

# What We Heard Report (Consolidated)

## Resource Extraction Regulatory Review

June 2022









## Table of Contents

4	PROJECT OVERVIEW AND HISTORY
4	ENGAGEMENT HISTORY OVERVIEW
5	WHAT WE HEARD – ALL PHASE SUMMARY
6	PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT OVERVIEW
6	ENGAGEMENT PHASE 1   MAY 19 - JUNE 12, 2020
8	ENGAGEMENT PHASE 2   OCTOBER 19 – NOVEMBER 13, 2020
12	FINAL RESOURCE EXTRACTION REGULATORY REVIEW REPORT
14	PHASE 3 ENGAGEMENT   MAY 3 – 20, 2022

## Project Overview and History

In 2019, Sturgeon County Council directed Administration to commence a Resource Extraction Regulatory Review (RERR). This review was designed to assess whether modifications to the County's Land Use Bylaw or other municipal process were required to ensure a competitive balance between economic, social, health, and environmental outcomes in resource extraction.

The review assessed the County's context, regulations, market conditions, competitive positioning, and best practices in aggregate extraction. The review also sought to incorporate feedback from the public and operators through an extensive consultation process. Upon completion, the RERR engagement process became one of the largest stakeholder engagements in the County's history.

In addition to collecting public feedback, the consultation process offered an opportunity to share information with the public about the aggregate industry, including the economic impacts of the industry, the importance of aggregate, and information on how the industry is regulated.

## Engagement History Overview

- Communications Platform Developed: Q2 2020
- Public Engagement Phase 1: May – June 2020
- Best Management Practices Report (BMP): Q2 2020 Potential Bylaw
- Amendment Scenarios: September 2020
- Public Engagement Phase 2: October – November 2020
- What We Heard Reports 1 & 2: September 2020 and January 2021
- Public Engagement Phase 3: May 2022  
(rescheduled from 2021 due to impact of COVID-19 related health restrictions)





## What We Heard – All Phase Summary

- Resource extraction has clear impacts on resident quality of life – effective regulation is required. Over 60% of those engaged supported a review, however some noted that multiple reviews over time have contributed to some frustration.
- Over 80% of stakeholders agreed that the aggregate industry is important to the local economy.
- Industry reported that a high percentage of available aggregate resources are sterilized by current municipal regulations, such as setbacks. A more competitive, certain, consistent, and science-based approach to both regulation and compliance is needed rather than arbitrary requirements.
- The state of communication between residents and operators requires improvement. Improved community/stakeholder consultation through all stages of aggregate operations is desired, and ongoing operator monitoring and reporting is desired.
- Most operators expressed commitment to being good neighbours.
- The public would like ongoing input and a say in the extraction application process.
- The time required to extract and complete reclamation was noted as a current and ongoing issue.
- It is important to utilize revenues from resource extraction to support municipal tax minimization over time, and to support infrastructure and programs that benefit communities.
- There was overall interest in having a new/updated regulatory model for Sturgeon County, although less consensus as to what type of regulations.
- Extraction of non-renewable resources should be prioritized in the most sustainable locations.
- Community benefits can be significant and need to be prioritized. There are opportunities to review how the CAP levy is allocated, and the governance structure of the municipal oversight committee.
- **Of the eight Final Report recommendations that were provided to the County, six received support and two were not supported.**
  - I Recommendations on process (most supported a need to re-district rather than apply for permitting under AG) and setbacks (most supported same or larger setbacks) were not supported.
  - II Recommendation on increased performance standards (most residents supported more standards on noise, dust, water/air quality monitoring, vehicle registration and driver training, traffic and speed limits, haul routes, hours of operation, reporting, etc.) were supported.
  - III Operator respondents commented that the recommended process was preferred, amended standards could be acceptable if consistent and reasonable, and one operator reported that setbacks greater than 200m from dwellings and subdivisions would continue to significantly impact future operations.

