

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 - Lehigh Public Hearing
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:36:53 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Greetings:

I am not sure what has happened to the live stream video feed on the Lehigh public hearing. The sound quality has deteriorated dramatically between yesterday and today. This is making the continuation of the hearing questionable since people cannot hear what is being said clearly.

If councillors are having even half as much difficulty hearing clearly, the continuation of this hearing under these compromised circumstances is highly questionable. Councillors must be able to hear all presentations clearly for there to be procedural fairness in the hearing.

Janet Ballantyne

Michelle Mitton

From: JANET BALLANTYNE [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:26 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 - opposition to Lehigh application

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Greetings:

I expressed my concerns about the process in an email yesterday. I would like to reiterate them now. The approach that has been taken with this hearing has meant that the residents feel they are speaking into a vacuum – not a fair process. It would have been easy to have provided some form of live feed for residents. Many other municipalities have done so. It is only appropriate that all parties to a public hearing have the same access to participation. Hiding behind inadequate provincial regulations is no justification for shutting out participation.

Janet Ballantyne

Karen Jiang

From: JANET BALLANTYNE [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:26 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 - opposition to Lehigh application

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Greetings:

I expressed my concerns about the process in an email yesterday. I would like to reiterate them now. The approach that has been taken with this hearing has meant that the residents feel they are speaking into a vacuum – not a fair process. It would have been easy to have provided some form of live feed for residents. Many other municipalities have done so. It is only appropriate that all parties to a public hearing have the same access to participation. Hiding behind inadequate provincial regulations is no justification for shutting out participation.

Janet Ballantyne

Kristen Tuff

From: Miriam [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 - Opposed

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

To the Rocky View Council members:

After listening to all the proceedings to date I strongly question how Council can vote in support of this by-law. This process seems to be deeply flawed if the information submitted by credible experts is not seriously considered. Also the strong opposition of the community has to be taken into serious consideration. Council needs to vote NO to this application.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Arnold and Miriam Bezeau

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - bylaw c8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:23:05 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Opposed to the Lehigh Hansen application

We were asked to provide letters and videos outlining our opposition to the LH application before January 27 2021. It is very clear that many residents spent considerable time and money and effort to prepare their presentations and letters. It was dismaying to learn that administration had not even bothered to review the letters and reports that the residents , in good faith, provided.

We sat through the entire process yesterday and this morning and were disappointed with the negligence of administration in this regard.

We were also disappointed to learn that the county has been less than forthcoming to provide documents that were requested by numerous residents.

We were also disappointed to learn that those in support of the project were non-residents, contractors or other gravel pits and such.

We are dismayed by the apparent bias that has been shown towards LeHigh Hanson from county administrators. and we fail to understand where that is coming from. Administration has not considered any of the views of over 400 county residents along with the lengthy report submitted by John Wetherall. This report also contained numerous technical reports by professional experts.

Leo and Colleen Bieche
20 Chamberlain Pl.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:51:35 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

My live feed for the hearing is frozen with on and off sound. If it is not working the hearing should be stopped until it is fixed.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:10:33 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Staff should be able to hear valid criticism. The council member that does not accept that there are open to criticism is wrong.

Karen Jiang

From: KAREN BOLGER [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:25 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 Scott Property

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

My name is Karen Bolger and as a 31 year resident of Bearspaw living on Burma Road I strongly oppose the Scott Property application. Knowing that Cancer is often caused by environmental issues I cannot understand how Lehigh Hanson and Rockyview County could allow this project within proximity to so many residents. For the sake of me, my family and future grandchildren Please vote no to allow this project to move forward.

Karen Bolger
25174 Burma Rd

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C -8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:05:47 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

To Whom it May Concern,

Please, read this email as my official protest against the proposed Lehigh Hanson gravel Pit proposal located North of Burma Rd.

Some of the concerning negative effects could include:

- Air quality effects from fine silica dust, a known carcinogen.
- Noise for 13 hours per day, 6 days per week.
- Significant risks to groundwater/drinking water
- Loss of wetlands & sensitive habitats, negative affects on wildlife/ wild life corridors.

Sincerely;

Brigitta Kozuback
Address: 19th AVE NW.
Calgary

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw 8082 Opposition
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:12:44 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

I am making this submission now because under the process established by the Council landowners do not have the benefit of a live feed. I have raised this matter repeatedly in my previous submissions.

I fully anticipate that Lehigh be asking for more time for its rebuttal, notwithstanding that your process sets forth they have only 10 minutes.

I fully anticipate that Lehigh will bring a motion for more time, notwithstanding that your process sets forth they have only 10 minutes.

Therefore, I am recording my objection now and request that it be placed on the record. Lehigh's protestations about lacking time to respond or needing more time to respond are completely meritless. Some history is important. On November 18, 2020, I requested relevant data from Lehigh. I was ignored. Within that request was a request for all data from their "54 boreholes." I was ignored, nothing was provided, and no data from these wells was referred to in Lehigh's materials. It would be procedurally unfair for Lehigh to make any reference to this data now. Frankly, as explained by Dr. Burton when he clearly set forth that the Lehigh wells did not penetrate the very strata that they claim is a "barrier", the Council should fully draw an adverse inference that this data is harmful to Lehigh.

Lehigh's technical reports were only posted late in the day. They were certainly posted after Lehigh claims to have concluded consultation.]. To put that in perspective, the technical reports that Lehigh has grounded its application (and reviewed by Staff) were only made available to landowners after this process was set. Obviously Lehigh had unlimited time to prepare its reports. It is the applicant. Yet it sought to hobble landowners by not making those reports available.

Landowners therefore were forced to work around the clock to locate experts and obtain experts reports, all within a COVID restricted period. Landowners resoundingly did so.

I have, on behalf of landowners, submitted several requests for adjournment. In particular,. All were ignored. Finally, landowners were forced to engage Mr. Niven as counsel. Even then, it would appear that this hearing was only adjourned to February 2, 2021 due to the broad COVID restrictions and not out of any concern to procedural fairness to landowners.

I repeatedly demanded the full Nichols report to test the assertions of Lehigh. Landowners had retained Dr. Ayers, a professor at the U of C, to analyse the claimed benefits. Staff made it perfectly clear that the Nichols report was provided to staff by Lehigh, it was intended to be relied on (and we saw that confirmed in the opening presentation of Lehigh), and therefore landowners were entitled to review it. WE were refused. In fact, I was directed to make a FOIP request. That point bears repeating. On behalf of all landowners, I was denied some of

the very evidence that the applicant relies on and that was reviewed by staff. This is flagrantly procedurally unfair.

On January 27, we received an incomplete response to the FOIP request. I then was forced to provide this to the landowners expert Dr. Ayres, have Dr. Ayres review the data, and have Dr. Ayres respond in accordance with the deadlines for video recordings.

