

From: [Raymond Soetaert](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#)
Subject: RERR
Date: February 14, 2023 1:54:52 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

One of the questions I have asked from the beginning and have not received an answer to is this:

Why is there a different set back for individual dwellings (400 m) and multi lot subdivisions (800 m)

What makes my life style, property, less valuable than someone in a subdivision?

Ray Soetaert

Member at Large

CVSG committee

From: [Diane Pysmeny](#)
To: [Legislative Services](#); [Jason Berry](#); [Jason Berry Candidate](#)
Subject: Fwd: Resource Extraction Public Hearing
Date: March 3, 2023 9:13:39 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

Firstly I would like to thank your Planning team for the excellent presentation made at the January meeting and all the work they have put into this project including the extensive public engagement.

I would like Council to take into consideration the following concerns I still have as a rural resident of Division 6.

Setbacks:

I still do not agree or understand why farming residents v's sub division residents are being treated differently. In the current bylaw and the proposed bylaw in my opinion farm houses are being treated as second class citizens where a lower setback of 400 metres from the corner of my home is acceptable.

I do not see the logic for this. Treat all residents the same - 800 metres from any home.

Enforcement:

I do hope in your planning for this you have included extra enforcement staff instead of spreading your current staff thinner?

As a resident in 2010 I endured over 20 oil wells and a battery site within a mile radius of my house.

This increased noise, traffic, pollution and destroyed the gravel road and our quality of life. This road subsequently had to be rebuilt at what cost as there was no road use agreement in place.

My family farm has been in your County for close to 100 years. We love where we live. We live here for a quiet rural life. Not to be living in an industrial area. When I built my new house the rules were **100 metres from property line**. So I am expected to follow these rules to build a home from my neighbour yet you believe a noisy, pollutant can be placed next to me under 400 metres from the corner of my house, not from my property line, that makes absolutely no sense to me.

Many of the fields surrounding my farm are owned by people who do not live here. Therefore, why would they care if they have resources they can make money on. They will not have to live next to their rural quiet life being destroyed.

Many of my neighbours have cattle and horses, having a resource extraction close to these animals will also affect their wellbeing with noise, traffic and pollution.

As a resident I am not in favour of reducing any setbacks from their current level. And I urge Council to reconsider treating residents as first and second class citizens based on the 800 vs 400 setback and make all 800.

The DC district concerns me. While I understand the need for obtaining resources, it makes me very uncomfortable as a resident that any current or future Council can determine this on a case by case basis. I believe DC districts are to make rules more stringent not to make them more flexible? While you are making them more stringent for noise etc. you are making it potentially more flexible with reduced setbacks.

Regarding the CAP levy I am interested to see how this has been distributed within the County for the past 3-5 years? I do not think many groups are aware of this funding so I am glad that you are including a refreshed communication plan around this.

Unfortunately I will not be able to make the Public Hearing due to prior commitments. I hope you take my written submission concerns seriously.

Respectfully

Diane Pysmeny

Resident and Farmer in Division 6

From:
To:
Subject:
Date:

[Legislative Services](#)
Resource extraction
March 8, 2023 4:08:11 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender, and know the content is safe. If you are unsure of the contents of this email, please reach out to IT at ISSupport@sturgeoncounty.ca

To: Legislative Services, County of Sturgeon

My name is William R. Rudko and I am currently a landowner in the County of Sturgeon. I would like to comment on bylaw changes to the Resource Extraction Regulatory Review. I have entered into a lease agreement with an aggregate company for the extraction of the sand resource that exists on the property. I would like the county to consider the reduction of the setback distance of the existing bylaw. The actual process of this extraction work entails some activity which results in some noise but not an excessive amount. The extraction of this resource is a one time endeavour. Therefore it is only for a limited time. This property is remote without many residential properties in the area. I would like to see this resource developed. It benefits the local economy, myself included. The County of Sturgeon would receive a royalty benefit from this resource. The removal of this resource will level the property so that it can be put back into pasture land and other agricultural endeavours. The lease agreement states that the property will be brought back to a suitable condition for utilization. I intend to fence the property for livestock or hay production. At the present time, it is covered in scrub brush, and home to deer and moose. Environmentally speaking, there would be an advantage to reclaiming this land to grassland for future use.


William R. Rudko



March 6, 2023

Sturgeon County
9613 100th Street
Morinville, AB
T8R 1L9

Attention: **Travis Peter**
 General Manager, Development and Strategic Services

Reference: **Resource Extraction Regulatory Review**
 Bylaw 1607/22 Schedules A and B

Lafarge is Canada's largest provider of building materials and solutions including aggregates, cement, ready mix and precast concrete, asphalt and paving, and road and civil construction. With over 6,900 employees and 400 sites across the country, Lafarge's vision is to become the global leader in innovative and sustainable building solutions and our mission is to build progress for people and the planet.

