

# Meeting Minutes



## Supplementary Aggregate Resources Policy Study - Working Group Meeting #6

---

Location:	Caledon Town Hall, Mayfield-Palgrave Room 6311 Old Church Rd, Caledon East, ON
Date:	March 21, 2024
Time:	6:30pm – 8:30pm

---

### In Attendance

#### In-Person

Steven Burke (SB), Glenn Pothier (GP), Cheryl Connors (CC), Neil Morris (NM), Joe Nethery (JN), Xavier Costa (XC), Ian Sinclair (IS)

#### Remote

David Sylvester (DS), Martin Bamford (MB), Councilor Lynn Kiernan (LK), Mark Dorfman (MD), Marsha Paley (MP), Councilor Christina Early (CE), Jane Thompson (JT)

#### Regrets

Jeff Hignett (JH), Mayor Annette Groves (AG)

### Agenda Items

- **Opening Remarks (6:30 p.m.)**
    - Welcome, Indigenous land acknowledgement and session/agenda overview
- 
- GP: Opens to comments re: last meetings notes
    - No remarks regarding meeting #5 notes

- **Process for Initiative Advancement (6:40 p.m.)**

- Work plan update
- Small group meeting plan (and expert participation at those)
- Background Report completion plan
- Disclosure of documents

- 
- JN: We remain in the issues and review phase
    - Issues analysis
      - Background report as additional context
      - Saved to add the policy recommendations report
  - Individual subgroup (SG) meetings for topic exploration
  - Working group meetings one a month
  - **Briefing council in June—as regularly scheduled**
  - Open house to be based on questions raised through that
  - In summer, to be working on draft official plan and (if needed) zoning by-law amendment
  - **Statutory public meeting targets for Sept 3 or 17**
  - **Recommendation report for Committee / Council adoption in September/October**
  - We have procured more technical experts to meet with us for the next two breakout groups

Comments and questions:

- IS: How is sub-group scheduling progressing? Are we going to heard from Credit Valley Conservation and the region on the Flaherty West and Pinchin Pits. Somewhere along the way we'll need a discussion regarding fill
  - JN: we don't have a set master list right now
  - Should be mostly set within the week
- IS: Is there a master list of documents that have been produced?
  - JN: We are working on a project website update which will include a master record
  - We could be making more thorough use of the website and it's an effective tool leverage from an information standpoint

Background Completion Plan

- JN: an important piece to complete to keep us moving forward. First draft of the report completed in the next week.
- **Our intent to have it prepared for discussion for ARCWG meeting in April**
- **Comprehensive analysis will happen in the Policy Options report**
- **Ensures the feedback from these sessions is included in the policy report**
  
- NM: greatly supports a mechanism for identifying feedback. Would like to firm up the way of going about it. We make a lot of points and comments, but we don't know how it's being recorded or reflected
- JN: would have a personal bias to track changes in word
  - Build a comment table to say what was received
    - Ex. NM said this... accepted, rejected etc
- DS: the terms of reference for supplementary aggregate resource was passed a year ago, noted comprehensive analysis is to be completed. How can we come up with new policy inputs if we don't even understand the strength of our current policy? Why was this report not complete last fall?
- SB: updates are being made to the background report
- DS: Will there be part of the background report part of the comprehensive policy options report
- JN: we need a couple months to pull that off
- **GP/SB: What revisions will be in the background report? What will be included in the policy options report?**
  - JN: contains summary of aggregate framework (history)

- Containing some statistical information about Caledon aggregates
  - Containing and tying up the discussions we're having currently (and sub-group meetings)
    - It requires more time to do that appropriately and maximize what time we have left
  - DS: does anyone else feel it is vitally important to have had this proper analysis of existing policies already made?
    - JN: coming up with this work plan and strategy is a response to that
  - CC: agrees with DS
    - What is our existing policy? What need to be improved and what are other municipalities doing?
    - What value comes from updating the background report?
  - IS: we should be looking at OPA 161, looking at what failed, what worked, what needs new (fill; comprehensive rehabilitation plan). Is there a table of contents for the report?
    - JN: yes
  - NM: we can do a lot of good work without having the background report
    - We can creatively come up with suggestions of how these things can be addressed
    - Doesn't want the group to get confused that we can't move forward without getting this done
  