# Public Engagement Overview

A comprehensive three-phase public engagement program was completed as part of the RERR. A comprehensive public engagement program was undertaken to ensure the perspectives of a range of stakeholders were captured.

## Engagement Phase 1 | MAY 19 - JUNE 12, 2020

The following is an excerpt of the [Phase 1 What We Heard Report](#):

*The month-long, first phase of public engagement included interviews with industry representatives and members of the public, an online survey, and informal telephone and email correspondence with the public. In total, 210 online survey responses (including more than 7,000 inputs) were received. Nearly 250 residents and industry representatives were involved in interviews, phone call discussions, and coffee chat sessions overall.*

### KEY FINDINGS | PUBLIC

The public engagement component of the RERR included an online survey and the option to participate in a coffee chat session. Coffee chats consisted of local residents and landowners, while (anonymous) survey participants may have included residents, landowners, and anyone else with an interest in the review. Main findings from the public engagement program are outlined immediately below, while further detail about overall engagement results are explained further within this report.

- 60% of survey respondents believe it is somewhat, or very reasonable to complete the Resource Extraction Regulatory Review project.
- 80% of survey respondents agree that aggregate is essential to the construction industry and the economy in general.
- 69% of survey respondents are somewhat, or very familiar with the typical aggregate application process, with 38% having been involved in an associated public engagement program for a project.
- Survey respondents say the top four priorities associated with this project are noise, water, traffic, and development setbacks.
  - » **Noise** – Most members of the public prefer reducing hours of operation and increasing enforcement to mitigate potential impacts.
  - » **Water** – Residents are mostly interested in protecting drinking water from potential impacts and increasing monitoring and enforcement to mitigate concerns.
  - » **Traffic** – Members of the public mostly mentioned pedestrian and driver safety and overall impacts to infrastructure as key issues.
  - » **Development setbacks** – The majority of combined participants (industry and public) agree that current setbacks are arbitrary, although some said that setbacks still should not be reduced.
- 66% of survey respondents identify as residents and/or landowners within the County.

## KEY FINDINGS | INDUSTRY

The industry engagement component of the RERR included direct interviews with known operators. Main findings from the industry interviews are outlined immediately below, while further detail about overall engagement results are explained further within this report.

- **Communication:** industry noted an overall improvement in communication between operators, the County, and residents would best ensure overall understanding and help build trust.
- **Correctness/accuracy:** generally, industry agrees that a science-based approach to both regulation and compliance is needed rather than arbitrary requirements.
- **Clarity:** industry claimed that lack of clarity on zoning, bylaws, and regulations can create unnecessary confusion and lack of certainty in a project process.

Generally, industry noted that their primary interests are related to zoning, setbacks, performance standards, priority extraction areas, and open pit limits.

In terms of the top four priorities (as mentioned in the previous section), industry responded as follows:

- **Noise** – Collectively, industry is open to improving potential impacts through the implementation of performance standards.
- **Water** – Residents are mostly interested in protecting drinking water from potential impacts and increasing monitoring and enforcement to mitigate concerns. Industry demonstrated openness to create a security fund as a potential mitigation/solution.
- **Traffic** – Industry is generally supportive of increased mitigation measures related to haul traffic to reduce potential impacts. Members of the public mostly mentioned pedestrian and driver safety and overall impacts to infrastructure as key issues.
- **Development setbacks** – The majority of combined participants (public and industry) agree that current setbacks are arbitrary. Industry prefers to limit impacts through performance standards.