Lehigh has the duty and obligation to present its full case. An applicant cannot ignore relevant data. A technical consultant must and should obtain all relevant data and the failure to do so is unconscionable. In addition, Lehigh claims that it fulfilled its duty to consult (which is obviously wrong on the record, as there is unanimous opposition by about 500 landowners with no support) and the data referred to by Dr. Burton (and Dr. Zaghloul, and Mr. Moroz and Ms. Le May) conclusively demonstrates that no barrier on the Lehigh land exists. The well data irrefutably demonstrates water below and above a barrier. This is impossible if a barrier exists. But fundamentally, it was up to Lehigh to obtain this data through good faith consultation or through its consultants fulfilling their obligation to look at all relevant data.

Therefore, any extension must be refused. That is precisely the standard that landowners were held to and it is procedurally unfair to rule otherwise.

I am also deeply concerned, as are all landowners, with procedurally unfair case splitting. The only possible reason Lehigh can have to exceed 10 minutes is that it is seeking to repair its completely deficient case. Lehigh is an applicant with a duty to consult. There is absolutely no reason for it not to bring forth its full case. Procedural fairness requires it to do so. Landowners fully and comprehensively responded to that case and that ends it. Rebuttal is not the opportunity to introduce new evidence and the rule against case splitting expressly prohibits that. The rule is rooted in fairness. To allow an applicant to spring up new evidence or new positions only after those opposed have responded denies the right of a full and fair response. A deficient application must be dismissed. Procedural fairness demands that result as does the overwhelming evidence before you.

A fundamental point bears repeating. This Council must depend on the quality of evidence provided by applicants. In this case, had landowners at their own expense not engaged objective, unbiased and non-partisan experts, Council would only have the assertions of the applicant which plainly seek to excavate a project over an alluvial aquifer, expose the drinking water aquifer to direct contamination, cause regional dewatering, destroy sensitive wetlands, cause permanent lowering of the water table, present economic benefits while ignoring the countervailing and overwhelming costs, and an overall application which is patently destructive of the environment and which in no way fosters the well being of the environment. Thankfully, landowners thwarted that effort by Lehigh.

Thank you

Willima Corbett

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw 8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:13:11 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Having spent yesterday watching the live feed I have the following observations.

You have heard Lh keep referring to itself as a good neighbour. From what you heard yesterday including:

-LH has received fines in excess of \$130,000,000 US for environmental and safety offences in the US over a 20 yr period (see schedule 1 to my written submission);

-LH produced questionable, inadequate data and appears to have manipulated data;

-LH is unwilling to make firm enforceable commitments but want Council and residents to rely on vague assurances of future good conduct;

would you trust tLH to act so as to protect your environmental, health and economic concerns.

The answer has to be a resounding no.

William Corbett

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw 8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:22:34 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

From yesterday's hearing I would like to make a further comment on the planning department's performance. I consider it an embarrassment to the county. It showed, in my opinion, clear bias in favor of the proponent and in fact the planning department has abandoned any pretext of neutrality. Planning department yesterday acknowledged that it had communicated with the proponent in relation to issues germane to the hearing shortly before the hearing. This was totally improper. When residents sought to meet with planning such meetings were rejected. Different rules for different folks. More apprehension of bias.

William Corbett

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw 8982-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:21:55 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

A couple of brief comments on water and health and safety.

You have heard evidence that the hydro geology of the proponent is not just flawed, it is totally unreliable. There is no 5 meter barrier as required. This is a safety issue. Air and noise safety considerations have also been raised. Precautionary principle mandates that the application be rejected.

William Corbett

Karen Jiang

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:25 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Fwd: Concerning Bylaw C-8082-2020
Attachments: Video.MOV; ATT00001.htm

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

I am not sure that my sound clip below made it to the package for council consideration. Please take a listen. It is of the noise that we here from the Star Pit on a regular basis at our home on Silverwoods Drive.

Thank you

Sharon Craik

Begin forwarded message:

From: Sharon Craik [REDACTED]
Subject: Concerning Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: December 9, 2020 at 8:06:52 AM MST
To: legislativeservices@rockyview.ca

The County had requested comments in advance of the [December 22nd](#) public hearing regarding Lehigh Hanson's application to redesignate the 600 acres at the north-east corner of Burma Road and Range Road 25 to accommodate an open pit gravel mine on what is referred to as the Scott Property and their application for the accompanying Master Site Development Plan. Even though this meeting has been postponed, I wanted to enforce our opposition to this project.

We (my husband and I) are opposed to this application. Heavy industry such as open pit mining is incompatible with residential communities. As a result, this application represents a completely unacceptable land use for this area.

Since the County refused Lehigh's two previous applications in respect to this property, several new residential developments have been approved in the immediate vicinity. These approvals signalled that the County is committed to the land use strategy in the Bearspaw Area Structure Plan which identifies this land as the location for future country residential development. As a result, the County has no social license to now impose open pit mining in this location.

Open pit gravel mines impose dramatic negative consequences on everyone who lives anywhere close to the gravel pits. These negative consequences include unavoidable costs to residents' health, safety, and quality of life, as well as serious environmental costs. I am attaching a recording of the Star Pit noise from February 12 at 8:10 pm. This is just one night and the noise is this loud during the day and night. Most days it is 24 hours of noise.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 - question
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:05:06 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

I'd like to know why the Reeve is allowed to interrupt to the video when you explicitly told Councillor Wright that there would be no discussions after each video?

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Re: Bylaw C-8082-2020 - question
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:08:28 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Staff deemed it “unnecessary” (was the word used as I recall) to review the technical contents of the residents submissions. This is wrong and insulted residents.

> On Feb 3, 2021, at 10:04 AM, Megan Cropper <megancropper@gmail.com> wrote:

>

>

>

> I'd like to know why the Reeve is allowed to interrupt to the video when you explicitly told Councillor Wright that there would be no discussions after each video?

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020: Forwarded CBC article about the need to conserve wetlands in Alberta
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:22:52 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dear Reeve Henn, Deputy Reeve McKylor, and Rocky View County Councillors,

Please see the attached article posted yesterday by the CBC. The article is regarding the need for Alberta to protect its wetlands, one of the topics that has been raised in relation to the applications before Council today. As such, it is timely and pertinent to some of the issues raised by your constituents in the proceedings to date. In addition to the professional opinions about the value of the wetlands located within the Scott property that were provided within the submissions in opposition of the applications, the article may help inform Council further about this one issue.

Sincerely,

Lori-ann Esser

From: accounts@cbc.ca
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:07:04 AM
Subject: From wastelands to conservation: Why Alberta needs to start thinking about its wetlands | CBC News

[REDACTED] is sharing this article from CBC with you:

[From wastelands to conservation: Why Alberta needs to start thinking about its wetlands | CBC News](#)

Tuesday marks the 50th anniversary of an international agreement to protect wetlands around the globe, and this may get you thinking what is so important about wetlands.

[Go to article](#)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 - Redesignation Item – Aggregate Extraction and Processing - A Road Map for Members of Rocky View Council to “in Good Conscience” Vote “No” to Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:27:43 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

A Road Map for Members of Rocky View Council to “in Good Conscience” Vote “No” to Bylaw C-8082-2020

By way of background, I was until November 2020 a 7-year landowner/resident of 39 Cody Range Way and current landowner/soon to be re-resident in Bearspaw at 39 Church Ranches Blvd. with my wife and four children (aged 7 and under). Me and my family are all **OPPOSED** to the application of Lehigh Hanson to redesignate the Scott Property Lands for ultimate use as a gravel extraction pit pursuant to proposed Bylaw C-8082-2020 (the “**Application**”).

