

Meeting Minutes



ARCWG Sub-Meeting: Stream / Valley Mapping

Location:	Caledon Town Hall, Mayfield-Palgrave Room 6311 Old Church Rd, Caledon East, ON
Date:	April 11, 2024
Time:	4:30pm – 6:30pm

In Attendance

Joe Nethery (JN), Xavier Costa (XC), Ian Sinclair (IS), Jane Thompson (JT), Neil Morris (NM), Jeff Hignett (JH), Martin Bamford (MB), Councillor Christina Early (CE), Cheryl Connors (CC)

Regrets

Mayor Annette Groves (AG), Steven Burke (SB), David Sylvester (DS), Councillor Lynn Kiernan (LK)

Agenda Items

Mapping Presentation (4:30 p.m.)

- JT: where does the town get this data?
 - JH: the provincial data should align with the CVC mapping data
 - JN: by applying new information on top of the base data provided by the province and additional reputable sources, these layers have been put together
- JH: valley mapping 1 shows two purple colours, darker purple is the added areas, and light purple is the unchanged areas
 - Intermittent streams are the dashed blue lines, where permanent streams are in solid blue
 - Natural features and areas are hashed in green, where solid green shows the Niagara escarpment plan area
- JT: a natural heritage system, what does that look like? Do you have a data layer that shows that? That's one of the things that's super confusing
 - JH: now following the upper-tier standard and it is now called "Natural Features and Areas"
 - JN: there are nuances between each layer established in those Provincial documents

- IS: This raises a question about the confidence in data
 - JH: the mapping of the province isn't meant to display that much detail
 - JN: there's a question regarding the level of confidence and data, and what's the backstop behind that in the event that there is an issue with the mapping
 - NM: Whole issue of round truthing needs to be addressed
 - JN: there is routinely policy wording around this accuracy, with final evaluation typically done at a site-specific stage when there is a project at hand
- IS: highly vulnerable aquifer mapping is very important, I am thinking about fuel handling
 - JT: locate refueling outside of site with asphalt or concrete pads, and make it part of the licensing agreement
- JN: Peel Region has provided the criteria as to what constraints were included as HPMARA
 - One thing that we learned through the HPMARA convo, there are items not included in the HPMARA/ things in the purple that this group finds inappropriate
 - Local constraints exercise is already listed as a policy idea
 - **Have potentially uses of lands or activities been considered in the locating of resources areas and constraints? (How does this align with source water protection requirements?)**
- JT: what other policies would be relative?
 - Revisiting: there should be a threshold study on surface and ground water feasibility/dewatering
- IS: why bother going out with all the other studies if you haven't gotten the surface and ground water feasibility/dewatering out of the way yet
 - **Is there an ability to phase or stage applications such that some threshold policies are met prior to allowing an application to advance?**
 - HPMARA should be considered an overlay with streams, valleys, natural features and so on—so that when you're looking at an application you're not just looking at the HPMARA
 - In consideration you can look at several different maps
 - **JN: Can we include mapping that shows the interrelation of various features with potential mineral aggregate resource areas?**
- **MB: If extraction is permitted on or adjacent to a highly vulnerable aquifer, there should be policy direction as to what measures are appropriate as to how aquifer is protected through all phases of operation, including closure and rehabilitation.**
- **IS: Are exhausted pits appropriate to be shown as potential resource areas?**
 - NM: figuring out the best way to make sure the constraints we are considering are appropriately addressed in our policy options
 - JT: Identify new resource areas that the province has put out in maps, after you apply the regional constraint mapping, what do we now have? It's trying to scope it down to the new areas and what's left
 - **JN: Asking Jeff to explain the yellow portions on the mapping that was assembled**
- **CC: Source Water Protection information should be reflected on the aggregate resource mapping.**
 - The most shocking part of seeing this was the Region not providing reason for what was and wasn't taken out of the mapping. Observable inconsistencies in the removal of areas
 - JT: do we all want to make our list and share?
 - JN: I'll leave that to you as individuals to decide
 - **To add to next main meeting agenda**
- IS: is there a market for the resources identified, how do we deal with that fairly? Some companies don't want some of the resources from certain areas
 - JT: who's going to pick up a little 5-acre extraction site
 - JN: something that may not appear valuable to one person may not necessarily be true to another
 - JT: the analysis we're trying to go through is what is realistic and what isn't
 - CC: this is human health involved, and the settlement areas are present prior to the aggregate site. We're accelerating this way too fast; we're rushing through something that took past staff 9 years to do

- **Is there a requirement to update the maps as part of this study?**
- NM: the perspective I'd like to bring back is there is a requirement to update the OP, so in doing that, we can either skip aggregates or we can try and fit it in—there is a strong need for it. Don't want to support the idea of it taking 9 years, and the mapping is just a piece of the puzzle
- IS: find people in the building and give the residents a full hard copy of the OP
 - JN to share IS recommendation with Steve
- *Meeting ends 6:05pm*