## Engagement Phase 2 | OCTOBER 19 – NOVEMBER 13, 2020

The following is an excerpt of the [Phase 2 What We Heard Report](#):

*Engagement Phase 2 included a consideration of potential recommendations / land use bylaw amendment options, and focused on an online survey, informal telephone and email correspondence with the public, and a public open house. The public open house was held on November 5, 2020, from noon until 9:00 p.m., and was conducted in adherence to AHS Covid-19 guidelines at the time. In total, 42 people attended the public open house and 145 survey responses (including more than 3,948 inputs) were received.*

### SURVEY RESULTS

- 65% of survey respondents are residents, 68% are landowners (58% of which are also residents) and 3% represent the aggregate industry.
- 90% of survey respondents believe sand and gravel are very, or somewhat important to the construction industry and municipal infrastructure.
- 81% of survey respondents believe sand and gravel extraction, processing, and other related industries are very, or somewhat important to the local economy.
- 59% of survey respondents suggested that email updates, direct mailings, and dedicated websites are the best way to improve communication and consultation between operators and the community.
- Regarding amendment options considered, there was no firm consensus:
  - » 36% of survey respondents said Amendment Option 1 (Stringent Performance Standards and Fixed Setbacks at Regional Low Point) met economic, social, health, and environmental expectations okay or very well, while 56% say it does not meet expectations well, or does so very poorly.
  - » 31% of survey respondents said Amendment Option 2 (Moderate Performance Standards, with Setbacks Fixed at Regional Average) met economic, social, health, and environmental expectations okay or very well, while 61% say it does not meet expectations well, or does so very poorly.
  - » 45% of survey respondents said Amendment Option 3 (Minimal Performance Standards, with Setbacks fixed at Regional Highest) met economic, social, health, and environmental expectations okay or very well, while 43% say it does not meet expectations well, or does so very poorly.
  - » 50% of survey respondents said Amendment Option 4 (Science Based Performance Standards and Setbacks) meet economic, social, health, and environmental expectations okay or very well, while 31% say it does not meet expectations well, or does so very poorly.
- When asked to select a preferred Amendment Option, the results were as follows:
  - » **Option 1** – Stringent Performance Standards: 26%
  - » **Option 2** – Moderate Performance Standards: 11%
  - » **Option 3** – Minimal Performance Standards: 30%
  - » **Option 4** – Science-based Performance Standards: 33%



## OPEN HOUSE FINDINGS

A high-level summary of the feedback gathered at the public open house held on November 5, 2020, is outlined below. Feedback was collected by members of the project team throughout the event, and guests were invited to complete the survey online.

### **Timelines**

The time required to extract and complete reclamation was noted as a current and ongoing issue. Stakeholders suggested more stringent rules should be applied and enforced.

### **Certainty**

Many attendees mentioned a desire for certainty through defined, fixed setbacks. Many suggestions were given regarding a minimum, generally ranging from 250m to 800m+.

### **Existing operator issues**

Several attendees noted ongoing issues with an existing aggregate operation in the County that appears to be somewhat vacant with little activity or maintenance. If possible, stakeholders recommended closing and reclaiming the operation, or at least, increasing maintenance.

### **Preserve quality of life**

Comments about preserving quality of life and rural lifestyle were mentioned, including maintaining privacy, protecting well water, and implementing adequate barriers to improve visual impacts.

### **Industry response**

Includes data from industry representatives that provided input directly to the project team. Members of industry reached out directly to provide feedback that could be directly attributed to the operator experience. A high-level summary of input is outlined below.

### **Desire to improve**

All stakeholders mentioned a willingness to improve regulations and practices to develop positive relationships in the community and create better operations. Specific areas for improvement included enhanced public engagement and communication, increased monitoring, fixed setbacks, and improved mapping.

### **Desire for certainty**

Most stakeholders agreed that a clear application process and defined requirements for operations creates certainty for industry, landowners, and supports decision making for Council.

### **Lack of consistency**

Some mentioned that every municipality has different requirements which generally makes the process long, confusing, and expensive for operators. At times, this means the cost is carried down to taxpayers.

### **Non-renewable resource**

Industry was generally encouraged to see the County taking the steps to evaluate aggregate resources now to better plan for the future and prevent the permanent loss of these vital, nonrenewable resources.

## OTHER KEY FINDINGS

Captured below are key themes that emerged through the Phase 2 Engagement.

