Tel (905) 607-4120  
Fax (905) 607-1132  
Email [ghunter@hunter-gis.com](mailto:ghunter@hunter-gis.com)  
Website <http://www.hunter-gis.com>

*This message contains confidential information intended only for the use of the person or entity named as recipient. The distribution or copying of this e-mail by anyone other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us and delete your copy. Thank you for your cooperation*

On 22/07/2010 3:05 PM, Baker, Cam (MNDMF) wrote:

Further to previous correspondence from Andy Fyon.

Cam Baker

Cameron Baker, Senior Manager  
Sedimentary Geoscience Section  
Ontario Geological Survey  
933 Ramsey Lake Road  
Sudbury, Ontario P3E 6B5

Tel: (705) 670-5902  
Fax: (705) 670-5905  
Cell: (705) 929-4084  
Email: [cam.baker@ontario.ca](mailto:cam.baker@ontario.ca)

---

Total Control Panel

[Login](#)

To: [dholmes@melancthontownship.ca](mailto:dholmes@melancthontownship.ca) [Remove](#) this sender from my allow list  
From: [ghunter@hunter-gis.com](mailto:ghunter@hunter-gis.com)

*You received this message because the sender is on your allow list.*

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 5375 (20100818)

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

9/13/2010