I attended by video link the Rocky View County Special Council Meeting with respect to the Application on Tuesday, February 2, 2020 in its entirety and currently viewing the Wednesday, February 3, 2020 (the “**Special Meeting**”). I have reviewed and considered all written and video submissions provided in respect of, or made at, the Special Meeting. The following is a list and summary (in no particular order) of certain of the various reasons that OPPOSITION stakeholders to the Application submitted to be considered by Rocky View Council at the Special Meeting, and which in my view can be used as a road map for each of the members of Rocky View Council to “in good conscience” vote “no” to the Application. This list is not meant to be a complete list, but a summary of many of the salient arguments in opposition to the Application which should make

1. **Incomplete Rocky View County Administration Supporting Opinion:** at the Special meeting County administrator Dominic Kazmierczak indicated that administration has not reviewed or considered the opposing stakeholders’ technical submissions in providing their supporting opinion to Rocky View Council that Rocky View Council should proceed with approving Bylaw C-8082-2020.
2. **“No means no”:** after two previous failed applications from Lehigh Hanson in respect of the Scott Property in 1994 and 2010, residents of Bearspaw were then clearly in OPPOSITION of the Application, and with respect to this now third Application made by Lehigh Hanson, residents of Bearspaw are clearly, vehemently and overwhelmingly OPPOSED by the residents of Bearspaw and frustrated with this now third time the Application is being made. Enough is enough!
3. **Mental anguish:** many of the residents of Bearspaw who submitted videos and who

have been through the two (2) previous Applications of Lehigh Hanson appear to have suffered much stress and anguish over Lehigh Hanson's continued actions to keep revisiting the Application.

4. **Deficient Application of Lehigh Hanson:** the technical experts that submitted reports and evidence with respect to the Lehigh Hanson application are incomplete as noted by technical experts in opposition to the Plan. An incomplete and fully considered application should not be acceptable to Rocky View Council.
5. **Health Implications:** the record with respect to health implications of aggregate extraction on populations living near gravel pits are unequivocal and detrimental. In addition, since the 1994 and 2010 Applications, there is now even more expert evidence of adverse health implications, including with respect to adverse health implications related to Covid-19 patient outcomes.
6. **Environmental implications:** the Paskapoo aquifer is at extreme risk of environmental contamination and the lakes, ponds and interconnected water systems in the Bearspaw area are at extreme risk of 'dewatering' if the Application is approved. In addition, as noted by technical geological experts, there is clear evidence that Lehigh Hanson's expert's technical review of the water system is incomplete and factually erroneous – there is not two (2) aquifers but only one (1) aquifer.
7. **Incomplete Economic Cost-Benefit Analysis:** Expert evidence from an economics expert provided evidence that both Rocky View County administration's and Lehigh Hanson's cost-benefit analysis to both Rocky View County and Bearspaw residents is incomplete and does not consider at all any cost analysis to the community. Also, expert evidence was tendered to show that there is overall a net-negative benefit to Rocky View County through tax levies – let alone an enormous cost to current Bearspaw residents' through diminished property values.
8. **Unclear and insufficient proposed indemnification programs:**
 - a. Lehigh Hanson's proposed well water and property value indemnification programs are unclear and undeveloped;
 - b. there is no evidence that a financial creditworthy counterparty would even be on the hook – has the parent publicly-traded company to Lehigh Hanson even willing to provide this indemnification; the property value destruction provided by those in opposition is significant; and
 - c. the proposal is only for immediate adjacent landowners/properties and does not

apply to other landowners/properties which will also be adversely affected.

9. **Lack of Creditworthy Reclamation Counterparty:** the proposed development by Lehigh Hanson is a subsidiary of a much larger, foreign owned conglomerate; I did not see any evidence that the publicly-traded Lehigh Hanson parent company will actually be on the hook for reclamation obligations.
10. **Lack of consultation:** many of the submissions (both written and video) have expressed no or little consultation by either Lehigh Hanson or Rocky View County administration with respect to the Application. In particular, evidence was heard that there were residents that do not have access to computers and their voices have not been heard.
11. **Residents Concerns have not been met by Lehigh Hanson:** merely providing for a conveyor belt does not satisfy all of the residents' concerns, particularly when the Application now provides for a new concern, gravel crushing at the Scott Property, which the previous applications had not.
12. **Land use is not compatible with the Bearspaw ASP:**
 - a. the Bearspaw ASP clearly identifies that the lands situate therein are country-residential, a heavy-industrial use such as aggregate resource extraction is not compatible, nor is a 150-meter setback (being only a minimum) from residential properties is a sufficient transition between land-uses that are not compatible; and
 - b. Aquifers are protected in the Bearspaw ASP; there is expert evidence that the Aquifer will be severely impacted.
13. **Decrease of Quality of Life for Residents:** Many of the submissions in opposition focused on this aspect.
14. **Abundant Aggregate Supply Elsewhere in Rocky View County Not Situate in Proximity to Dense Population:** as noted in submissions, there are many other locations in Rocky View County with geological formations which would provide for abundant aggregate supply not located in the vicinity of dense residential development. There is no need for a gravel pit to be directly adjacent to the Bearspaw area when there are many other locations in the County which could be considered for gravel extraction.
15. **Moral Obligation:** given the number of interested parties opposed to the Application, it is each member of the Rocky View Council's moral duty and imperative to vote "no" to

the Application.

If anything, in my view, it has become abundantly clear that, now more than ever, it is incumbent that Rocky View County administration and Rocky View Council need to revisit and complete an Aggregate Resource Development Plan for all of Rocky View County so that both project proponents for aggregate construction and residents have clear guidelines on what aggregate developments may be considered to be approved by Rocky View County.

Please vote "NO".

Many thanks,

Andrew Kolody

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C -8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:05:47 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

To Whom it May Concern,

Please, read this email as my official protest against the proposed Lehigh Hanson gravel Pit proposal located North of Burma Rd.

Some of the concerning negative effects could include:

- Air quality effects from fine silica dust, a known carcinogen.
- Noise for 13 hours per day, 6 days per week.
- Significant risks to groundwater/drinking water
- Loss of wetlands & sensitive habitats, negative affects on wildlife/ wild life corridors.

Sincerely;

Brigitta Kozuback
Address: 19th AVE NW.
Calgary

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:11:32 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Council,

We have learned many things over the past two days.

Lehigh Hanson has stated, and County Staff has parroted, that “the Applicant worked with stakeholders to develop policies to effectively address the concerns of adjacent landowners”.

- The absurdity of this fundamentally untrue statement is made clear by the public response. The County has received 476 letters of opposition from affected residents.
- There is not a single letter of support among any respondent within the circulation area.
- No personal consultation occurred during this application process.
- Council must acknowledge that the consultation obligation has been breached for this project.

Lehigh Hanson has stated, and County Staff has parroted, that “the technical assessments provided and the resulting policies presented in the MSDP effectively address how any adverse impact of aggregate extraction on existing residents, adjacent land uses, and the environment would be managed and mitigated to an acceptable level.”