Lafarge Canada Inc. has been an operator and landowner in Sturgeon County for over fifty years. Lafarge has reviewed all the documents pertaining to the Resource Extraction Regulatory Review, including proposed changes to **Bylaw 1607/22** Schedules A and B, and have been an active participant in all open houses and information gathering opportunities since the inception of this process. Our organization provides the following comments and feedback, which is broken down into three separate sections.

Bylaw 1607/22 Schedule A

1. Sturgeon County should leave condition 4c) (ii) in place, which allows industry to enter into individual agreements with landowners for encroachment within 400m of their residence. Lafarge feels, especially in circumstances where only one or two landowners are in close proximity to an existing or proposed pit, that industry should still have this opportunity to work specifically with landowners instead of automatic placement into the proposed NRE-DC zoning.
2. Lafarge is supportive of the inclusion of the mandatory use of the Alberta Sand and Gravel Association truck registry program, along with the proposed amendments to Condition 7d).
3. Lafarge is seeking additional clarification on Condition 7e). Firstly, does this apply to only new proposed sand and gravel pit operations or are permitted, existing pits also included? Secondly, do the mandatory TIAs apply to all pit operations, whether new or existing, or does it only apply when county road upgrades are deemed necessary?
4. Lafarge is seeking clarification on Condition 10b). Have subclauses (i) and (ii) always been in place and if so, when were they enacted into the Land Use Bylaw?

5. Lafarge is not supportive of Condition 12. While Lafarge is supportive of the incorporation of dust and noise control and mitigations for some operations, which could include the incorporation of perimeter berms, placement of a processing plant on the pit floor and/or strategic placement of aggregate product stockpiles, the proposed wording in subclause (i) is far too subjective to enforce and virtually immeasurable without an onsite noise monitor.
6. Lafarge is supportive of the Groundwater Monitoring program and has been an active participant since its inception. All operators within the monitoring area need to contribute and participate; not just a select few. Since the program currently monitors groundwater only in the Calahoo-Villeneuve areas, does condition (b) suggest that all new sand and gravel pits within the monitoring area require hydrogeological assessments or all new sand and gravel pits within the county boundaries itself require this assessment?
7. Lafarge supports community engagement but is not supportive of mandatory, annual open houses / community events. Community and neighbor engagement can be done through a variety of means and measures and open houses should not be the only mandated method. In fact, open houses are often not well attended and not necessarily the preferred method of communication by the public. Operators should also be permitted to mail/email quarterly, semi-annual and/or annual reports detailing our operations. Operators could also create websites/links to our operations for information and opportunities for residents to provide feedback. If open houses/community events are the only method for information sharing and community engagement, operators should be permitted to complete them for area operations (ie Lafarge Borle/Stollery sites along with our Calahoo Pit operations) or done in conjunction with another operator whose operations share the same jurisdiction.

Bylaw 1607/22 Schedule B

1. Lafarge has no issues with Condition 4 but clause (e) should not be mandatory and instead encouraged by the operator when pit planning allows for these situations. There are situations in which this would not allow for the most efficient extraction of sand and gravel and overall pit development and could ultimately extend the life of the pit.
2. Condition 6 represents a significant change to overall operations in closer proximity to subdivision and individual residents. While Lafarge is not opposed to more oversight and requirements, much of the details and requirements are either confusing, vague, extremely costly to oversee and/or too onerous for operators to undertake.
 - a) Regarding conditions 6 (a) and (b), the applications for other approvals/registrations should not be required at the time of a redistricting application as in some cases, it may not make financial/organizational sense to pursue these applications until redistricting has been achieved. Instead, it can be a requirement that these be provided when they have been prepared.
 - b) What are the particular requirements that necessitate a request by the county to complete a TIA as highlighted within condition 6 (d)?
 - c) Condition 6 (e) does not provide any direction and requirements related to a request for a traffic management plan.

d) Condition 6 (h) does not provide any description about the criteria for a track out management plan. Does this pertain to tracking sand, gravel and mud onto paved county roads and provincial highways?

e) Condition 6 (i) seems to indicate that NIA are now mandatory. Lafarge is supportive for requesting them when in close proximity to individual residents and subdivisions but feel that these requirements should be assessed on a site basis to determine if all operations require their completion.

f) NIAs, as part of the summary, provide operators with a series of proposed mitigations to reduce noise impacts on the surrounding area. Lafarge does not understand the rationale behind Condition 6 (j). Condition 6 (i) should provide direction to noise and acoustical consultants to provide possible mitigation measures in their documents.

g) As with Condition 6 (i), it also seems that air quality assessments are mandatory too as per Condition 6 (k). Again, Lafarge is supportive for requesting these but only when in close proximity to individual residents and subdivisions. Additionally, in the absence of measurable air quality standards within the LUB and MDP, what is the basis for the monitoring and what thresholds are being required?

h) It appears that hydrological impacts assessments could also mandatory as per Condition 6 (p). What are the criteria for requiring them? Again, site specific assessments should be undertaken first before making this assessment mandatory, especially if all water wells within a certain radius are not embedded within or using the sand and gravel aquifer.

i) Lafarge is seeking some rationale behind the request for a visual impact assessment, along with the criteria behind them. These assessments are highly subjective in nature, and difficult to enforce given the lack of standardized criteria and differing opinions on what constitutes effective mitigation.

