

# Meeting Minutes



## Supplementary Aggregate Resources Policy Study - Working Group Meeting # 9

---

Location:	Caledon Town Hall, Mayfield-Palgrave Room 6311 Old Church Rd, Caledon East, ON
Date:	June 6, 2024
Time:	6:00pm – 8:30pm

---

### 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), Neil Morris (NM), Martin Bamford (MB), Raida Chowdry (RC), Marsha Paley (MP)

### Agenda Items

#### Opening Remarks (6:00 P.M.)

- GP: Welcome, Indigenous land acknowledgement and session/agenda overview
- GP: The working group has generously shared their time, wisdom, and talent. You have provided policy ideas, we have a draft policy options report, there is more work to do with that report. A number of the working group members are unhappy with the draft and don't want it to be put forward. Some may not have had a chance to digest it.

#### Policy Options Report (6:10 P.M.)

- JN: Our latest milestone is the interim draft options report. I don't want to suggest the report is in a final state. Some of those changes that I am asking to have reflected, it is a revised conclusion that consolidates recommendations.
  - GP: To confirm are you referring to the summary of policy options?
  - JN: Yes.
- JN: I am going to ask for additional policy analysis to help illustrate the intent behind the answers provided. For example, the maps and how they come into play should be better

clarified. The document is also not finally formatted. It is important to follow the guidelines of the AODA so everyone can access this information.

- JN: In front of you is a companion piece that includes the policy ideas from the last three submissions that came from Jane, Ian, and Allan along with responses.
  - JN: to update memo name for Jane's submissions.
  - JN: There should be a reference to which questions have been incorporated with a response that is either ranked clarification needed, item to discuss, professional disagreement, not incorporated, or incorporated.
- GP: What does professional disagreement mean?
  - JN: Not to close off those discussions, but it's where we see a planning challenge.
  - JN: Discussion means we want to ensure we understand the question correctly.
  - GP: What is the difference between clarification needed and item to discuss?
  - JN: Clarification needed comments are more minor and straightforward.
- IS: There is no discussion for policy "bbbbbb". How?
  - MD: Under 6-18 is the questions. Go to page 52, 6-16.
  - JN: We are happy to discuss and understand. Is there an alternative way to express this?
- JT: The whole process is jammed. We have done a lot of studies, and we have a lot of material. The way the process is set up, Mark was doing this report before we were done. I don't think any work we did meant anything for this report. We need to talk about the process and about how we as the working group develop policy options and work through issues. We need to come up with a list of issues and policy topics. We have a lot to discuss.

### **Member Submissions — Status and Alignment (6:20 P.M.)**

- IS: We are highly experienced residents. That is why we are here. The Terms of Reference says that this working group will aid the Town of Caledon. It's not "let's have a meeting" it's more like "we'll do it". We are supposed to aid the council, we are doing all this work, and the work is being dismissed.
- CC: On the first page it says that the working group were provided a draft of report, and they had a meeting on June 5, 2024. It has been written that the meeting has already occurred, and it conflicts with the Terms of Reference. What do you get out of the open house with content like this?
- DS: There are some redeeming components. There are two fundamental shortcomings because it doesn't speak to the natural environment or impact on human health. We need more here. They are safeguards that would create a terrific improvement. In terms of June 19th, I don't know if this can be rescued to create a meaningful open house.
- SB: June 19th was scheduled to avoid the summer season. Having said that, a resident asked for a second public meeting, so we are looking at a second open house for a July 25th meeting. It also comes with an early July ARCWG meeting to discuss content received, and further reports. It's a two-stage process.

- GP: I came in partway through this process. What is the group's role? For example, using the 1000m buffer as an example. If the project team can't support it, what happens?
  - MB: I see snippets of ideas, educating readers on a topic. But it doesn't necessarily conclude on a recommendation. The professional disagreement points should be discussed before going out as concluded. I don't know what the next step is.
  - JT: It feels like a decision is already made. This is MDs vision. Process-wise, this is not what I envisioned. I thought we would release a document that identifies who brought up concerns, how it was addressed, how the decision was reached, and how we got to those answers.
  - GP: But if a difference of opinion remains?
  - JT: Council decides. They should see all the issues.
  - SB: Council makes the decision; we use a lot of sources such as the public and working group. That is all presented in the final report. Ultimately, the report is written by MD.
  - JT: A lot of input won't be made public. It needs to be disclosed.
  - MD: I appreciate what you're saying. I dealt with all of the comments and submissions, and I didn't write it before I received it. When I was going through various submissions, I was not making a definitive statement or answers (they are not answers). The point is this is a discussion document.
  - MD: It is not a final definitive statement. The only reality is that there are statutes and guidelines that the Province has put out there for the last 50 years. This is an attempt by Caledon to deal with the impacts and implications of pits and quarries. We cannot regulate them; we have no authority. The only thing we can do is use the by-law amendments.
- IS: Releasing the report June 2 for a June 5 meeting and requesting comments within two days is confrontational. The process is not collaborative, not at any point. Staff takes our input and just go away to write policy without us. Others in this group are upset. We need collaborative development on these policies. Why are we sitting through these discussions without SB or MD there?
- GP: Who controls who goes into this report?
  - JT: The Terms of Reference says working group is to provide direction. We just need to accept the report as a fair representation of the work being done. We are attempting to find consensus. The working group will decide if it is to be released.
  - CC: Could the 19th be an information outreach? Receive more input to consider?
- CC: It is not "what we think", it's in the Terms of Reference that we will collaborate and direct. We have much experience and meet considerably (inside and out of the process) to discuss. We haven't discussed the issues. We're not trying to fight with staff, I thought we were on the same page, but I feel ignored and disrespected.
- NM: I am taking a different view. My view is we were assembled to provide input. I see steps in a process to get us to a point of comfort.

