Resource Extraction Regulatory Review

Responses to Public Questions from March 15 Public Hearing

Submission from Marc and Hinke Therrien

"Can we have a setback clause to intensive livestock operation?"

Sand and gravel extraction operations may impact different types of livestock in different ways. The proposed resource extraction direct control land use district would allow us to set site-specific setback distances. If a specific setback distance between the resource extraction operation and the livestock operation can be scientifically supported, that setback distance could be set. Council would consider any demonstrated impacts to livestock when making its decision for a rezoning application.

"Can we consider setback clause to Barns? Not just residence."

Currently, we have proposed setbacks in the resource extraction land use district for residences and multi-lot subdivisions. The proposed resource extraction direct control land use district would allow us to set site-specific setback distances. The content of your barn – turkeys – would be considered when setting setback distances for any new resource extraction operation.

"Who will enforce these new operator requirements? We are a complaint-based bylaw system which will be too late for us as we will have livestock death."

The permit conditions for a new resource extraction operation in the resource extraction direct control land use district should consider adjacent landowners and their concerns; permit conditions are site-specific and help protect the environment and neighbour quality of life.

In addition, approved resource extraction development permits would be valid for five years. If an operator wants to renew, they'd have to apply for another permit, which would also be valid for five years. This repeats for the lifespan of the operation. New or different conditions could be applied to this permit to align with regulations and to set performance standards.

The County recently hired a development compliance officer who is focussed on making sure development permit conditions are met. This individual would investigate development and land use complaints – including those related to resource extraction operations – and take enforcement action, as needed.

"If I have a noise issue and it has impacted my business due to livestock death, how will that be dealt with? Who is liable? How do I ensure the death would be covered?"

Sturgeon County encourages you to participate in any consultations and public hearings for resource extraction operations near your property. The regulations for a new resource extraction operation in the resource extraction direct control land use district should consider adjacent landowners and their concerns; regulations and performance standards are site-specific and help protect the environment and neighbour quality of life.

Submission from Raymond Soetaert

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

The existing setback distances – operations must be at least 400 metres from residences and 800 metres from multi-lot subdivisions – were recommended in the Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Extraction Area Structure Plan, which was approved by Council in 2001. We do not know why different setback distances were recommended in the area structure plan and corresponding resource extraction district in the Land Use Bylaw.

Most feedback we heard from industry and members of the public about setback distances was that the current setback distances are arbitrary. There was no consensus around setback distances; however, maintaining the existing setback distances in the resource extraction land use district was generally supported.

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

We do not know why different setback distances were recommended in the Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Extraction Area Structure Plan and corresponding resource extraction district in the Land Use Bylaw.

Most feedback we heard from industry and members of the public about setback distances was that the current setback distances are arbitrary. There was no consensus around setback distances; however, maintaining the existing setback distances in the resource extraction land use district was generally supported.

Submission from Diane Pysmeny

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

The County recently hired a development compliance officer who is focussed on making sure development permit conditions are met. This individual would investigate development and land use complaints – including those related to resource extraction operations – and take enforcement action, as needed.

"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."

Direct control districts allow us to create land use/zoning districts with site-specific regulations and performance standards; these are used when other land use districts are inappropriate or inadequate. Direct control districts consider existing/future surrounding developments, the applicant's interests, and the public interest.

The intent of the resource extraction direct control land use district is that any reduction in setback distance would also have greater performance standards applied to reduce the

impact a resource extraction operation may have on the environment and adjacent properties and landowners.

"Regarding the CAP levy I am interested to see how this has been distributed within the County for the past 3-5 years?"

Resource extraction operators in Sturgeon County must pay a levy, called the Community Aggregate Payment (CAP) levy. These funds help keep taxes low and fund community services.

Council adopted a Community Grant Policy on Oct. 13, 2020, which details how CAP levy dollars are spent in the community. Please see Appendix I to see how funds were distributed in 2022.

Currently, there are no proposed changes to the CAP levy. If the proposed bylaws are approved, there is a motion before Council to review the CAP levy and how funds are distributed to balance the benefits to the broader community with the benefits to communities near resource extraction operations.

Submission from William Rudko

No questions were submitted.

Submission from Lafarge

Bylaw 1607/22 Schedule A ẅ Changes to current resource extraction land use district

"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?"

