

September 14, 2021

Rocky View County
262075 Rocky View Point
Rocky View County, AB, T4A 0X2

Re: Mountain Ash Limited Permit Application PRDP20211744

Dear Rocky View Councillors,

On July 13, Honourable Councillor Greg Boehlke expressed concerns on behalf of Rocky View constituents about Mountain Ash Limited Partnership's (MALP) Good Neighbour Agreement given the persistent concerns with MALP's stakeholder engagement to date. Although Mountain Ash has since updated their Good Neighbour Policy, their ongoing actions have not correlated with their plan, instead the proponent have taken actions to damage relationships within the Rocky View community.

Below is a list of grievances between MALP and their local stakeholders all within the 1.6km proximity outlined in Mountain Ash's Good Neighbour Plan, names have been removed to respect confidentiality as there is a fear of retribution by MALP towards these group of individuals expressing these concerns. We are willing to share our names and concerns with Council privately, after the September 14th meeting.

Stakeholder 1:

Despite claims that MALP met with stakeholders prior to the Development Permit heard by Council on March 2nd, Stakeholder 1 did not have any contact MALP until after this hearing. After a request to review to the Good Neighbour Plan and MALP agreeing to share this document, Stakeholder 1's emails were ignored and has since never heard back from the proponent.

Stakeholder 2:

Stakeholder 2 lived on the property of the proposed project. After receiving the Development Permit on March 2nd, this person was evicted. The eviction was not in accordance to the *Residential Tenant Act*, yet when Stakeholder 2 raised any concerns about MALP's actions being outside of the rule of law, MALP's Project Manager threatened Stakeholder 2 with a lawsuit, this person left immediately in fear that they would be served and would be unable to afford legal fees.

Stakeholder 3:

Stakeholder 3 was served with a cease and desist for expressing concerns around MALP's stakeholder engagement process the day after the July 13th hearing; MALP refuses to have contact with Stakeholder.

Stakeholder 4:

Stakeholder 4 was not contacted until after the March 2nd hearing, again MALP stated that this person was included in their engagements, yet this is untrue. MALP later emailed this stakeholder stating that they are suspending all communications accusing them that there was an anti-gravel sign on their property. This is absolutely false, there was never a sign on their property, in fact the sign was on another property 2 quarters away from the stakeholder's property. Yet earlier, MALP stated that they

had already engaged with this person on their property prior to March 2nd, again an untrue sentiment. Given that MALP has stated that they went around to each of their neighbour's property to discuss their development plans, it is evident that this person was missed as they do not even know where this stakeholder even lives.

Stakeholder 5:

Despite claims that MALP met with stakeholders prior to the Development Permit heard by Council on March 2nd, Stakeholder 5 did not hear from MALP until after March 2nd. During those engagements, MALP was rude and dismissive of their concerns and left abruptly after concerns and questions about water well impacts were raised. All engagement have since been halted with Stakeholder 5.

Stakeholder 6:

Again Stakeholder 6 was threatened with a lawsuit by MALP's Executive Director after Stakeholder 6 attempted to draw up a petition against the project.

Stakeholder 7:

Stakeholder 7 was reprimanded at their place of work. This stakeholder was using their company email to contact MALP and government officials regarding the MALP Development Permit. This person currently has engaged legal counsel to confirm their suspicions that MALP or their team applied this pressure.

Range Road 40 Stakeholders:

There has been no contact between MALP and any of their neighbours on Range Road 40.

MALP must exhibit an improved relationship with all of their neighbours, including those who may be opposed to aggregate operations. Although there is a Good Neighbour Policy on paper, their track record has been poor to non-existent at best. We are gravely concerned that Mountain Ash will not act as a *Good Neighbour* to anyone who holds differing views. MALP has yet to begin operations but they are already doing so in contrary to their own policies.

We are discouraged by this notion that MALP will suspend communications or serve and threaten neighbours with lawsuits if/when they express concerns about the project. The company's limited and already poor track-record as it relates to working with their stakeholders should be taken into consideration prior to the approval of this amendment, and MALP must develop a line of open communication and trust with their neighbours going forward to protect Rocky View County and their residents from bad actors in the region.

Signed on behalf of a group of neighbours located within a 1.6km distance from the MALP Summit Pit