- The applicant, and County Staff, have minimized the likely and foreseeable impacts of this project.
- Data has been ignored by Lehigh Hanson and its technical consultants.
- **The evidence that has been presented to you by independent experts over the past two days is overwhelming, and fully discredits the claims made by the applicant.**

Lehigh Hanson has claimed that it will apply best practices and ‘raise the bar’ for gravel operations in the County.

- This is plainly false. This application increases harms relative to Lehigh’s previous proposals.
- Operating hours are increased. Setbacks are reduced. Most importantly, onsite crushing will dramatically increase noise impacts.
- The applicant had proposed enclosed crushing operations in 1994, and no crushing whatsoever in 2010. To claim best practices by proposing unenclosed crushing now is ridiculous.
- This is a company that cannot be trusted to do right by its neighbours or the environment. Lehigh and associated companies have been fined more than US\$130 million for environmental and other offences in the United States in the last 20 years alone.

Faced with clear and overwhelming evidence against their application, Lehigh must not be permitted to introduce new information or to bring forward new promises that cannot be reviewed and responded to by the public.

Similarly, Lehigh’s application for land use redesignation cannot be approved now, with a vague commitment to address technical aspects at the development permitting state. County Staff state in their report that “the technical assessments provided and the resulting policies presented in the MSDP effectively address how any adverse impact of aggregate extraction on existing residents, adjacent land uses, and the environment would be managed and mitigated to an acceptable level.”

Aside from being false, this statement reinforces that Staff have considered the technical information provided by Lehigh and have used it in assessing the appropriateness of the proposed land use redesignation. Assessing the validity of that technical information is therefore a present requirement. It has been thoroughly discredited, and the application must be rejected.

As laid out in the Agenda package (see pages 522-537 of 1104), this application **is non-compliant with at least 45 regulatory requirements**, including 16 items of non-compliance with the Area Structure Plan alone.

This application is in direct violation to Area Structure Plan provision 8.3.21, which states that *“Redesignation proposals and/or applications for subdivision and development approval to accommodate the extraction of natural resource - aggregates should only be considered where, in the opinion of the Municipality, the rural residential character of adjacent lands is not unduly negatively impacted or substantially altered.”* Council knows that this application would violate this common-sense provision, and it must be rejected.

Finally, the admissions by County Staff yesterday create an apprehension of bias. County Staff admitted yesterday that they relied only on information from the applicant in forming their recommendation to Council, and ignored expert evidence provided by landowners. Staff admitted that they met with the applicant as recently as a day prior to the public hearing to discuss technical aspects of the presentation to council. Residents requested a meeting with County Staff to discuss the project on November 25, 2020. This request was denied by Theresa Cochran, who is a signatory on the staff report recommending approval of this application.

This application must be rejected.

Leah Weatherill

51 Timber Ridge Way

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - audio video replay request for Jalkotsky
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:56:42 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Please replay the video from Peter Jalkotsky. It was not able to be understood as the audio was not functioning properly.

Thanks,
Ailsa

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - bylaw c-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:19:25 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Please replay the video from Peter Jalkotsky. It was not able to be understood as the audio was not functioning properly.

Thanks,
Ailsa

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - RE: Bylaw C-8082-2020. Equipment in the Scott Pit- Todays hearing
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 8:53:42 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Good Morning: I mistakenly thought that this was a more or less interactive link and it was important to get my question in quickly. However as it seems the bylaw reference is critical I'm resending this. It is my understanding that Councillor Wright was told there would one loader, one backhoe and one bulldozer in the pit at any one time. If that is correct then my question still stands. I doubt one loader can accomplish this, so how many should there be?

Ron Lefebvre

31 Lone Pine Cres.

From: Ron Lefebvre [REDACTED]
Sent: February 2, 2021 10:39 AM
To: 'publichearings@rockyview.ca'
Subject: Equipment in the Scott Pit- Todays hearing

Councillor Wright asked about the equipment in the pit. If there are approx. 300 working days at 11 hrs per day (both maximum) there are 3300 working hours available in a year. To extract 2M tons per year that loader will have to load at least 606 tons per hour or 10 tons per minute. That sounds like a pretty good loader. I suspect that many more than one loader is required. Please advise.

Ron Lefebvre

31 Lone Pine Cres

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:54:40 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dear MD of Rocky View Council,

I am a resident in the area of the proposed Lehigh Hanson gravel mine.

I firmly believe gravel operations and residential areas are not compatible and should not be in the close proximity of each other.

This application has been denied more than once. The gravel applicant states that residents' concerns have been addressed in this application, however that is NOT the case. Noise, air pollution, degradation of water table are issues that can never be remedied. High levels of silica are also inherent components of the gravel deposit and their release into the air cannot be stopped. The applicant is proposing to build a conveyor belt to transport the gravel to a location within city limits. This is another inherently highly noisy and dust producing operation and proves, that the applicant not only did NOT address residents' concerns, but is planning to add yet another noise and pollution creating feature to their design.

In addition to MD residents, all of the above will be negatively impacting hundreds of City of Calgary residents living in adjacent communities.

Please do not approve this application.

Best regards,

Libuse (Liba) Levicek
24080 Meadow Dr.
T3R 1A7

[REDACTED]

Karen Jiang

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 9:30 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

I Libuse (Liba) Levicek would like to clarify my previous submission and state one more time, that i am opposing this application and would like to ask MD of Rocky View Council to reject it based on the evidence provided as well as the fact that the application has been reviewed and assessed on at least two occasions prior to this date and rejected both times.

Thank you,

Libuse (Liba) Levicek
24080 Meadow Dr
T3R 1A7
[REDACTED]

On Wed, 3 Feb 2021 at 09:58, [REDACTED] wrote:
Dear MD of Rocky View Council,

I am a resident in the area of the proposed Lehigh Hanson gravel mine.

I firmly believe gravel operations and residential areas are not compatible and should not be in the close proximity of each other.

This application has been denied more than once. The gravel applicant states that residents' concerns have been addressed in this application, however that is NOT the case. Noise, air pollution, degradation of water table are issues that can never be remedied. High levels of silica are also inherent components of the gravel deposit and their release into the air cannot be stopped. The applicant is proposing to build a conveyor belt to transport the gravel to a location within city limits. This is another inherently highly noisy and dust producing operation and proves, that the applicant not only did NOT address residents' concerns, but is planning to add yet another noise and pollution creating feature to their design.

In addition to MD residents, all of the above will be negatively impacting hundreds of City of Calgary residents living in adjacent communities.

Please do not approve this application.

Best regards,

Libuse (Liba) Levicek
24080 Meadow Dr.
T3R 1A7
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - RE: Bylaw C-8082-2020 - Opposed
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:02:56 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Quoted from the Herald:

'County administrator Dominic Kazmierczak said they haven't reviewed opponents' technical submissions, which raised the eyebrows of Coun. Samantha Wright, who represents Bearspaw.

"So your opinion is based solely on what the applicant submitted?" said Wright.'