If approved, the bylaw would apply to new resource extraction operations and those that need permit renewal. Clause 11.2.7 (e) – in which an operator would need a development agreement with the County and would need to make improvements to offsite municipal infrastructure if recommended in a traffic impact assessment (TIA)– would also apply to existing operations where a traffic impact assessment was required and infrastructure upgrades were recommended. Traffic impact assessments are not required for all development permit applications, but may be needed depending on the scale of the operation, the proposed haul routes, etc.

"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?"

Rules for operational hours for secondary processing (11.2.10(b)) were introduced into the Land Use Bylaw in 2017 as part of the rewrite of the Land Use Bylaw.

"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?"

If the proposed bylaws are approved, there is a motion before Council to compile a groundwater monitoring policy and necessary management plans, as needed. This policy is intended to apply county wide to all operations operating in an aquifer, and hydrogeological assessments would be needed.

Bylaw 1607/22 Schedule B ẅ Proposed resource extraction direct control land use district

"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."

We encourage you to view Aggregate Pits: Municipal and Provincial Processes, which was published by Alberta Environment and Parks in 2021. This document outlines the application process in which provincial approval is initiated before applying for municipal land use districting/zoning changes.

"What are the particular requirements that necessitate a request by the county to complete a TIA as highlighted within condition 6 (d)?"

Traffic impact assessments (TIA's) are not required for all development permit applications, but may be needed depending on the scale of the operation, the proposed haul routes, etc. This would be evaluated on a project or site-specific basis.

"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?"

Clause 11.3.6(d) – in which a track out management plan that identifies how roadways will be cleaned and maintained – applies to the tracking of sand, gravel and mud onto both paved and gravel roads, and provincial highways on a site-specific basis.

"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."

The noise impact assessment (NIA) (clause 11.3.6(i)) – which would assess the noise-related impacts of an operation – would inform the operators requirements in a noise mitigation implementation plan (clause 11.3.6(j). The noise mitigation implementation plan would demonstrate how all noise-related performance standards, monitoring and reporting requirements would be met.

"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?"

An air quality assessment (clause 11.3.6(k)) would determine what is required by the operator as part of an implementation plan.

"It appears that hydrological impacts assessments could also be 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."

Clause 11.3.6(p) states that an application would need a hydrological impact assessment, where required by the province of Alberta or where a potential impact is identified through a water well report.

"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."

Ensuring acceptable visual impacts of resource extraction on the community is an important performance standard recommended by the Resource Extraction Regulatory Review report. The assessments would be reviewed on a site-specific basis and would be subjective based on the local community impacts.

"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?"

Clause 11.3.9(a) lists specific noise mitigation measures – such as installing noise reducing mufflers – but also notes the methods for each operation would be detailed in a noise impact assessment (clause 11.3.6(i)).

"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."

Clause 11.3.9(b) – in which noise limits at the property line can't exceed set limits – only apply to the resource extraction direct control land use district. This is because setback distances between homes and an operation in this district may be less than those in the resource extraction land use district.

"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?"

The requirement for berms already exists within the existing resource extraction land use district, and we propose including them in the resource extraction direct control district as well. Feedback from the required community consultations will help determine additional landscaping requirements.

General comments

"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?"

Some of these performance standards may apply to existing and permitted operations. Approved resource extraction development permits would be valid for five years. If an operator wants to renew, they'd have to apply for another permit, which would also be valid for five years. This repeats for the lifespan of the operation. New or different conditions could be applied to this permit to align with regulations and to set performance standards.

"Lafarge requires additional information on the 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?"

Offsite municipal improvements or mitigation measures would refer to work that is on County-owned right-of-ways or lands, typically haul routes, roadways or drainage works. Onsite municipal improvements or mitigation measures would refer to requirements on the specific site, such as drainage or internal driveways.

"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."

In both the resource extraction and resource extraction direct control land use districts, we propose that topsoil shall be stripped and stockpiled on-site for future reclamation prior to commencing operations. This is understood to be a standard approach to help transition land back to an agricultural use in alignment with reclamation plans. The intent with this condition is to eliminate the sale of valued topsoil.

"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."

Sturgeon County currently hires a third-party environmental consultant to monitor groundwater levels and water quality surrounding resource extraction operations by placing monitors in known aquifers and in private landowner water wells.