- Enhanced communications and engagement between operators and residents continues to be a highly valued approach moving forward.
- While survey respondents appeared to demonstrate an openness to refining regulations for aggregate extraction, predictable setbacks are noted as an important aspect of the final amendment option.
- General concerns about haul traffic were mentioned throughout the survey, including comments about driver behaviour, road maintenance, and safety.
- Many survey responses and face-to-face discussions included mention of monitoring and enforcement, particularly the importance of enforcing revised regulations and questions about who will monitor operations, how often, and if findings would be communicated publicly.
- Throughout the Phase 2 engagement, some stakeholders and respondents inquired about property value assessments and corresponding compensation as a component of aggregate operations near residences.

## STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

Feedback was gathered from multiple meetings with three key stakeholder groups throughout the second phase of public engagement. Input collected from each meeting has been consolidated into key messages from each committee. The three key stakeholder groups were Sturgeon County's Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Committee (CVSGC), Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), and the Economic Development Advisory Board (EDAB).

### Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Committee (CVSGC)

- **Survey:** Varying inputs on the public engagement Phase 2 survey were received.
  - » Some members expressed concerns over the approach taken to the survey and emphasized the need for content to be presented in an impartial and unbiased manner.
  - » Some members also noted that respondents should have the option to vote for “no changes” when selecting a preferred approach to potential bylaw amendments if they felt changes should not be considered.
  - » Not all members agreed with all questions on the final version of the survey but did appreciate the difficulty in balancing many stakeholder inputs and the review process that was undertaken prior to circulation.
- **Public Notification and Communication:** Members generally agreed (across all committees) that enhanced public notification processes, information provision, and communications processes (on behalf of both industry and the County) are critical to successful decision making in any bylaw approach.
- **Explained Economic Impacts:** Some indicated that they would like to see more detailed economic impact reports later in the process to facilitate a more detailed understanding of the anticipated impacts associated with each potential approach.
- **Bylaw Amendment Options:** Some members noted that more detail on each bylaw amendment option (for example, what specific performance standards might be under each option) would be helpful in fully assessing each option. There was no consensus amongst members regarding a preferred option; some members expressed a preference for Option 4, while other expressed a desire for further refinements to the options and a “combination” option not part of the four originally presented.

### Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)

- **Industry Regulation:** Some members noted that they would like to see regulations developed in a manner that regulate effectively while also not being unduly onerous upon industry operators.
- **Economic Impacts:** The committee noted in the first meeting that understanding how the economic benefits are translated is important, and that this information should be developed as part of the second phase of public engagement.
- **Public Notification and Communication:** Members generally agreed (across all committees) that enhanced public notification processes, information provision, and communications processes (on behalf of both industry and the County) are critical to successful decision making in any bylaw approach.

Combined and Preferred Options: All committees discussed the potential bylaw amendment options.

The TAC discussed the benefits and drawbacks to each option, and noted that a “hybrid” option may be preferred. Most TAC members noted that Option 4 was likely the best if one of the four was chosen without further refinements.

### Economic Development Board

- **Economic Impacts:** The economic advisory board advised early on that more detailed information on the economic impacts of potential approaches would be an important and valuable metric to weigh each approach.
- **Public Notification and Communication:** Members generally agreed (across all committees) that enhanced public notification processes, information provision, and communications processes (on behalf of both industry and the County) is critical to successful decision making in any bylaw approach.
- **Combined and Preferred Options:** All committees discussed the potential bylaw amendment options. The Economic Advisory Board, like the other key stakeholders, did discuss a “hybrid” option and noted that there were pros and cons to each option, and that the options should be combined to derive the most benefits while addressing some of the areas of concern noted in earlier meetings.