Canadian Cities and Municipalities duty is to always be 'fair and equitable', the above statement proves RVC has failed on both counts, council has no choice but to determine RVC has been delinquent in its due diligence. Will council now be formally instructed to disregard Administrations recommendation?

Martin Jones

226 Church Ranches Way

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - RE: Bylaw C-8082-2020 - Opposed
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:23:30 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

The residents video that played @ 9:19 was totally unintelligible, it must be replayed by RVC with the audio adjusted, this is unfair representation!

Martin Jones

226 Church Ranches Way

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - RE: Bylaw C-8082-2020 - Opposed
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:50:41 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

The live stream audio has failed again!

||| Martin Jones

||| 226 Church Ranches Way

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - bylaw C 8082 2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:21:55 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

NO, the only answer is NO

Karen Jiang

From: Larry Marshall [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C-8082-2020

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Having listened to all of the public submissions over the last 2 days I am even more concerned about the risk to the ground water/aquifer system than previously. I am convinced that the geological interpretations presented are sound and that Lehigh has failed to properly evaluate the risks posed by their plan. We CANNOT afford to make a mistake when it comes to the hydrogeology of this project. The ramifications of making a mistake are enormous.

Larry Marshall
Church Ranches

Karen Jiang

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:25 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - RE: Bylaw C-8082-2020 - Opposed

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Did RVC undertake their own comprehensive engineering study to verify LH applications claims, if not why not?

||| Martin Jones

||| 226 Church Ranches Way

Karen Jiang

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Re: Bylaw C-8082-2020

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Councillors,

Vehemently Oppose

Your treatment of Bill Corbett was disgraceful.

Just because he has a different opinion to yourself, one or two Councillors tried to shut him down.

He had some very valid points to make, which in a democracy it is his right to make.

Martyn Griggs

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Oppose Bylaw C8082-2020 Lehigh Hanson Gravel pit on Scott Lands
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:20:05 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Oppose Bylaw C8082-2020 Lehigh Hanson Gravel pit on Scott Lands

We support the Bearspaw residents in opposing the Lehigh Gravel pit.

We agree with the Bearspaw residents and their expert Geologists and Hydrogeologists that the gravel pit will cause impact on the water aquifer based on our experience and specialists.

2020-06 Alberta Environment approved the Burnco Approval No. 00430788-00-01 and License No. 00396954-00-00 allowing mining in the water table without any input or communication with the adjacent landowners.

The Water Act states, “Public consultation is a key component of the development of these plans and includes opportunities for local and regional involvement.” We believe the Alberta Environment process for the Burnco approval should proactively involve adjacent landowners to protect their interests.

In a 2009 letter to Rocky View County, re NW13-26-5W5M gravel pit (now Burnco West Cochrane Gravel pit): “Water is very important to us and often hard to find. The proposed new hole in the ground will be like a giant wash basin. Will it draw down our water table for our wells?”

In 2019, we drilled three dry water wells on NW-24-26-5W5M, which is immediately north of the gravel pit and all were within a few hundred metres of the Burnco gravel pit and a fourth well was drilled further to the north. The water well driller claimed the dry holes were in water bearing formations. The holes showed water signs, but now have no water. This is clear evidence that the gravel pit impacted the water aquifer.

Gravel pits need to be temporary with a firm timeline, less than 5 years in duration. With the transition to a pit, currently there is no check to make sure they are following their social responsibility on the 5-year review term. The terms of operations can change without input and this is happening. This is wrong. These pits should not be approved, but if it is, the timeline needs to be shrunk to 5 years to excavate and reclaim the area for future use. This allows for the resource to be extracted before a residential community is developed. Having the highest social value for the community. These gravel pits cannot be business as usual with no timeline for closure into the future. This model ceased to be acceptable in the last century. This is Alberta a great place for innovative and operational efficiency. These pits cannot keep ignoring the concerns of the people around them and operating, business as usual. These pits need to address and come up with way better ways to extract gravel.

Ann McKendrick McNabb
President McKendrick Ranches Ltd.



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Fwd: Bylaw C- 8083-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:00:25 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed gravel pit at the Scott site in Rocky View County.

To have this in a community close to the houses in Rocky View is absurd. The 24/7 noise will cause stress for those around the site not to mention affecting underground water. In addition, there is no way to mitigate the dust that would be created and its negative impacts on residents health.

I do not agree with this proposal and hope that all those opposed to this project will be heard and the right decision made to not allow this gravel pit to go ahead.

Debra Mercer
220 Dalcastle CRT NW
Calgary
T3A 2A7

--

Debra Mercer

--

Debra Mercer
Secretary Chapter 001

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Land use designation
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:54:19 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

My name is Joanne Moroz/resident of Church Ranches/Rocky View County and I am opposed to Bylaw C8082-2020 redesignating land

Lehigh Hanson:

What is the cost of the Water Mitigation program and what exactly would be done if water is contaminated?

What is the actual noise of the conveyor belt?

Has Rocky view COUNCIL reviewed ALL the technical data inputted either by submissions or videos by 4 geologists, doctors/nurses, engineers, lawyers, audiologist, accounts, financial economists, real estate and many other professionals disputing Lehigh Hanson information?

Did COUNCIL NOTE?.... Video of actual gravel dust on snow

Video of wind blowing dust

Videos of some 85 video submissions (Note – many of these videos were for MORE than one household)

These included concerns about:

**Water contamination/Health Effects/Noise/Traffic/Home
Values/Dust (carcinogenic)/Wildlife/environment**

Etc. Etc. Etc.

IF.....Rocky view council approves this land designation, what control/recourse do residents have in forcing Lehigh Hanson to follow through with all their PROPOSED “mitigation” plans. Probably NONE. The average person would never be able to sue this huge German company due to finances later. Where does leave the residents?

Will Rocky View STAFF and COUNCIL cover costs?

Did Rocky View STAFF research all the technical information or did they just believe everything Lehigh Hanson submitted?

Thank you answering all my questions and remind you to please do the right thing

Joanne Moroz

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C -8060-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:58:46 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

The audio on ur system is horrible. Another failed project along with Lehigh Hansen project.
Help me understand.

Sent from my Galaxy

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Peter Jalkotzy Video C-8060-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:06:55 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Ur audio is terrible for this presentation - it should be replayed.

Doug Morrison
RV County

Sent from my Galaxy

Karen Jiang

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C-8060-2020

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

A few audio submissions were terrible - they should be replayed to see if Count Staff can enhance their quality.

Peter Jalkotzy for sure should be replayed.

Doug
RVCounty

Sent from my Galaxy

Karen Jiang

From: Melinda Olliver [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - sound out on video

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Hello Council,

This is Melinda Olliver, the subject of the video where the sound kept cutting out. In case it was missed, the main points i was hoping to make were:

1. There are several homes within 500 meters of the proposed site and most will have a sight line of the project.
2. The Rockyview Water Coop, which services over 500 homes, is 0.9 km from the subject land. (My soliloquy about our purchase is not important- I was just sad we had been misadvised about the potential purposes of the land owned by Lehigh. We had been advised prior to purchase that it was slated for development with several developers interested. We would not have bought in 2017 if we believed that wasn't the case)
3. There is land for sale only a few km north of this quarter section that does not abut residential communities and we have been advised several developers are interested in the land currently owned by Lehigh Hansen. There are lots of options available other than this particular pit!!