The proposed bylaws include the requirement for ongoing water and groundwater monitoring and management as part of the approval to redistrict/rezone land for resource

extraction. If the proposed bylaws are approved, there is a motion before Council to compile a groundwater monitoring policy and necessary management plans, as needed.

"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?"

The 'Implementation Process' outlines how the County will implement the recommendations provided in the Resource Extraction Regulatory Review Final Report.

The County recently hired a development compliance officer who is focussed on making sure development permit conditions are met. This individual would investigate development and land use complaints – including those related to resource extraction operations – and take enforcement action, as needed. This is a service enhancement, and the cost is funded with tax dollars; however, Community Aggregate Payment levy funds may be considered to fund some or all of this position. This has not resulted in higher permit fees or additional fees and charges.

Submission from Laura Cline

No questions were submitted.

Submission from Phil Soetaert

No questions were submitted.

Submission from Jan and Leanne Cosby

"I'm sure no one else would accept this project in their back yard or any other acreage development … would you?"

Sturgeon County encourages you to participate in any consultations and public hearings for resource extraction operations near your property. The permit conditions for a new resource extraction operation in the resource extraction direct control land use district should consider adjacent landowners and their concerns; permit conditions are site-specific and help protect the environment and neighbour quality of life.

Submission from Mike Chadi

"Respectfully, I find that this distinction between the two zones to be an arbitrary one. If 400 metres is deemed a sufficient distance to mitigate the impacts of extraction from a single residence, why would a doubling of that distance be required simply because

there are multiple residences in a particular vicinity? This question of course presumes operators that are community stakeholders who follow and adhere to industry best practices and standards to ensure minimal disruption from extraction activities for nearby residents."

The existing setback distances – operations must be at least 400 metres from residences and 800 metres from multi-lot subdivisions – were recommended in the Calahoo-Villeneuve Sand and Gravel Extraction Area Structure Plan, which was approved by Council in 2001. We do not know why different setback distances were recommended in the area structure plan and corresponding resource extraction district in the Land Use Bylaw.

Most feedback we heard from industry and members of the public about setback distances was that the current setback distances are arbitrary. There was no consensus around setback distances; however, maintaining the existing setback distances in the resource extraction land use district was generally supported.

Submission from Sturgeon River Watershed/Aquifer concerned citizens

No questions were submitted.

Submission from Heidelberg Materials

No questions were submitted.

Submission from Candace Stoppa

No questions were submitted.

Submission from Carlee Caouette

No questions were submitted.

Submission from Rick & Beverley Reid

No questions were submitted.

Submission from Kirsty Stewart

"I am a lay person, but my question is will the removal of sand and gravel in a river valley might not inevitably fill the pits with water and lower the river itself? Will the farmland have less water under it as water runs the line of least resistance toward the pits? And if we are talking of restoration after extraction, how difficult will it be to fill in where maybe considerable water has accumulated. The building projects we see are all making lakes now around them because of this."

Should proposed operations affect any type of water (overland or groundwater) the province is the governing authority; it may or may not allow extraction to occur.

If the proposed bylaws are approved, there is a motion before Council to compile a groundwater monitoring policy and necessary management plans, as needed.

"Finally, is it possible to ensure compensation if needed? I must add the future restoration proposed here also. Companies run out of funds or close down as we have seen with the abandoned oil derricks. I would like to suggest a restoration fund be setup by the resource extraction companies which they pay into at a decided rate over the years of operation."

Under the Government of Alberta's Code of Practice for Pits, Alberta Environment requires resource extraction operators to pay a deposit upon approval. That deposit serves as security that the land be reclaimed as approved. Should the operator not perform its due diligence, those funds would be used to reclaim the site.

"For children and others, is there going to be ongoing safety monitoring near and around the extraction machinery and pits? For the wildlife, has there been any study of migration trails and input from conservation? Inevitable 'roadkill' and cleanup might be something also to consider, as is the possibility of driving increasing numbers of coyote into residential areas. And as we increasingly acknowledge the indigenous treaty land, I need to ask if the local tribes have been involved and what they say? Might there be a costly reaction later on if not?"

Sturgeon County encourages you to participate in any consultations and public hearings for resource extraction operations near your property. The permit conditions for a new resource extraction operation in the resource extraction direct control land use district should consider adjacent landowners and their concerns; permit conditions are site-specific and help protect the environment and neighbour quality of life.

