

Meeting Minutes



ARCWG Sub-Meeting: Pits to Parks (Fill Experience)

Location:	Caledon Town Hall, Mayfield-Palgrave Room 6311 Old Church Rd, Caledon East, ON
Date:	April 4, 2024
Time:	10:30am – 12:00pm

In attendance

Jeff Hignett (JH), David Sylvester (DS), Joe Nethery (JN), Xavier Costa (XC), Ian Sinclair (IS), Jane Thompson (JT), Neil Morris (NM)

Guests from CVC: David Hatton (DH), Laura Rundle (LR), Jesse DeJager (JD)

Regrets:

Martin Bamford (MB), Mayor Annette Groves (AG), Councillor Lynn Kiernan (LK), Steven Burke (SB), Mark Dorfman (MD), Glenn Pothier (GP), Councillor Christina Early (CE), Cheryl Connors (CC)

Agenda Items

Laura Rundle Presentation (10:45 a.m.)

Intro and Presentation

- CVC Introductions
 - JD: senior manager of land planning, been with the CA for 20+ years
 - LR: conservation planner, been on this project for 2 years
 - DH: background in soil management, brought in on part-time basis to provide advice for Pits to Parks
- JD: really about the landowner side of things
 - Topic to discuss is Pits to Parks Restoration Project and using excess soil from municipal projects to fill
- *LR: Begins presentation*
 - Working with region to decide how to best use excess soil for this rehabilitation
 - Will eventually be open to the public for recreational use
 - Jim Tovey lakeview conservation area
 - New 26 ha landform on Mississauga's lakefront
 - 1.5 million cubic metres of clean excess soil

- Variety of habitats
 - Open to public in 2025
 - Focused on consulting with partners to decide where excess is going to be coming from
 - Pits to Parks
 - Beneficial reuse of excess soil
 - Enhanced ecological restoration of former pits
 - Two new credit valley parks
- JD: a bit of a different model for green space model
 - LR: Pinchin Pit
 - Acquired 2013
 - Operated by AECON for 15 years (sand and gravel)
 - Acquired for restoration and rec purposes
 - LR: Flaherty West Pit
 - Acquired 2019
 - Sand and gravel – Lafarge
- LR: restoration and feasibility study
 - Still in this phase
 - Determine environmental and social impact
 - 3 stage study components
 - *Stage 1a*
 - Water resource risk – complete
 - Engagement - ongoing
 - Traffic impact - complete
 - Archeological (stage 1) - complete
 - *Stage 1b*
 - Groundwater
 - Conceptual design
 - *Stage 1c*
 - Integrated soil management
 - Target Timeline
 - 2022-2023, restoration feasibility study: stage 1
 - 2024, stage 2
 - 2025, integrated soil management plan
 - 2026+, implementation
- JD: happening at an interesting time with policy updates, etc.
 - Part of the challenge is distinguishing what this is vs other applications
 - Hoping this can show a better way forward for the public and natural heritage post-extraction
 - We're trying to demonstrate that this is a good land use (restoration)
- JT: good demonstration, but maybe not with public money
- DH: excess soil quality control program
 - Beneficial reuse, not sending into land fills
 - definition of soil—not the same as fill, no concrete, strictly soil (including shale)
 - fill is just soil that's been reworked, a lot of different terms we can use
 - Quality Control Program
 - Source site requirements
 - Source site needs to provide all background info to MRNF about soil quality
 - Very detailed, very comprehensive, and can only be done by a qualified person
 - CVC needs qualified person to assess if everything is covered and to be satisfied that the soil meets quality standards
 - Ph, metal and organics, volatile organic compounds...
 - Inspections and audits
 - Site inspections on daily basis, not a requirement but something they do