Thanks so much.

Melinda Olliver

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - RE: Bylaw C-8000-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 8:56:45 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Further to my previous email and listening to 3 more hours of presentations I add the following comments:

- After hearing from 2 more “subject matter experts” i.e. geology/geophysics it appears that the AECON engineering study regarding the interruption of the site geology formation and the impact on the water table is grossly deficient and is actually bad engineering.
- Also the sound and noise specialist has raised concerns on acceptable provincial and industry standards regarding allowable and acceptable db levels not being followed.
- It also appears that the administration has been negligent in not including the technical data and recommendations from the experts who presented February 2/2021. This needs serious follow-up as to why not. This apparent lack of transparency creates concerns that Lehigh may be exerting undue influence on both administration and council personnel to steer their decisions toward approving the application.
- I have been enjoying the presentations and admire the amount of work the residents have expended to oppose what to me is a no brainer. This is no place for a pit operation to exist in proximity to a high density residential area.

I look forward to today’s presentations and questions from councillors.

Garry Pangracs P. Eng.

From: Garry Pangracs New [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 3:01 PM
To: 'publichearings@rockyview.ca'
Subject: Bylaw C-8000-2020

I have been listening to the presentations and have been amazed at the high quality especially by the geologist with 40 years’ experience. I have lived on 42 rolling Acres Place for the last 30 yrs. and am about 1.5 miles from the Lehigh pit and after hearing the presentations I am more than ever opposed to the pit. I am a P. Eng. and have been involved in mining all my life including iron ore, coal, gold and oilsands: all in remote areas where no one wants to live. So in closing listen to the residents of Rocky View and say NO to the proposal.

Regards

Garry Pangracs P.Eng.

[REDACTED]

Karen Jiang

From: Kelly Paulson [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - FW: (C-8082-2020) Opposed

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

After watching these videos it is clear that we do not want this in our backyard. We also do not want this in anyones backyard. Your vote will send a clear message to the voters in your divisions how you would protect them in the same situation. We hope that message will be that you have the common sense to protect the people you represent. I can't imagine the reasons that anyone at this point would vote yes to let it move ahead at this location. If you vote yes please clearly let us know how you stand to support that decision within your own division and in the future if what the experts presented on health impacts comes true. Don't regret a vote made today for purely financial reasons.

Thank you,
Kelly

Karen Jiang

From: Jonathan Pendlebury [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C-8082-2020

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dear Council,

My family and I just purchased and now live at 88 Timber Ridge Way, Church Ranches. My wife and I have watched all the stream, from beginning presentation with LH to the final video. After considering all the evidence, especially the overwhelming evidence from unbiased experts, my entire family of 5 are strongly against this application and request that you reject the pit not just now but forever!!!

Kind regards,

Jonathan



Jonathan Pendlebury

REALTOR®
Royal LePage Benchmark

Office: 403-253-1901
Cell: [REDACTED]



Benchmark

INDEPENDENTLY OWNED AND OPERATED

www.bearspawrealty.ca



[Like us on Facebook!](#)

Karen Jiang

From: Kyle Penton [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:16 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dear Councillors,

Please register this letter in opposition to the by-law.

Please consider all the submissions which address medical, economic, and environmental consequences of the application. Those are the most important issues present, and I cannot speak to them any better than those who submitted. What I can do is add my own anecdote to these submissions.

We, and others, purchased our properties in the area relying on the land use classification in the Bearspaw Area Structure Plan, which designated the land in question as Country Residential. We also noted that this gravel application had been rejected twice in the past and, importantly, subsequent residential developments had been encouraged and approved by the County after these rejections. We took these residential development approvals as a signal that the county was committed to the County residential designation.

If this application is approved, how can anyone rely on the integrity of the present land use classifications anywhere in Rockyview?

Again, please listen to the independent experts who oppose the gravel pit on medical, economic, and environmental grounds. Please stand up for your constituents rather than a foreign conglomerate.

Thanks,
Kyle Penton and family
(land owner in close proximity)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw No. C-8082-2020- OPPOSED
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:21:59 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dear Council,

Please reject this application once and for all. Life is too short to go through this again.

Thank you.

Rod Lipman
Sent from my iPad

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Re: Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:22:48 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dwayne Romansky and Dawn Romansky of 37 Timber Ridge Way are opposed to the land redesignation application based on professional, third party, unbiased reports that clearly show imminent damage to the Paskapoo aquifer, noise during construction and operations that will clearly exceed rural acceptable limits and the unknown acute damage caused by crystalline silica particulate matter (dust) and the devaluing of our property as shown in the independent economic cost/benefit study.

Thanks you,
Dwayne Romansky

On Tue, Feb 2, 2021 at 11:19 AM Dwayne Romansky [REDACTED] wrote:
The MSDP states noise will be exceeded during construction. During the hearing this issue was simply glossed over and not answered. Lehigh Hansen know very well how long construction of each phase is and simply evaded answering the question.
Thank you,
Dwayne Romansky

On Tue, Feb 2, 2021 at 10:46 AM Dwayne Romansky [REDACTED] wrote:
Please address the noise during construction of each phase of the mine. It was stated that the noise will exceed allowed limits during construction and while the gravel operation is above the berm.
Thank you,
Dwayne Romansky

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw 8082 2020. Opposed
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:16:03 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

This was from the Calgary herald.
Bylaw 8082 2020

<https://calgaryherald.com/news/local-news/residents-dump-on-huge-gravel-pit-plan-as-rocky-view-councillors-weigh-approving-it>

Sent from my iPhone

Karen Jiang

From: Dawn Rosine [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:25 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw c-8082-2020 oppose

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

The Calgary herald is reporting that county staff has acknowledged they only reviewed LH material in preparing there recommendation and admitted they did not review any land owners submission... IS this true?

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020. Council Hearing
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:20:50 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

To RockyView council.

My name is Fred Scharf and live at 25021 Briarwood drive in Bears paw. I have submitted my opposition to the rezoning of the Scott property both via email and video submission. I have also taken the opportunity to review some of the submissions from those in support which are largely contractors, consultants or others who stand to benefit from the open pit gravel mine. There is however one submission from the Sage Hill community indicating Lehigh Hansen are "good neighbours". If this is the case in Sage Hill it is certainly the exception based on their documented operating violations across North America.

They have been charged with numerous environmental infractions; including a 2011 lawsuit under the EPA for dumping millions of gallons of toxic waste water in to Cupertino Creek in Santa Clara county California. Along with 14 clean Air act violations from 9 of their plants in eight US states. In Canada Lehigh Hansons Esseroc Canada Inc. subsidiary was fined for discharging dust into the natural environment and failing to notify the Ontario ministry of the discharge. These are only a few examples of their ongoing violations.

Lehigh Hansen has demonstrated through it's operating practices they should not be trusted to operate as a responsible corporate citizen respecting local, provincial and federal laws, standards and regulations. Not withstanding this is a totally incompatible land use and the determinatl health and environmental impacts resulting from the project, Lehigh's Hansens operating practices must be considered in any decision regarding their application to operate an open pit gravel mine.