"Mental health studies are starting to show the relation of the environment to increasing or decreasing mental 'angst'. Noise, vibration, lights are all being cited as problems in wellbeing and sleep. Might it not be worthwhile considering the 'value' that is inherent in the Sturgeon River area? An alternative to resource extraction could be to make trails and sitting/observation areas where people can come and enjoy the peace and beauty of nature and all it has to offer in better health and, the much-needed opportunity to de-stress. I believe the increasing and vital need for this can no longer be overlooked or de-valued against the consideration of economic gains."

Sturgeon County encourages you to participate in any consultations and public hearings for resource extraction operations near your property. The permit conditions for a new resource extraction operation in the resource extraction direct control land use district should consider adjacent landowners and their concerns; permit conditions are site-specific and help protect the environment and neighbour quality of life.

Submission from Louis Belanger

"[The Friesen pit] was to be a 10 year project which would be completed if started when they granted their permits. Its concerning to hear the county wanted direct control. I feel that the pits will use this to their advantages. Why should I have to settle for less or equal to what was present 10 years ago? I feel the county will force me to have to allow them closer than 400m without fair compensation?

Landowner support of an application is not always required, but it can influence Council's decision to approve a redistricting/rezoning application. Landowner negotiations may occur with industry in the pre-application stage; the County/Council is not involved in these negotiations.

Submission from Tim Cholewa

"When we arrived here were looked there [Victoria Trail] to buy land and build a house but chose not to when we drove down there and saw with our own eyes what a moon scape looks like!! Void of all wildlife and fauna, this all effects property values of the residents affected. Who pays that cost?? Will the county step up?"

We require applicants to submit reclamation plans to transition land back to agricultural or some other form, as agreed to by the landowner. Should the community and Council request an alternative end land use such as recreational, this would be negotiated and form part of the approval.

Under the Government of Alberta's Code of Practice for Pits, Alberta Environment requires resource extraction operators to pay a deposit upon approval. That deposit serves as security that the land be reclaimed as approved. Should the operator not perform its due diligence, those funds would be used to reclaim the site.

Questions received in verbal presentations

What location does this review focus on?

The Resource Extraction Regulatory Review does not focus on a specific project or extraction area. It is a review of the rules applied to resource extraction operations throughout the County. These rules would apply to new sand and gravel extraction sites or applications to change/expand operations or renew a permit.

How will the County keep us informed about resource extraction rules?

The County will continue updating the county website with new information about the proposed resource extraction rules. If the changes are adopted by Council, the rules will form part of the Land Use Bylaw and will be in place on Sept 30, 2023.

If the proposed bylaws are approved, administration will prepare a staged implementation plan for other recommendations in the RERR Final Report, which includes a review of communication supports, by Sept. 30, 2023.

How will the County keep us informed about resource extraction operations?

If the proposed bylaws are approved, administration will prepare a staged implementation plan for other recommendations in the RERR Final Report, which includes a review of communication supports, by Sept. 30, 2023.

Who makes the decision where resource extraction operations are located? Who is the development authority?

Any landowner can apply to redistrict/rezone their land and Council must pass a bylaw for the redistricting/rezoning to be approved. Each land use district allows for certain uses, such as resource extraction; however, the landowner must still apply for a development permit. The development permit details the specific conditions that will apply for the intended use and is issued by a development officer who acts as the development authority.

Is adjacent landowner support needed for an applicant to rezone to direct control and reduce setback amounts?

Landowner support of an application is not always required, but it can influence Council's decision to approve a redistricting/rezoning application. Landowner negotiations may occur with industry in the pre-application stage; the County/Council is not involved in these negotiations. Sturgeon County encourages you to participate in any consultations and public hearings for resource extraction operations near your property.

What are the proposed changes to the Community Aggregate Payment (CAP) Levy?

Currently, there are no proposed changes to the CAP levy. If the proposed bylaws are approved, there is a motion before Council to review the CAP levy and how funds are distributed to balance the benefits to the broader community with the benefits to communities near resource extraction operations.

Where does the money from the Community Aggregate Payment levy go?

Resource extraction operators in Sturgeon County must pay a levy, called the Community Aggregate Payment (CAP) levy. These funds help keep taxes low and fund community services. Council adopted a Community Grant Policy on Oct. 13, 2020, which details how CAP levy dollars are spent in the community. Please see Appendix I to see how funds were distributed in 2022.