3. Condition 9 will be very onerous to implement and expensive to manage for industry.

a) Condition 9 (a) will be impossible for industry to implement. The vast majority of operators' sand and gravel trucking fleet are subcontractors. Operators, cannot and likely will not, force the truck owners to install noise reducing mufflers. Secondly, is the county making noise berms mandatory?

b) Condition 9 (b) suggests that the county is implementing mandatory enforceable noise limits. Does this only apply for NRE-DC zoning? Again, Lafarge is not directly opposed to noise monitoring, under certain circumstances and situations, but annual reporting is more realistic and quarterly reporting is unacceptable as outlined in condition 9 (c). "Legitimate" complaints should also warrant disclosure of noise monitoring information to allow for a proper investigation for each complaint.

4. Condition 10 will also be onerous to implement and expensive to manage for industry. Lafarge does support measurement for air quality mitigation, including processing plant placement along the pit floor, strategic placement of berms and product stockpile but not enclosing a

crusher within a rural setting. Secondly, mandatory air monitoring is ineffective if non-point dust sources are not excluded (ie multiple operators, proximity to non-paved county roads) or if baseline studies of all non-point dust sources are not captured. Lastly, as suggested above, annual reporting is more realistic and quarterly reporting is unacceptable as outlined in Condition 10 (b). Participation in a regional airshed to undertake regional monitoring should be considered as an alternative to site specific monitoring.

5. Lafarge does not support mandatory perimeter berms nor quarterly or annual reporting as outlined in Condition 11. Berming requirements needs to be assessed on a site specific basis depending upon NIA recommendations and are not necessarily the optimal solution to visual concerns. How is the county planning to assess and enforce compliance of visual components? What is a “visual impact” and how is visual impact to be monitored?
6. Lafarge does not support Condition 12 (e). All this information can be provided to concerned residents, neighbors and the general public through other means (operator website, regular email / mail correspondence, contact number to the operator’s site superintendent on pit signage, etc).

General Comments from the Request for Decision Document

1. Lafarge is supportive of Motion 4 (d) pertaining to a review of CAPL allocation. Our organization would support more funds allocated to both initiatives within the communities surrounding our operations but also towards other projects in other areas in the county, with less allocation of CAPL into general revenue.
2. Lafarge does not feel that Motion 4 (e) should be undertaken by the Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Advisory Committee. Our organization feels that the Land Use Bylaw ultimately determines whether a project can be undertaken when applied for. Sterilizing sand and gravel deposits based upon geographic location should not be sought. Many government and industry-based sources of information are available to surmise where these deposits could be found.
3. Lafarge is indifferent about performance standards that are mentioned in Motions 396/22 and 397/22. Mandatory, across the board, performance standards are not supported by the industry. Implementation of performance standards based upon scientific analyses and recommendations to mitigate against negative effects to neighbors should be considered. Unfortunately, many performance standards do not account for non-point sources, inputs from other industry or commercial sectors, and are based upon subjective criteria. Continual monitoring of noise and air are expensive to run and operate and can make current and future developments uneconomical and unviable. Will existing and permitted operations be subjected to any of these new performance standards?
4. Lafarge requires additional information on a proposed amendment to Bylaw 1607/22 pertaining to transportation performance standards. What exactly is being proposed or suggested for both onsite and offsite mitigation measures?
5. Lafarge requires additional information on county’s “implementation of new technologies for noise mitigation and noise performance”. Lafarge has completed many NIAs throughout our

market area and implements many mitigations for our operations as recommended by our noise and acoustical consultants. The county cannot "force" operators into using certain mitigations and should defer to noise and acoustical experts for the proper implementation of effective mitigation strategies.