# Final Resource Extraction Regulatory Review Report

Following the second phase of public engagement and based on all engagement, research, and other analysis conducted to date, a Resource Extraction Regulatory Review Final Report was concluded by the County's consultant. The [Final Report](#) provided the following eight (8) recommendations:

## 1. Implement new municipal regulatory model with enhanced performance standards.

### Highlights of this recommendation (Final Report – Page 16)

- Implement a new, dual-approach regulatory framework\* within the County's Land Use Bylaw and statutory plans based on the intensity of use and corresponding setbacks from residential developments of 200m or 50m for extraction activities, and 300m for crushing activities.
- Make no changes to the existing Resource Extraction (RE) district, unless and until such time as all operators have transitioned.
- Implement enhanced performance standards within the County Land Use Bylaw for extraction operations intended to protect air and water quality, minimize noise levels, reduce traffic and dust impacts, ensure acceptable visual impacts, and require progressive extraction and reclamation.

## 2. Apply new flexibility in the municipal permitting process.

### Highlights of this recommendation (Final Report – Page 23)

- Apply new flexibility to the municipal permitting process for operators, to accommodate options to either re-district to one of the new resource extraction zones, or to apply for approval as a discretionary use within the agriculture district.

## 3. Enhance operator reporting and municipal enforcement.

### Highlights of this recommendation (Final Report – Page 26)

- Increase municipal compliance and education resourcing to complement enhanced operator quarterly reporting and annual third-party validation requirements.

## 4. Update municipal processes.

### Highlights of this recommendation (Final Report – Page 27)

- Update municipal application processes, including fee schedules, policies, and administrative procedures, to align to the revised regulatory framework needs.

## 5. Implement a Municipal Communications & Information Platform.

### Highlights of this recommendation (Final Report – Page 28)

- Develop a new municipal communication and information platform to support all stakeholders in local resource extraction activity, including a dedicated web platform, educational materials, contact information, newsletters, and more.

A communications and information platform may include a dedicated Sturgeon County web page, educational information on resource extraction, contact information to support communications, regular mailings, newsletters, etc.

## 6. Review the Community Aggregate Payment (CAP) Levy.

### Highlights of this recommendation (Final Report – Page 29)

- To reflect greater expected revenue over time and ensure the effective allocation of funds, a review of the CAP levy is recommended. This review would ensure the distribution of broad community benefits balanced with benefits to communities immediately near aggregate operations.
- The appropriate percentage of allocations of CAP levy for different types of initiatives (regulatory support, community facilities, local programs, infrastructure, municipal tax relief, etc.); and the possibility for supportive policies and procedures related to the allocation of this levy.

## 7. Ensure representative committee membership.

### Highlights of this recommendation (Final Report – Page 30)

- Review the Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Committee Bylaw to include membership from other known extraction areas in Sturgeon County, transitioning to a “Sturgeon County Sand and Gravel Extraction Committee.”

## 8. Communicate Transitions for Existing Operations.

### Highlights of this recommendation (Final Report – Page 30)

- Develop transition communications to describe the potential options and the implications of new regulations to existing aggregate operators and residents.



## PHASE 3 ENGAGEMENT | MAY 3 – 20, 2022

The month-long, third phase of public engagement included a public open house on May 3, 2022, three virtual Ask a Planner sessions, and weeks of open access for stakeholders to provide verbal or written feedback.

- 39 residents attended the in-person event.
- 14 participated in the “Ask a Planner” sessions.
- Received 27 written submissions including emails, letters, and completed booklets.
- Conversations appeared generally open and constructive. Some individuals with strong opinions noted that they were appreciative of more details, and that they would read the report and other background materials. Some with strong opinions noted that their views were unchanged.
- Most attendees noted they were not comfortable with the proposed regulations overall, focused predominantly on concerns related to setbacks and process.
- Ian Skinner presented to Committee of the Whole on April 23, 2022

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON FINAL REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

### RECOMMENDATION 1 | New municipal regulations with enhanced performance standards (OVERALL NON-SUPPORT FOR SETBACKS, SUPPORT FOR HIGHER STANDARDS)