  - **Topic Exploration (7:10 p.m.)**
    - Topic 1: HPMARA Mapping — report on outcomes of the small group meeting
      - *Questions of fact/clarification*
      - *Additional comments/feedback*
      - *Implications for moving forward*
    - Topic 2: New OPA Chapter 13, Environmental Policies
      - *Sharing of rationale and OP phasing approach*
      - *Questions of fact/clarification*
      - *Additional comments/feedback*
      - *Future meeting on the Policies*
    - Topic 3: Requested discussion on separation distances
- 

Topic 1:

- Discussion at end of meeting about big points covered (5 points found in slides and SG meeting 1 notes)
  - Limitations of constraints
  - Aim of OGS is to simply inform decision makers and are science focused only
  - Responsibility of the town re: constraints
    - Notion that the resource is present weighs strongly
  - What does protection for long term mean?
    - We have the 2023 report for mapping methodology
    - Peel staff are going back through their records to see if they have reasons for additional removal of areas in Caledon
    - Many areas in Brampton were removed
  - Mapping acts an identifier
    - We are interested in looking at methodology and making town-based maps
    - Taking what's been provided to us isn't sufficient
- JN: it's important that we're getting policy ideas. Taken the liberty to write 4 notes re: these items, looking for strong feedback on the following (will do this in sub-group meetings going forward)
  - 1. Develop and apply a local town constraints protocol
  - 2. A policy, statement of intent, or definition of protection for the long term
  - 3. Req. around demonstrating fiscal feasibility around a new extraction?

- 4. Req. around demonstration practicality of new extraction? What does this mean?

#### Comments and Questions

- CC: impression left that Caledon would likely undertake a constraints exercise
  - Ministry of Mines people saying that there were some economic considerations
  - Difficult to map bedrock appropriately, that Mono Mills is bedrock and may not be accurate mapping
  - Industry can go to the province and have geological maps changed
  - In terms of protecting the resource, it gets protected until the land value changes for a new use (e.g., housing)
  - Directive gets broken all the time for economic
  - Methodology of report seemed to not be applied consistently (small fragments kept in places and removed in others?)
- GP: are we doing further work around these things?
  - JN: Policy Options are target for this; this is something that the project team needs answered
- IS: is it worth time challenging experts' knowledge of identifying aggregate resources in mapping?
  - Asked about groundwater during SG meeting
  - Quarries must have a dry working floor – all water needs to be pumped out, so where will all the water go? If no receiving streams nearby, so where will it be removed to?
  - Don't challenge the presence of the bedrock or groundwater, this is a major constraint that needs to be considered
  - Identification of resource versus designation as a land use is a problem
  - Dig into history of "cabinet corners" and issues of designation
  - What does protection of the long-term mean?
  - The effects of having these and use identifications and land use policy which is a provincial policy thing
  - Problem of the fragments, doesn't see its reasonable or viable to protect fragments
  - Same influence on those whose property abuts it
  - Practicality and protection—PPS—identify and protect as much as practically possible, where practical is undefined
  - We should cover it in the background report, easier to defend (in OLT)
- CC: OLT treats it as a designation
  - SB: where we need to clarify is in the policies as well, not a designation
  - JN: policy hit points in here that will be included in report
- **DS: IS suggested policy inclusion that says any request to mine below water table aggregate would need a dewatering and watershed study be completed first**
  - JN: Taking note of that and include it in the working group suggestions
  - GP: all these ideas are being captured and being given serious consideration
- JT: respond and build on what IS what saying vs identification vs protection, we need to look at that and see what we do and don't like—local refinement: Caledon constraints
  - JN: suggests JT writes up a mapping request and team can work to set that up
  - JT: will write it up and set it up as a meeting
  - MP: supplied Caledon with all the layers that the city has used (GIS)
  - There is no list of specific properties and the specific criteria as to why they were removed.
  - Rockford remains identified because it was identified that the resource could not be removed at that time It is an identification of the resource but for the purposes of the OMB it is not going forward from a planning perspective
  - JT: there will have to be some further discussion around Rockford, OMB says it would be env devastating to extract with current tech
- IS: real conundrum in planning for aggregates, whitebelt and commercial and residential. For aggregates we have to do all this ARIP and must be of a quantity currently req. for bridges, road. You look at policy in PPS and it doesn't really fit for aggregates

