

# Meeting Minutes



## Supplementary Aggregate Resources Policy Study - Working Group Meeting # 1 1

---

Location:	Caledon Town Hall, Mayfield-Palgrave Room 6311 Old Church Rd, Caledon East, ON
Date:	July 02, 2024
Time:	12:30pm – 3:30pm

---

### In Attendance

Glenn Pothier (GP), Joe Nethery (JN), Ian Sinclair (IS), Steven Burke (SB), Mark Dorfman (MD), David Sylvester (DS), Cheryl Connors (CC), Jane Thompson (JT), Raida Chowdhury (RC)

### Agenda Items

#### Opening Remarks (12:30 P.M.)

- GP: Indigenous land acknowledgement.
- GP: We want to have a conversation about policy options.
- GP: Draft policy options for the 25<sup>th</sup> open house.
  - JT: Why has that commitment been made? There was a conversation that said if we can do this in time great, but we don't want to put out garbage in a short time frame.
  - SB: That's not a decision which can be made by the Working Group.

#### June 19th Open House Debrief (12:35 P.M.)

- GP: Event overview. Good Q&A session and got positive feedback from the public.
- JN: Key themes. The need for policies to protect natural heritage, green spaces, water resources, air quality polices, etc.

## Jointly Exploring Policy Directions/Options (12:45 P.M.)

- DS: My submission was created by biologists, an environmental lawyer, etc. There was lots of collaboration. But it is short on data.
- DS: Does anyone have an explanation about how to respond to this “item to discuss”? Will we hear today if that means that's included as a policy?
- DS: I have mentioned natural heritage, noise bylaws, low hanging fruit.
  - Paragraph 31.
- JT: I don't need an expert to tell me the rules.
  - MD: I agree, I'm just not familiar with the wording.
- JT: We need to take a look at standards.
- IS: The problem with numbers in planning is missing function. I think we should work on what is really going on.
  - NM: Yeah, but how can we map that? There are some things (changes) we can't map.
  - MD: It's important to set standards in the pre-consultation stage so the Town has a standard in place.
- DS: Joe, will these memos be incorporated in today's discussion?
  - JN: I will defer that to Glenn.
  - GP: It depends on the time. If we want to be productive, we should use topic areas. What is not in here that you would like to see?
- JT: We have more traffic than Toronto, and most of it is Provincial and possibly International. They need to be using other highways.
- JT: Prior to approval a study needs to take place. Before a new aggregate operation becomes in effect, we need to determine that sufficient capacity exists on roads, traffic movements can be accommodated, etc.
  - GP: Mark, is this doable?
  - MD: There's two ways.
  - IS: We can't afford to build all those roads.
- CC: Putting another truck route west of highway 10 is very undesirable. Our roads are so unsafe. Why can't we say that if roads are no longer regional, they can't be truck routes? No aggregate routes should be allowed on Town roads.
  - JN: My recommendation would be, if this delegation happens, it would be wise for the Town to do an update to this work. Implementation of a transportation master plan.
- NM: I can't imagine getting accepted from no longer calling it regional roads.
  - CC: We have the ability to say they can't be used for trucking.
- IS: Sand and gravel. How do you get the provincial networks and who's paying for it? How do we get the product out?
- JN: Disagreement on the word arbitrary.
- IS: I want to see a study and how they dealt with arterial roads.
- IS: Outlier resource areas, subject to “conditions”