- Most attendees did not support the proposed setbacks of 200m and 50m in two districts. Many comments that proposed setbacks are not large enough – input ranged between 250m to a quarter section setback. Previous public comments to Sturgeon County (pre-2018) suggested that current 400m/800m setbacks were insufficient and should be increased.
  - » Comparisons to other municipalities in the region indicated that Sturgeon County's current setbacks were significantly higher than the average.
  - » Individuals understand that setbacks can be changed, but requested they match other communities. The decrease to 50m was viewed as excessive.
  - » Some comments that setback should be measured from property line, not the dwelling.
  - » One company reported that setbacks of 200m from dwellings and subdivisions would not significantly impact future operations.
  - » Comments around having a standard setback rather than two options and need more clarity.
  - » Comments that residents need to determine setback, not industry.



- Most attendees supported increased performance standards on operators (noise, dust, water/air quality monitoring, vehicle registration and driver training, traffic and speed limits, haul routes, hours of operation, reporting, etc.).
  - » Operator respondents commented that amended standards could be acceptable if consistent and reasonable.
  - » Comments that increasing conditions around road use agreements and 7 day per week water / dust application.
  - » Multiple concerns regarding the inability to completely enforce the additional performance standards.
  - » Concerns that extraction needs to happen near paved roads, not dirt roads.
  - » Several comments about noise from trucking and pit operations, especially when they are operating 24/7. Operating hours an issue too.
- Other comments included:
  - » Multiple concerns about Vinca Bridge and #825 Bridge – both of which currently need to be repaired. Already experienced multiple fatalities and accidents due to increased truck traffic.
  - » Concerns about costs associated with devalued properties and decreased demand.
  - » Ground water and drainage concerns – questions regarding effects on residents' wells and related costs.
  - » Several comments regarding health concerns – silica dust connected with silicosis.
  - » Some stakeholders feel unrepresented in the Final Report and that recommendations are “one sided” in favour of industry / operators.
  - » Concerns regarding the negative impacts on the natural functions (non-recoverable environmental debt) of the Sturgeon River Watershed.



## **RECOMMENDATION 2 | A flexible process for permits and approvals** **(OVERALL NON-SUPPORT FOR PROPOSED PROCESS)**

- Several concerns that there should be no allowance of extraction as a discretionary use in Ag districts and that extraction should be required to re-zone their properties, to provide certainty and transparency to current and future landowners in the area as to what those lands are designated for. Need a public hearing too. Don't want to buy next to Ag just to find out a pit will be coming in.
- Several comments for an expiry of permits, including requirement to re-apply if operator hasn't extracted to avoid neighbours living in perpetual uncertainty.
- Recommendations to clarify the definition of an active pit.
- Some upset that time, money, and effort are taken out of their day while one operator hires "lobbyists to pressure the County".
- Frustrated with public hearings to be attended - companies can afford to lobby and appeal.
- Comments that landowners must be notified personally when their land is being affected.

## **RECOMMENDATION 3 | Enhanced operator reporting and enhanced municipal enforcement** **(OVERALL SUPPORT)**

- Most attendees of the open house noted they supported increased municipal enforcement. This is consistent with past inputs as well.
- Some comments regarding need to hold operators responsible for reclamation (to a specific standard) and timelines.
- Most supported need for dedicated municipal enforcement officer, complaint line, etc. Annual reporting not enough.
- Concern related to Victoria Trail un-reclaimed pits.
- Questions asking if there is a way Sturgeon County can get more involved with the reclamation process, and if these areas can be reclaimed to uses other than AG (ex. Goose Hummock).
- Comments for Sturgeon County to keep an exhaustive inventory of all old pits and their status, and keep this information easily available for public consumption.
- Some concerns regarding the negative impacts on the natural functions (non-recoverable environmental debt) of the Sturgeon River Watershed. Questions about environmental legislation section 60 of the Municipal Government Act – residents are asking why section 60 being omitted at the earliest stages of land use planning and development.
- Several concerns about the municipality losing the ability or jurisdiction to enforce anything.
- Some residents do not trust that operator promises will be kept, or any performance standards can be enforced.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 4 | Updated municipal processes**