- DS: I will admit I expected collaboration to influence policies written. I thought planners would write the final draft. My assumption was planners have the right to determine the recommendations.
- GP: It would have been good to have this figured out from the start. We need to reconcile this now.
  - JT: I am not saying the working group can say no. But the report must fairly represent input received and that has been considered.
- MB: I didn't think we were writing policy or dictating release, but we should be doing more and contributing more than as a passive spectator. Where do the working group's inputs get documented?
- GP: Can we recast the report in a manner aligned with Jane? Issues area, individual issue areas within that big item, reflect the working group discussions, and therefore analyze and make a recommendation.
  - JT: That would be useful. Drill down to topics identified of interest to focus attention.
  - JN: We absolutely can. My hope was to get feedback like this to improve. There is an intriguing idea here. It requires time to pull this together.
  - GP: So, June 19<sup>th</sup> wouldn't be about the policy options report.
  - MD: We started talking about fundamental issues. I am framing this entire discussion. I don't want to take you down a road where you are just going to fail. This is about the community. The process is evolving as I would have anticipated it.
- JT: The issues are as you see them. We need a first principles discussion around issues.
  - MD: For example, land use compatibility is important.
  - JT: I agree, but there are other locational issues at hand. We should make our locational issues clear.
  - GP: Opposed to having just the policy, make sure to talk about who was involved.
- JN: I am hearing suggestions to make this report more whole and make sure it accurately reflects conversations we have had. As tough a conversation we are having, I am hearing things that are actionable.
- IS: Gist is that options report won't be the basis of the open house?
  - SB: The report came out fast, to start discussions and get feedback. I could definitely recommend a revised approach to 19th.
  - DS: What about submitting our ideas ahead of time?
  - JT: Is July 25 fixed?
  - SB: Availability of alignment (facility, councilors, staff).
  - JT: Should canvas again after the June 19 event, before advertising it, to ensure alignment.
- GP: So, is there consensus around workshops on the policy options report? Should we do a series of workshops? And for how long, 1 hour? Half day?
  - JT: Half days will give us time to discuss principles and the process.
  - GP: So, do we have consensus?

- MB: I don't know, I'm not available.
- JT: Not everyone needs to be engaged in every discussion.
- GP: Would the group allow JT to work with MD and JT?
- JT: A principles discussion should be one session.
- NM: What is the difference of issues vs principles vs concerns?
- MD: Human health is a fundamental principle. There are two planning fundamentals: Is it good planning? Is it in the public interest?
- GP: I think the way MD interprets principles is different than the working group.
- IS: If you're going to discuss principles it would be helpful to ground them out. "What are the tests for?" There are lot of high-level labels being thrown around, what do they mean? You have to look at planning tests to frame those.

### **Upcoming June 19 Public Meeting (8:05 P.M.)**

- GP: Let's recap.
  - June 19<sup>th</sup> open house is a go, the policy options report does not go out as part of that (recast).
  - July 25 is a pending hold for the requested second open house, dependent on the 19<sup>th</sup> and initial examinations.
  - Looking at some future workshops to discuss. "Principles" anytime Wednesday June 12.
- DS: The non-official plan items could be great as principles. Let's make as much progress as possible on Wednesday.
- JT: We could bring Regional maps and also show where we are in the process.
- GP: State of process, thoughts on principles, issues areas.
- IS: Might consider using 63 statements raised, perhaps as a survey to gather feedback on items.

### **Next Steps and Open Forum (8:20 P.M.)**

- JN: Staying internal for the time being for the policy options report.
- IS: Professional disagreement needs to be renamed.
- SB: Did we have an agreement on the 63 items as a basis for an open house presentation on June 19<sup>th</sup>?
- MD: Summarize, consider posing issues in buckets.

### **Closing Remarks (8:25 P.M.)**