How long would development permits be valid for?

Approved resource extraction development permits would be valid for five years.

If an operator wants to renew, they'd have to apply for another permit, which would also be valid for five years. This repeats for the lifespan of the operation. New or different conditions could be applied to this permit to align with regulations and to set performance standards.

Where are the existing resource deposits in Sturgeon County?

This map shows potential resource deposits in Sturgeon County. There may be deposits in other areas not shown on the map, and some areas on the map may only have small deposits. Not all deposits are practical or cost-effective to extract.

How are impacts of gravel extraction on groundwater monitored?

Sturgeon County currently hires a third-party environmental consultant to monitor groundwater levels and water quality surrounding resource extraction operations by placing monitors in known aquifers and in private landowner water wells.

The proposed bylaws include the requirement for ongoing water and groundwater monitoring and management as part of the approval to redistrict/rezone land for resource extraction. If the proposed bylaws are approved, there is a motion before Council to compile a groundwater monitoring policy and necessary management plans, as needed.

What can a resident do if they believe an operator is operating outside their permit approval?

If a resident believes an operator is operating outside their permit approval, they can submit a written complaint to pandd@sturgeoncounty.ca. The County recently hired a development compliance officer who is focussed on making sure development permit conditions are met. This individual would investigate development and land use complaints – including those related to resource extraction operations – and take enforcement action, as needed.

Can the applicants continue to apply for a development permit even if a prior application was refused?

If an application for a development permit has been refused, the landowner can submit another application for a development permit on the same site for the same or similar use six months after the date of the refusal or a lesser time period, as determined by the development authority.

What is the nature/concept of the direct control district?

Direct control districts allow us to create land use/zoning districts with site-specific regulations and performance standards; these are used when other land use districts are

inappropriate or inadequate. Direct control districts consider existing/future surrounding developments, the applicant's interests, and the public interest.

The intent of the resource extraction direct control land use district is that any reduction in setback distance would also have greater performance standards applied to reduce the impact a resource extraction operation may have on the environment and adjacent properties and landowners.

Why can a permit be approved, and no action taken by the applicant?

Once districting/zoning is approved, it remains in place until it is changed again by bylaw. There is no timeframe for when an development permit application needs to be submitted after the land has been zoned.

Approved resource extraction development permits would be valid for five years. If an operator wants to renew, they'd have to apply for another permit, which would also be valid for five years. This repeats for the lifespan of the operation.

If a development permit is issued and not started within 12 months, the development permit approval expires and is no longer in effect and a new permit application would be needed. The districting/zoning, however, remains on the land until the property owner applies to redistrict/rezone to a different land use district, such as the agriculture district once the land has been reclaimed.

The province has a similar practice where it requires an activities plan every five years for the lifespan of the pit

What happens when an agreement is in place for a setback distance of less then 400 metres and a renewal occurs?

Currently, a landowner and an operator can negotiate a lesser setback distance and the operation can be approved with that setback distance. Under the proposed changes, operators would have to redistrict to the resource extraction direct control district when their permit expires, and they'd have to request the reduced setback amount. Landowner support is one of the criteria evaluated by Council to consider a setback reduction. If a reduced setback distance is approved, it remains in place as long as the resource extraction direct control district is in place on the land.

How will performance standards be enforced going forward?

The County recently hired a development compliance officer who is focussed on making sure development permit conditions are met. This individual would investigate development and land use complaints – including those related to resource extraction operations – and take enforcement action, as needed.

Appendix 1: Community Aggregate Payments

Bylaw 1400/18 - Community Aggregate Payment Levy

Defines levy of $0.40 per tonne of sand/gravel to be paid quarterly

2022 CAP Levy - Community Enhancement Reserve		
County Projects	488280.76	50%
Area Structure Plan Organizations	244,140.38	25%
Recognized Community Associations not in ASP	122,070.19	12.50%
Reserve	122,070.19	12.50%

2022 CAP Levy - Sturgeon Industrial Fund Reserve		
County Projects	13991.75	50.00%
Area Structure Plan Organizations	6,995.87	25.00%
Recognized Community Associations not in ASP	3,497.94	12.50%
Reserve	3,497.94	12.50%