##### **(OVERALL SUPPORT)**

- Most attendees of the open house did not support the need to update municipal fee schedules, policies, and procedures if the regulations were amended.
- Comments that quarterly reporting is not adequate when quality of life is affected by daily operations.
- Support for this type of long-term planning but concerns that this will extend approval times for other municipal processes and requests.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 5 | Municipal communications & information platform**

##### **(OVERALL SUPPORT)**

- Most attendees of the open house supported increased community consultation between operators and residents, and municipal information platform.
- Some comments regarding the perceived poor quality of the current Sturgeon County website, and lack of trust in a new platform being of higher quality.
- Need better public education about municipal and provincial governing authorities.
- Some comments that Council appears to be pressured by industry to change bylaws – therefore holding industry above residents.
- Cases involving proximity issues should be dealt with directly between the company and adjacent landowners so that a purchase price for the land can be negotiated, or approval is denied.

#### **RECOMMENDATION 6 | Review of Community Aggregate Payment (CAP) levy**

##### **(OVERALL SUPPORT)**

- There are opportunities to review how the CAP levy is allocated, and the governance structure of the municipal oversight committee.
- Comments that Council should approve compensation and/or a discount on taxes each year for impacted residents, funded from CAP.
- Multiple residents feel that all expenses have not been accounted for in this report – the current model is “biased”.
- Residents feel that spending CAP levy on the community provides no benefit to the community itself. Rather, it is a way of the industry “advertising that they are a good neighbour”.



### **RECOMMENDATION 7 | Representative committee membership from across the county (OVERALL SUPPORT)**

- Comments that the committee should represent all areas of the county that are subject to resource extraction.
- Some comments that the existing committee has a 'conflict of interest', should not include operators, etc.
- Some comments that the committee is a 'lobby group' and that it only works in the best interest of the sand and gravel companies.

### **RECOMMENDATION 8 | Communicate transitional requirements for existing extraction operations (OVERALL SUPPORT)**

- Most attendees at the open house supported transition communication and supports for existing operators and affected residents.
- Some concerns about adding more additional costs for the County – not accounted for in this recommendation.

#### **General comments**

- Several people noted the engagement is comforting and was well done, despite their lack of support for setbacks and some other elements.
- Several comments that setbacks and process is not a "balanced" approach, and instead has a major focus on economic gain rather than quality of life.
- Concerns about decrease in land values, comments that the municipality should compensate.
- Concerns that operators allowed to have many open pits at the same time. Should be required to reclaim completely before moving to another pit.
- Most residents expressed no concern with losing potential economic benefits of increased extraction.
- Concerned about children's health re: Silicia dust and truck traffic (multiple fatalities already).
- Some critical of making "sacrifices for an oil industry while the world is transitioning to green energy and sustainability".
- Multiple comments and critiques regarding the questions of the survey (unfair, biased, leading, misleading).
- Residents have been waiting for road repairs, feel truck traffic will make it worse before it's fixed.

## SUMMARY OF IAN SKINNER'S PRESENTATION TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON APRIL 23, 2022

Ian Skinner and his colleagues suggested in their presentation that municipalities have been ignoring their responsibility to direct, control and manage water bodies, particularly at the earliest stages of land use planning and development.

They noted the preglacial Onoway Valley, which includes the Sturgeon River, is a valuable aquifer that must be protected and that the value as a water source exceeds the value of any resource that could be extracted.

Mr. Skinner stated that the province is not meeting its requirements to protect ground and surface water resources and felt it is, therefore, incumbent on municipalities to do so.

His group is opposed to the reduction in setbacks proposed by the recommendations report. Further, he stated the checkboxes on the request for decision related to environmental stewardship should not be checked "Not Applicable."





9613-100 Street Morinville, Alberta T8R 1L9  
780-939-4321 | [www.sturgeoncounty.ca](http://www.sturgeoncounty.ca)