

## Supplementary Aggregate Resources Policy Study - Working Group Meeting #5

---

Location:	Caledon Town Hall, Mayfield-Palgrave Room 6311 Old Church Rd, Caledon East, ON
Date:	February 22 <sup>nd</sup> , 2024
Time:	6:30pm – 8:30pm

---

### IN ATTENDANCE

Steven Burke (SB), Jeff Hignett (JH), Mark Dorfman (MD), Glenn Pothier (GP), David Sylvester (DS), Cheryl Connors (CC), Jane Thompson (JT), Neil Morris (NM), Martin Bamford (MB)—remote (part of meeting), Joe Nethery (JN), Xavier Costa (XC), Ian Sinclair (IS), Mayor Annette Groves (AG), Councillor Lynn Kiernan (LK)—remote, Councillor Christina Early (CE), Marsha Paley (MP)—remote

### Regrets

Credit Valley Conservation staff—will be moving to technical meeting advance only

### AGENDA ITEMS

- **OPENING REMARKS (6:30 P.M.)**
  - Welcome, Indigenous land acknowledgement and session overview/objectives
  - GP Introduction
- **GP: This evening is really focused on hearing from members of the group re: issues and concerns**
- GP: Next meeting will allocate time to go through the rest of concerns and thoughts (the remaining of the 13)
- Questions about Agenda
  - IS: requests that we explore the number of meetings and their content for the future

- **SHARING THE 'NEWS' (6:40 P.M.)**

- New Project Manager
- New draft work plan and process
  - *Questions and comments*
- JN introduces himself and work plan draft
  - We are currently in phase 2b of this project as defined by work plan draft, and at the completion of process review task
  - The recommendation report will be split into two items, one being preliminary policy options report and background report
- Currently finalizing the Background Report—issues discussion feedback is going into that
  - Proposing to be undertaking that work into the beginning of April
  - Trip to council in March—with a fulsome report prepared post feedback
    - End of April/beginning of May is the target
- **Final project report—recommendation report—all the content we are documenting will be included in it**
- Information will be posted to the municipal website
- June 25<sup>th</sup> meeting—bringing options to council

**Note to ARCWG: Following this meeting, a revised work program is being prepared to extend spring technical review, pushing study completion into September.**

#### Walking Through Content of Meetings

- ARCWG meetings 5 & 6 are continued issues listening
- **Meeting 7 should have background report updated and back to the group—intent is to deliver 1 week prior**
- Meeting 8 will have draft policy options report ready

#### Group Questions, Concerns, etc.

- IS – where did this end of April timeline come from? – concern that everything is being compacted.
  - SB – this is the balance we've been able to come up with
  - IS - We're going to try and defend the 1-year extension of ICBL?
    - SB – confirms, we are.
    - JT – What would be the drop-dead date?
    - DS – October would be the expiry of ICBL. Could we work backwards from drop dead date and come back with an adjusted timeframe?
    - JT - When do we have to finalize policies (moving back from October 18)?
    - **Town will come up with a memo to provide a timeline for study completion within ICBL framework**
    - AG – staff are moving things concurrently—working on strengthening policies and working on ICBL

#### GP Summary of Key Points

- We need to clarify dates and legal issues.
- We all want to move forward—but not at the expense of thoroughness.

**Note to ARCWG: Following this meeting, a revised work program is being prepared to extend spring technical review, pushing study completion into September.**

- **TOPIC EXPLORATION (7:10 P.M.)**

- Using the 13 items from the Appendix to ARCWG Report to Council as the starting point — and working through them one-by-one:
  - *What are the concerns/issues/current Caledon OP weaknesses regarding the item?*
  - *Within the realm of what is permissible and legal, what policies/approaches could the Town of Caledon embrace to:*
    - *Ensure stringent/strong review of any new aggregate applications?*
    - *Maximize the protection of the community from an aggregate operation within the Town?*
  - *What comparable jurisdictions should be explored?*