6. Lafarge is not supportive of reduced operating hours, reducing pit footprint sizes or implementing mandatory performance standards. Any reduction of secondary processing hours increases our costs but also extends the amount of time needed to complete processing at our pits. Lafarge is also confused about the topsoil salvage recommendations. Is the county suggesting that all topsoil be stripped in our current operating area only or across a larger portion of our site? Lafarge feels that reduction of pit footprints should be the goal, along with strategic progressive reclamation, but not implementing policies that inhibit or significant restrict an operator's ability to responsibly develop the site. Our organization does support hiring noise consultants to determine the best mitigation strategies to reduce any potential impacts to our surrounding neighbors and implementing strategies on pit operations and aggregate hauling that strike the correct balance with county administration and residents.
7. Lafarge requires additional clarification pertaining to bullet two on page 4 pertaining to the Groundwater Monitoring and Management Plan and process. Lafarge fully supports the program and has been an active participant in adding additional monitoring wells into the program. Industry and residents both value the information being provided and regardless of jurisdictional responsibility, the county should continue the program while sand and gravel operations continue in the Calahoo-Villeneuve areas.
8. Lafarge requires additional information pertaining to bullet one in the Implementation Process. What exactly is service enhancement and what goals are being sought with increased enforcement and compliance with sand and gravel pit operators? What are the current issues with existing sand and gravel operations, outside of community sentiments? How is the increased enforcement being supported and who is ultimately funding it? Does this translate into higher permitted fees and/or the implementation of additional fees and charges?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input of the proposed amendments and changes to the Land Use Bylaw and changes to Natural Resource Extraction Zoning. If you have any questions or concerns related to the information provided in this document, please do not hesitate to contact me at (780) 423-6152, (780) 298-6747 or alternatively at brock.helm@lafarge.com.

Sincerely,

LAFARGE CANADA INC.

Per: 

Brock Helm
Land Manager, North and Central Alberta

LAFARGE CANADA INC.

8635 Stadium Road, Edmonton Ab, T5H 3X1

Phone: 780-423-6161 Fax: 780-425-8882

www.buildingbettercities.ca | <http://www.lafarge.ca>

 A member of
LafargeHolcim

March 9, 2023

**Bylaw 1607/22: Resource Extraction Regulatory Review
Public Hearing – March 16, 2023**

Dear Sturgeon County Council and Administration,

Sil Industrial Minerals is a member of Sureway Construction Group of Companies, and is western Canada's largest proppant producer, maintaining numerous privately owned and leased land investments in Sturgeon County for the intended purpose of natural resource extraction. Yellowhead Aggregates is a related entity within the Sureway Group, with land holdings near Villeneuve for the purpose of gravel extraction.

We thank-you for the opportunity to be heard in regards to the Resource Extraction Regulatory Review (RERR) in Sturgeon County, and the resulting proposed bylaw changes.

We are pleased that the proposed bylaw changes recognize the significant variability in resource extraction operations throughout the County, whether they're related to gravel extraction and/or processing, or silica sand extraction, by implementing a method in which impacts of an activity can be assessed on a case by case basis. We feel this is a critical recognition when implementing good governance, as there truly is no "one size fits all" approach to policies surrounding an industry such as resource extraction, and its development within the municipality.

However, the proposed bylaw provides very little certainty for industry operators, landowners, and neighbors alike regarding expectations around what applications will be approved. While we recognize there are many different potential outcomes that were considered as part of this review, it seems that the proposed bylaw change may simply implement more stringent performance standards, leaving operators with additional red tape and permitting challenges, with no certainty or expectation around what may or may not be accepted and approved. Alternatively, this leaves residents wondering how close an operation may be developed adjacent to their house. Further, this begs the question how similar applications may be treated by different councils and administrations in the future.

We understand that countless outcomes were considered over the course of the RERR, and again emphasize the importance of recognizing that each natural resource extraction activity is different and subject to varying environmental, social, and logistical conditions. However, in order to provide some certainty for operators and landowners, a system that provides defined setbacks under specific operating conditions could instead be considered.

An example of this system might look like the following:

- Implement a "Restricted Use Zone" defined as 300m from the outside wall of any dwelling (including multi-lot subdivisions), to ensure all residents are addressed equally.
- Define operating conditions and performance standards for extraction and reclamation with the "Restricted Use Zone"
 - o This would ensure residents have certainty that secondary processing such as crushing and screening would not occur within 300m from their residence. This would also allow

crushing to occur on a site where currently, multiple adjacent residences each with 400m setbacks could effectively sterilize a property.

- Implement limited operating hours for activities within the “Restricted Use Zone” to provide clear and consistent expectations for operating hours adjacent to neighboring land uses.

This outcome would provide understanding on what types of activities would be considered within certain distances from residences and would define expectations around operating hours within those setbacks. The outcome would also provide for flexibility of expectations pertaining to different types of natural resource extractions, with varying environmental, social, and logistical conditions.

We appreciate the work that Sturgeon County has undertaken to prepare information and engage and consult with stakeholders, and further we appreciate the County’s recognition that reviewing the existing policies regarding natural resource extraction is imperative to ensuring a responsible economic future within Sturgeon County.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Laura Cline', with a large, stylized initial 'L' and a long, sweeping horizontal stroke at the end.

Laura Cline

Land and Environment Manager

Sil Industrial Minerals/Yellowhead Aggregates