I respectfully ask council to vote "NO" to the redesignation of the Scott property.

Karen Jiang

From: P K SCHULDHAUS [REDACTED]
Sent: February 3, 2021 10:26 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Council,

Landowners were shocked to hear Staff refer to Section 29 of the County Plan. There is no analysis of section 29 in the Applicants materials. There is nothing in the Staff report. It is procedurally unfair to attempt to bolster the applicants case. Staff cannot refer to requirements that the applicant itself has not referred to. It would appear to the Staff that virtually nothing needs to be decided here. Yet, the Staff refers to and relies on technical reports of the Applicant. This is blatantly one sided and unfair.

In fact, Staff confirmed unequivocally that contrary expert reports had not been reviewed. Staff refers to the hydrogeological report of Lehigh. Staff makes no mention of the fatal flaws in this work. There has ever been a mitigation plan presented to any landowner. In any event, I consider that I have the right not to have my drinking water impacted. Mitigation is not an excuse to inflict harm.

Regards,

Perry

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:11:14 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Councillors,

I protest this public hearing. Your link on your website for the Live View takes people to the "Additional Public Submissions" page of the materials and not the live video of the hearing. As a result people cannot view the Live Meeting!

Perry Schuldhaus

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:24:43 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dear Councillors,

This entire process and experience is absolutely bizarre!!!

I don't know why the landowners are having to work so hard to convince RVC not to approve this redesignation? I don't know why **Reeve Daniel Henn** is trying to **limit questions** and **encourage councillors not to ask too many questions** on the second day so that council can wrap up by noon. There hasn't been an issue of this significance and interest from Stakeholders in front of RVC in a long time and it is beyond me why Reeve Henn would not be encouraging council to fully explore and understand all the issues, perspectives and legalities for and against redesignation before asking Council to vote. Council votes in favour of **giving Lehigh Hanson more time to make its presentation** but yet **Landowners were forced to adhere to 5 or 10 minute presentation** and one **Landowner's video submission was excluded from the hearing since it was 20 seconds too long**; that is incredibly biased! Unless this has already been decided and what Council is now doing is going through the motions. All this does not sit well with many, many people observing these proceedings!

WE ARE HAVING TO PAY OUT OF OUR OWN POCKETS TO HAVE INDEPENDENT EXPERTS PREPARE REPORTS (which have been ignored) IN ORDER TO CONVINCE ELECTED COUNCILLORS, WHO'S SALARIES THE RESIDENTS PAY THROUGH PROPERTY TAXES, THAT RVC STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION IS WRONG AND WE ALSO PAY THE SALARIES OF RVC STAFF. BUT BASED ON THE WAY THE REEVE AND SOME COUNCILLORS ARE BEHAVING, AS WELL AS ADMINISTRATION, **WHAT IS SO PECULIAR ABOUT THIS ENTIRE EXPERIENCE IS ONE MIGHT THINK MOST OF YOU ARE WORKING FOR LEHIGH HANSON AND NOT THOSE RESIDENTS WHO LIVE IN THIS COUNTY!!**

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:22:56 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Yesterday when Ken Verner was answering a question he made a comment regarding LH wanting to be a good neighbour and that they have listened to the community, and have formed their application with that information in mind. But, that is a blatant lie. There has been NO communication from LH to our family, nor any other resident I have spoken with regarding this application. Contact/communication from LH has been ZERO. Their application has not taken us, the residents of the community, into account.

Based on all the comments from the community we hope Council will vote for the residents, their families, their investment, their peace and their safety; and make a clear statement to LH and others, that this property is never going to be a open pit gravel mine and its time to move on. Gravel extortion from this location is just not cohesive with the adjacent lands.

Thank you for your consideration to the voices of the community and its residents.

Thanks,
Trevor Seidel
24 Crestview Estates

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 - Opposed
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:23:46 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

To the Rocky View Council members:

After listening to all the proceedings to date I strongly question how Council can vote in support of this by-law. This process seems to be deeply flawed if the information submitted by creditable experts is not seriously considered. Also the strong opposition of the community has to be taken into serious consideration. Council needs to vote NO to this application.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,
Arnold and Miriam Bezeau

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020: Video of Peter Jalkotzy
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:02:43 AM
Attachments: [Video Commentary 30-Jan-2021.docx](#)

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Hello,

The audio quality was very poor during the video of Peter Jalkotzy, covering the deficiencies of the Cumulative Effects Assessment submitted by Lehigh Hanson.

Is it possible to replay Peter's video with improved audio?

If not, attached for your review is a transcript of that video.

Kind regards,

John Weatherill

51 Timber Ridge Way, Rocky View County

Video Commentary

Kelly Wise



Reference - C-8082-2020

Scott Gravel Municipal Development and Redesignation Application

My name is Peter Jalkotzy and I am submitting on behalf of Kelly Wise who lives in the Bearspaw area of the Rocky View county and opposes the application for approval.

I am a certified and registered environmental professional of good standing in Canada and Alberta. I have a 40+yr career in managing environmental assessment and approval processes, including municipal development planning and redesignation applications and processes. I am a recognized subject matter expert in environmental assessment and cumulative effects.

I have completed a review of the Cumulative Effects report and have had my opinions and conclusions peer reviewed by a 50+yr environmental and regulatory professional, former University of Toronto Professor and a published subject matter expert in cumulative effects.

The Cumulative Effects Assessment Report for the subject property is deficient and unreliable as evidentiary material. The report does not accurately assess and evaluate the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Master Site Development Plan. The errors and omissions, non-conformance and misalignment of policy render this document unreliable as evidentiary materials.

The report scopes out every conceivable Valued Component (VC) except for Wetlands and Ephemeral Water Bodies. The residual cumulative impact for this component is ranked as minor and is limited to the regional study area for the project (1km radius). This is not true considering the regional network of surface and groundwater resources, or the policy that prohibits development (i.e., Riparian Policy) or other registered and acknowledged environmental sensitivities (e.g. steep slopes, high water table).

The exclusion of every other VC is not warranted and does not reflect the reality of cumulative impacts from the project. Quality of Life is not even mentioned as a VC. Air quality and Noise have been scoped out while residents file new complaints to the noncompliance of existing operations. Wildlife are scoped out because the assessors claim they can find a home somewhere else. Surface water hydrology is not even discussed despite the County's signatures on the Nose Creek Watershed Water Management Plan which stipulates preservation of wetlands and natural features. To assess the aggregate resource solely as a monetary resource neglects to acknowledge the ecological function value including downstream hydrology. It is a well known fact that Spy Hill landfill has contaminated the local groundwater resource.

In the process, they have missed a number of key elements within the assessment that are specifically required by Section 29 of the Rocky View County Municipal Development Plan for aggregate resources (i.e., geophysical, geotechnical, stormwater management, reclamation plan).