- JT – Presentation

- We are to have input as the public voice—to speak directly to council
  - Want to be clear and present in what is finally produced
    - Such as, concerns and responses
  - Want record of the voice who is speaking and what they are saying
- Want input from Conservation Authority—get their interpretation, data, and mapping of important/relevant features
- *Mapping*
  - Concern over mapping of water resources:
    - Create a revised base map
    - Focus on new resources that Province has identified
    - Determine which areas are and are not realistic for future extraction
  - When we update mapping, map valley and stream corridors, woodlands and their drainage as well
    - It seems a lot of these features are not included in the mapping that was produced
    - Be reflected in the CHPMARA
- What is proposed vs in current OP
  - Big concern that approach in new OP is completely different from existing OP
  - Excess soil and filling is a threat
  - Air quality
  - The study should consider If the new OP should be adopted in full/Town-wide, in a phased manner, or deferred with respect to aggregate policies
- Proposal for side meetings where 1 or more members of the ARCWG will go off and pursue in depth an issue
  - Open to members of the ARCWG, and JN will facilitate
- IS – we need to clarify jurisdiction of CAs
  - We want to hear on the pits to park initiative:
    - Pinchin Pit and West Flaherty – Laura Rundell at CVC likely of assistance
  - **We should have a presentation on the current fill regulations**
    - Major concern in terms of rehabilitation
    - Quality control, Storage, trucking
    - Concerns about complete loss of control of the landscape
  - Need to take inspiration from OPA 161
- JT – time and approach should be to keep OP we have and upgrade and improve it for rural areas, we can treat urban areas differently
- CC – foundational principles from public's perspective

- From public' s perspective
      - Aggregate uses interfere with social functions
      - Public is expecting us to adequately protect them
  - JT - Mapping of streams has been done by the CA.
    - Would like to sit with CA and figure out how they work with the criteria and do the mapping
    - There are extensive water resources in Caledon—needs protection and consideration
      - consideration of pollution as it flows towards Lake Ontario
      - We want to dilute rather than pollute as it moves south
      - We simply don't have the resources to go and define each stream bed
      - Accurate mapping is wanted to inform better policy
    - Check post-meeting Niagara escarpment schedule—JH and Mark's map of Niagara escarpment/stream superimposed mapping
      - **The map will be shared**
  - **What is the ask relating to this schedule? – GP**
    - Not to try and repeat the process that resulted in the current map
    - Deal with new resources the province has identified
      - **Come up with a process of assessment and analysis**
  - MD - Needs to apply local constraints
    - CC - **suggests this is a side meeting topic**
  - **Requested: stream map and comparison of selected bedrock resources areas in Peel superimposed with each other**
  - Language making JT worried about new OP. Existing env. policies are solid, do not want to see the town lose them
    - IS – in terms of env study, doesn't see the ecosystem approach in the new proposed OP changes
  - Trucking issue – needs to be part of the conversation
  - We never did an analysis of our OP and best practices of other municipalities (matrix format)
- 
- DS: Info we intend to include (referring to circulated document):
    - Recommended policy principles and ideas:
      - Supported with evidence based, scientific evidence to give it legitimacy to appeal at OLT
      - Muskoka lakes policy – 2000m separation zone will likely not be supported in an OLT appeal due to lack of evidence
    - Principles we can't lose sight of:
      - Social impacts
      - Heritage
      - Hydrology
      - Traffic impacts
      - Health impacts
    - AG – Ask that we do look at "WHO" chart to protect residents of the area
- 
- **NEXT STEPS & OPEN FORUM (8:20 P.M.)**
    - GP need 2 hour meetings, look at issues list + give more meaningful thought, make this issues-focused. Have a list, discuss 2 issues each meeting.
      - JT don't dismiss issues

- SB we're interested in your input, want to discuss issues whether in OP or not (e.g., environmental policies). We assure you we aren't dismissing feedback. Policies provided are preliminary, please review, give feedback.
- GP need 2 hour meetings, look at issues list + give more meaningful thought, make this issues-focused. Have a list, discuss 2 issues each meeting
- SB – We see a role for experts in aiding us in creating and preparing these policies
  - Additional working group meetings
  - Put in a list to JN of the side meetings
  - JT list of 13 is a good point of starting
- GP need 2 hour meetings, look at issues list + give more meaningful thought, make this issues-focused. Have a list, discuss 2 issues each meeting
  - NM – Will bringing in technical experts be a reach? Is it unusual or feasible (in a planning context)?
  - SB – we have to sort out what their roles would be, but they would definitely add value
  - No technical experts have been procured as of the date of this meeting
  
- **Closing Remarks (8:25 p.m.)**
  - Looking ahead: Action items/What's next?
  - Any other comments/observations?
  
- GP – concludes and ends meeting.