- MD: Danger, what about other areas? There will be no law. The test has to be to see if there is an adequate arterial roads to get the material out when you have the HPMARA.
- NM: Water mapping. Are they proposing a subdivision, do they have constraints, require studies?
- JT: They can prevent dust from leaving the site. You might have all the monitoring on the outside. This kilometre zone is now released and has a moveable buffer with certain uses permitted.
  - MD That's why you need Caledon standards rather than Provincial standards.
  - JT: You either mitigate it or own the area on the outside.
- JT: I want to discuss all concerns and then look at each other's documents.
  - MD: We have a complete package of all the solutions.
- IS: I asked for a refueling sub meeting. Having a policy on fuel in recharge areas is really important.
- GP: Water
  - MD: We can say "no discharge beyond the limits of the licensed area". What we're trying to do is focus on the area beyond the licensed area. Licensed areas are limited by ownership.
  - JT: When we're talking about buffers, I think there are uses we can permit due to a large buffer, that we wouldn't permit with a hole in the ground.
  - DS: Once you permit discharge, you are negatively impacting groundwater.
  - JT: I don't know if licensing is the critical issue, here.
  - MD: Water taking regulations are under the Ministry of the Environment.
  - JT: You also have to demonstrate there's no off-site impacts, as part of the evaluation.
  - GP: Is there a policy for water discharge in licensed/unlicensed applications?
  - MD: It's added into the group policy report.
  - MD: Any contamination going off-site, you're saying water should be treated the same way. Should all contaminants be contained within the licensed boundary?
  - DS: Not because it's a contaminant, it could be.
  - IS: Maybe the way to tackle this is through a subwatershed study. Maybe water is leaving the property.
  - JT: Through planning, we minimize by placing things appropriately, such as through buffers.
  - MD: But does the Town have authority to do that?
- JN: Mark has made revisions. We had a successful open house. We can have a discussion next week.
- GP: Let's talk about buffer areas. Why not 1000 meters?
  - MD: I have an application for pit or quarry, it extends into influence area. So, it triggers the requirement to ensure adverse effects are dealt with eliminated or mitigated. It's not a buffer (e.g., 500 metres from licenses aggregate site). That is the way it's done now. That way it forces Caledon to be sure that the community is protected by various operations inside or outside the licensed area. That will lead to a decision by Caledon.

- JT: Draw a line around sensitive things but it is very subjective. But what we want to protect is virtually everything.
  - DS: Mark, is this concept you described in this document? I am looking for something more meaningful and substantial.
  - MD: The Province has created D6 guidelines. Where the thinking is going is that we have to reverse them, and we are not here to protect to aggregate but instead protect community.
  - GP: The disconnect is that David isn't hearing that in the policy.
  - DS: I read in Mark's latest version that there are policies that make D6 guidelines reciprocal. But I don't think it's that simple, the Province wouldn't accept that it's reciprocal but maybe Mark's buffer test will create a similar effect.
  - JT: In my list of constraints, 4 or more lots of 100 acres, it's not a farm anymore. If you expand that concept of where the line gets drawn, that'd be better.
  - MD: My opinions are not in the report, it's just factual. I've struggled with this myself. I'm not discrediting what you're saying, the point is it needs to be effective and in a positive direction on the community, without saying "no more pits".
  - JT: But does this circle intercept that circle? I don't think these people have confidence in the modeling.
  - IS: There are really aggressive applications from the industry. We should be working in the areas of influence & buffers.
- GP: Air quality
    - JT: Cheryl wanted to speak to air quality. We would like to see acceptance of the specifics of the approach.
    - MD: If we start going into specific policies. All of these will be translated into policies. We are not at the point to draft a document that looks like an Official Plan Amendment.
    - IS: We get into the issues of "what's evidence?"
    - MD: I did air quality research. Environment Canada does annual reporting of pits, but they only report if you reduce a certain amount of per year.
    - JT: I think their model is based on 30 days.

### **Next Steps and Open Forum (3:20 P.M.)**

- GP: July 25th public meeting.
- JT: We can put out something general in the Policy Options Report.
  - JN: We need to think about the level of depth that Policy Options Report should go into. You don't need to say they will meet "\_\_\_\_\_" standards. But you can set appropriate standards. The industry is watching this too. What information do you want out? I'm hearing feedback about depth.

- JT: If the item says a policy that will be developed will do “\_\_\_\_\_”, will we be part of the conversation?
  - JN: This won't be the last gathering. I would give a draft to discuss.
  - GP: If we have a meeting next week, that'll speed things up.
- 
- IS: Do we second guess the aggregate industry or best public interest.
  - JN: Ian, you sound like a strategist.
  - MD: In the PPS there is nothing that talks about social impact, only one sentence.

### **Closing Remarks (3:25 P.M.)**

- GP: Joe, any closing thoughts?
- JN: Give yourselves credit for the amount of work you have done.