## Topic 2:

- SB: approach is that the OP is ready for adoption Ch. 13 propositions. We can have a meeting or SG meeting discussing env policies and what we want, like, dislike, don't want. It is within this study's scope to identify revisions to the environmental policies if items emerge out of this study
  - JT: one of the things that kept being said is that none of this is etched in stone, it's all up for review
  - SB confirms
- JT: in S. 1.1.2 in proposed OP, there are a number of areas that would remain under the old plan—including Schedule "L"
  - Seems that applications coming in should be considered under existing plan while new one is being built still. Could clarify scope and make easier to amend later
  - SB: that is what we're doing, current aggregate policies are not going to be changed
  - JT: Are they going to be subject to Ch. 13 (new applications)
  - SB: Current aggregate policies are still in place. Even if Council adopts these new policies now, they don't come into effect until province approves them. If Peel approves them in a timely fashion, it may be subject to appeal.
  - There will be a point when there are two plans in effect, and applications will need to be considered how each apply
- JT: in the plan and dev committee meeting yesterday, it was said all natural env areas are not being diminished. A simple way to preserve that is that valley and stream corridors be given env protection designation. Ensures intent that was given to committee
  - SB: disagrees, feels that it's the same under the new plan
  - Is there interest in having a future SG meeting about this?
  - JN: it was on the list, there is significant pressure to have this discussion, that's why it's on the agenda now—not currently planned as a future SG meeting
  - JT: There's no way to call it fair to say it's protective
- IS: In pits and quarries act 1971, grandfathered with no filters, it's not right
  - JN: issue area to explore to see what we can do—see if it's a license issue or policy thing
  - IS: the planning act in zoning section cites aggregate mining as a land use. If it never ceases as a land use, the municipality has a right to be involved under the PPS

## Minimum Separation Distances:

- DS: fundamental tool in land use planning, most effective way to divert mining from around sensitive areas. Minimum separation distances covered in draft background report. How are we going to incorporate this into our new aggregate Policies? We don't have another 4 weeks to hear some of the general concepts or ideas
  - JN: re: timelines—policy options report needing 2-3 months to complete, not 4 weeks
  - Target completions in September, a 6-month proposition
  - We have some time here, but we do need to hustle
  - SB: it's on Joe and Mark to decide when that discussion comes forward. Minimum separation distances are on the table and we're still open to input on that
- MD: Provincial policy and interests are very clear, anything relating to aggregate operations is intended to protect aggregate resources and operators. There is nothing in provincial guidelines that sets out to protect sensitive areas. Whether we can impose a standard separation distance is very difficult. There have been attempts to provide min. distance separations, there was still an application within it and the OLT approved it
  - IS: we need a session on land use compatibility, D6 MOE, ...
  - JN: already planned
  - CC: should be following D6 very closely. Even though aggregate is an exception, there is an exemption that permits constraints re: pits and quarries
  - We can't put 300,000 ppl into Caledon and then make half the town pits and quarries

- MD: CC is correct—Caledon needs to have their own standards and regulations outside of the OP. So, when an application comes in, the standards can be applied to arrive at the standard min. separation

- **Next Steps & Open Forum (8:20 p.m.)**

- Looking ahead: Action items/What's next?
  - Any other comments/observations?
- 

- GP: what are you taking from tonight JN?
- JN: continuing to move forward in work plan, SG meetings will be coming up
  - All dates are considered confirmed
  - As we work on website update, group will be kept updated on items
  - On HPMARA, items have been noted
  - Ch.13 policies and considerations have been noted
  - If we are engaging on such matters in the study, that info will be shared
  - On setbacks convo, point was to get the ball rolling
    - Will think about scheduling and setting that up
  - JT is writing up some mapping requests to consider
- IS: request to prepare a map putting HPMARA on top of valuable aquifers mapping and watercourse schedule

- **Closing Remarks (8:25 p.m.)**

---

- GP: moving forward, we will continue to operate in person—we will make best efforts to attend in person—and will maintain a Zoom option as well.