Furthermore, the proposed land use redesignation is not in alignment with Provincial, County or Bearspaw Area Structure Plan (BASP) policy and specific recommendations from previous applications for approval to develop aggregate resources at this property (1994 and 2010). A review of the Bearspaw Future Land Use Scenarios clearly demonstrates that the distribution of residential land use has been the designated land use. As decided in 1994 when the county refused the proposed aggregate development plan for the subject property on the basis that the rural residential character of adjacent lands are not unduly negatively impacted or substantially altered remains unchanged, if not truer today. Meanwhile, the County continues to approve new residential subdivision immediately adjacent to the proposed development, as recently as November 10, 2020¹.

The County has demonstrated a development pattern that does not align with its own policy. This aggregate resource development land use proposal is not compatible with the predominantly Country Residential land use of the region.

¹ Division 8 - Bylaw C-8060-2020 - Redesignation Item - Residential Use File: PL20200059 (06606046). Property located on the NW corner of Burma Road and Range Road 25, immediately adjacent to Scott Property.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020: Video of Peter Jalkotzy
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:14:51 AM
Attachments: [Video Commentary 30-Jan-2021.docx](#)

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Hello,

The audio quality was very poor during the video of Peter Jalkotzy, covering the deficiencies of the Cumulative Effects Assessment submitted by Lehigh Hanson.

Is it possible to replay Peter's video with improved audio?

If not, attached for your review is a transcript of that video.

Kind regards,

John Weatherill

51 Timber Ridge Way, Rocky View County

Video Commentary

Kelly Wise



Reference - C-8082-2020

Scott Gravel Municipal Development and Redesignation Application

My name is Peter Jalkotzy and I am submitting on behalf of Kelly Wise who lives in the Bearspaw area of the Rocky View county and opposes the application for approval.

I am a certified and registered environmental professional of good standing in Canada and Alberta. I have a 40+yr career in managing environmental assessment and approval processes, including municipal development planning and redesignation applications and processes. I am a recognized subject matter expert in environmental assessment and cumulative effects.

I have completed a review of the Cumulative Effects report and have had my opinions and conclusions peer reviewed by a 50+yr environmental and regulatory professional, former University of Toronto Professor and a published subject matter expert in cumulative effects.

The Cumulative Effects Assessment Report for the subject property is deficient and unreliable as evidentiary material. The report does not accurately assess and evaluate the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed Master Site Development Plan. The errors and omissions, non-conformance and misalignment of policy render this document unreliable as evidentiary materials.

The report scopes out every conceivable Valued Component (VC) except for Wetlands and Ephemeral Water Bodies. The residual cumulative impact for this component is ranked as minor and is limited to the regional study area for the project (1km radius). This is not true considering the regional network of surface and groundwater resources, or the policy that prohibits development (i.e., Riparian Policy) or other registered and acknowledged environmental sensitivities (e.g. steep slopes, high water table).

The exclusion of every other VC is not warranted and does not reflect the reality of cumulative impacts from the project. Quality of Life is not even mentioned as a VC. Air quality and Noise have been scoped out while residents file new complaints to the noncompliance of existing operations. Wildlife are scoped out because the assessors claim they can find a home somewhere else. Surface water hydrology is not even discussed despite the County's signatures on the Nose Creek Watershed Water Management Plan which stipulates preservation of wetlands and natural features. To assess the aggregate resource solely as a monetary resource neglects to acknowledge the ecological function value including downstream hydrology. It is a well known fact that Spy Hill landfill has contaminated the local groundwater resource.

In the process, they have missed a number of key elements within the assessment that are specifically required by Section 29 of the Rocky View County Municipal Development Plan for aggregate resources (i.e., geophysical, geotechnical, stormwater management, reclamation plan).

Furthermore, the proposed land use redesignation is not in alignment with Provincial, County or Bearspaw Area Structure Plan (BASP) policy and specific recommendations from previous applications for approval to develop aggregate resources at this property (1994 and 2010). A review of the Bearspaw Future Land Use Scenarios clearly demonstrates that the distribution of residential land use has been the designated land use. As decided in 1994 when the county refused the proposed aggregate development plan for the subject property on the basis that the rural residential character of adjacent lands are not unduly negatively impacted or substantially altered remains unchanged, if not truer today. Meanwhile, the County continues to approve new residential subdivision immediately adjacent to the proposed development, as recently as November 10, 2020¹.

The County has demonstrated a development pattern that does not align with its own policy. This aggregate resource development land use proposal is not compatible with the predominantly Country Residential land use of the region.

¹ Division 8 - Bylaw C-8060-2020 - Redesignation Item - Residential Use File: PL20200059 (06606046). Property located on the NW corner of Burma Road and Range Road 25, immediately adjacent to Scott Property.

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:19:03 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

RVC Councillors;

I have been listening to most of the audio presentations and have read a lot of the written submissions. The more I hear and learn the more dismayed and angry I get at you, the RVC, to even consider such a ridiculous application by this German conglomerate, Lehigh Hanson (LH). Are you obligated to consider every application no matter if they are not conducive to land use zoning? The 5 or 6 gravel pits to the East of us all significantly breach the silica dust in the air emissions, noise levels, negative water aquifer impacts and truck traffic limitations that were part of their original development application and significantly exceed the limits for the health of the public & residents and yet they are allowed to continue to operate. The Lehigh Hanson's proposed gravel pit operation will be no different. You know that! There will be a significant degradation to quality of life and a huge negative impact to the health of all residents proximal to LH site if it is allowed to go ahead.

There appears to be large gravel reserves in many places throughout RVC. Why would you even consider allowing the development of a gravel pit so proximal to so many RVC residents?

Please represent your constituents responsibly and vote this down unanimously and never hear of it again.

Rick Wise
11 Lone Pine Cr

Kristen Tuff

From: Rick Wise [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:24 AM
To: Public Hearings Shared
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

RVC Councillors,

It snowed last night here in Calgary. Please take some time tomorrow and visit the area around the gravel pit operations to the East of Bearspaw and see if any of the snow around those gravel pits is white. By tomorrow there will be a thin coat of dust over all of the snow around those gravel crushing operations making it look like grey snow. That is what it will be like for all of us if you allow the LH pit to go ahead. We will be breathing this dust in every day for the next 30 years. Please vote against this application.

Rick Wise
11 Lone Pine Cr

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 9:39:03 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dear Rockyview Councilors,

Sarah Wright is correct; questions (if any) from councilors to the administration should be made immediately following each video presentation.

A couple of specific questions:

1. How would gravel mining operations be dealt with should (when) the conveyor belt system breaks down? Does the operation completely shut down temporarily until repairs are completed? Or what satisfactory alternative methods of gravel transportation would be implemented by LH temporarily?
2. Please review the following link (article AND video) which is a presentation from January 2017:
[Emergency room doctor pleads for safety on gravel miningCountyNewsOnline.ca - What matters in Rocky View County and Region](#)
3. Pertaining to the above link, how would Lehigh Hanson address the deadly health results from infusing the harmful crystalline silica particles that would be released into the air?

Thank you,

Walter Zielke

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Public Hearings Shared](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] - Bylaw C-8082-2020 (CENSORING?????)
Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021 10:15:08 AM

Do not open links or attachments unless sender and content are known.

Dear Councilors,

10:08am

How can you possibly even consider censoring the video submissions that differ from your view point? He was making a point!

Censorship, censorship, censorship!

Walter Zielke