- Need on-site inspections, can't just assess on paper
 - Those inspections are key
 - Pull trucks aside and take sample to be tested
 - JT: how do you know that all the trucks arriving are coming from the pit they're supposed to be coming from?
 - DH: Tracking mechanism has historically been a paper tracking system
 - Ticket is provided only at source site
 - Now moved to electronic (license plate, time, and date, etc.; CVC can track arrival time estimate, departure; Permanent recorded is then already created)
 - JT: does the private sector receive too?
 - DH: Soil Flow is the monitoring system (it's their technology, they don't do the actual monitoring)
 - DH: right at the source site, they're the final receiver, the receiver ultimately controls...
 - If the truck shows up and they're not on soil flow they get rejected
 - There's a whole process to getting through the gate and getting rejected at the gate
 - Third one: where you take an audit sample, 4-5 days later and they cease your
 - Some of the process you might go to, you contact the source site to resample
 - The sample may be 500g, goes to the lab, and the lab randomly samples 5g
 - If there's one speck of something like copper they'll be flagged
 - If we determine there may be a problem, go back excavate, test around, if there is a problem, that soil would be removed
 - We have so many safety measures in place, never had to remove soil from any sites
 - When we go to tender, put out a significant performance bond
 - They are obligated to follow the rules otherwise a financial penalty
 - JT: are they trucking companies?
 - They are typically excavation contractors
 - JT: what about in Caledon? Or is it up to the property owner
 - DH: can only bring material they are contracted to bring and sites they are contracted for
 - They are also the only contractor responsible, so tracking material is simplified
 - Most comprehensive, effective mechanism to ensure best quality soil
 - CVC is currently drafting soil specification and management guideline document that will be public eventually
 - Aggregate policy comments
 - Encourage simplifying and expediting land use changes post extraction
 - Encourage the transgress of pits and quarries to a public body and/or for public benefit once the license has been surrendered
 - Encourage a set of timelines for extraction activities
 - Policies that support the implementation of rehabilitation plans
 - JT: having only a certain amount of a site disturbed at a time
 - Are there any special considerations for sites below water table?
 - DH?: a different type of rehabilitation
 - Develop a restoration plan for...water...extraction
 - A touch more productive...requirements
 - If we were to acquire a pit that's in water, we'd go through a different process
 - JT: what's the long-term solution for something with kettle lakes?
 - LR: conservation Halton has some interesting examples
 - JT: is it possible to create inflow outflow in these things?
- **Questions and Comments**
- JN: If you're dealing with below water table, the groundwater will eventually continue to fill up, and come up through that cut
 - Halton's Area 9 restoration plan—water environment
 - Ultimately informed by policy and the technical guidelines that go with it
 - Pinchin and Flaherty are "legacy" sites

- DS: as a local resident, the concept or principle of millions of dollars of public money going to rehab the site doesn't sit well in principle. There must be some lesson or takeaways that could be applied to aggregate licenses that could minimize the costs of spent or depleted pits
 - JD: the revenue from receiving the soils pays for the operation and rehabilitation. Rate payer funds aren't being used
- DH: I agree with you, they're putting a lot of responsibility on the Qualified Person
 - They want this designation, and they feel the QP is going to take care of everything
 - Don't rely on the QP like that, QP will not solve all our soil problems
 - We hire a contractor to run our sites who has to provide millions in pollution insurance, plus they want to keep a clean name
 - **CVC will send slides to JN, he will circulate**
- IS: started out by having a fill by-law study, no work has been done since
 - **CVC to send over records from those conversations**
 - **JN: ask CVC to audit emails and send things to JN**
- JN: to wrap up, concluding summary of policy points:
 - Progressive rehab and phasing – JT
 - Public money being spent on sites – DS
 - Qualifying persons and requirements – IS
- JT: in terms of progressive rehab, additional issue: disturbed areas
 - Disrupting soils while still under license
 - JD: see it as requisition
 - JT: so, after uses would be a policy issue
- IS: consulting with the Mississauga First Nations (Flaherty)
 - LR: part of the Charleston West, indigenous gather... trails... different teachings on the site, more detailed perspective being plugged into the project
 - **JD: will send over video of speaker at site discussing fishing**
- *Meeting adjourned, 12:18pm*