



COUNCIL REPORT

Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee Recommendations and Final Report

Electoral Division: All

File: N/A

Date:	July 23, 2024		
Presenter:	Gerrit Scheffel, Regional Planner		
Department:	Intergovernmental Services & Regional Planning		
Approved by:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Executive Director / Director	and/or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chief Administrative Officer

REPORT SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to present the Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee: Recommendations and Final Report (Committee Report, Attachment A) and the What We Heard Report (Attachment B) for the Aggregate Resource Recommendations Survey (Survey).

The Committee Report (Attachment A) contains the recommendations and perspectives of the Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee members. Due to the complex nature of aggregate development in the County and the varying perspectives on the Committee, not all issues discussed by the Committee resulted in consensus recommendations for the County. Therefore, the Committee Report was split into two parts; Part 1 includes those issues where consensus was reached and lists a set of six Committee Recommendations for the County to consider. Part 2 includes those issues where consensus could not be reached and provides a summary of the discussion and different perspectives shared by Committee members on each issue. The Committee Report includes a Gap Analysis of the draft Aggregate Resource Plan developed in 2018 and a request that all future public and stakeholder engagement on the project be held separately from other engagement initiatives.

With submission of the Committee Report, the Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee mandate has been fulfilled, and the Committee’s function is considered complete.

Administration hosted an online Survey seeking feedback on the contents of the Committee Report. The Survey was open for feedback from May 23rd, 2024, to June 14th, 2024, and received 126 submissions. The intent of the survey was to gauge the level of public agreement with the six Committee Recommendations, to confirm how well the public felt represented by the Committee, and to provide the public an additional opportunity to indicate their concerns with aggregate development in the County. Results of the Survey were summarized in the What We Heard Report (Attachment B).

One letter submission from Hillstone Aggregates (Attachment C) has been appended to this report.

ADMINISTRATION’S RECOMMENDATION

THAT Council receive the Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee Recommendations and Final Report as information.

THAT Council direct Administration to bring a report back to Council no later than the end of Q4, 2024, that includes an analysis of the Committee Report and outlines recommended actions, a workplan, and review of budget implications.

Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee Recommendations and Final Report

BACKGROUND

In 2022, Rocky View County Council relaunched the Aggregate Resource Plan (ARP) project with the approval of a project Terms of Reference (Attachment C). The Terms of Reference outlined the requirement to form a Stakeholder Advisory Committee headed by a third-party Chair and six volunteer individuals representing local perspectives on aggregate development in the County. The Committee's mandate was to submit a set of consensus recommendations for the development of an ARP, to identify gaps in the 2018 ARP project, and to identify appropriate engagement techniques and opportunities for the remainder of the project.

ANALYSIS

Administration has provided a short summary of the Committee Report (Attachment A) alongside results of the Survey in two parts:

- Part 1: Committee Recommendations with Consensus Support, and
- Part 2: Committee Discussions and Areas of Non-Consensus.

A full breakdown of the survey is included in the What We Heard Report (Attachment B).

Part 1: Committee Recommendations with Consensus Support

Part 1 of the Committee Report (Attachment A) lists six Committee Recommendations that received consensus support by the Committee. These recommendations focused on actions the County could take to improve the regulation, monitoring, enforcement, and communication strategies regarding aggregate development in the County. The Survey indicates significant agreement and support for these six recommendations.

No.	Committee Recommendation	Survey Results
1.	That the County develop Performance Standards specific to aggregate development in the County.	92% Agreement
2.	That the County actively regulate aggregate operations through proactive site monitoring, timely expert review of submitted operating reports, and take appropriate enforcement action when necessary.	91% Agreement
3.	That the County develop updated Application Requirements specific to aggregate development applications in the County.	89% Agreement
4.	That the County develop a publicly accessible online platform dedicated to aggregate development within the County.	84% Agreement
5.	That the County define a mandatory stakeholder engagement process for all new aggregate applications and renewals.	89% Agreement
6.	That the County write an Aggregate Resource Plan with clear, accessible language.	91% Agreement

Part 2: Committee Discussions and Areas of Non-Consensus

Part 2 of the Committee Report (Attachment A) lists the key issues where the Committee could not reach consensus understanding, and summarizes the various perspectives shared on each issue. Survey respondents were asked to identify the key issues they would like the County to address with the Aggregate Resource Plan.

Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee Recommendations and Final Report

No.	Area of non-consensus	Key Issues Identified on Survey
1.	Locational criteria for aggregate development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37% identified “setbacks” • 30% identified “community impacts”
2.	Consideration for groundwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 23% identified “groundwater”
3.	Cumulative impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15% identified “cumulative impacts” • 16% identified “health and safety”
4.	Address environmental concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38% identified “environment”
5.	Recognize Big Hill Springs Provincial Park as an Environmentally Sensitive Area (with special status)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6% identified “Big Hill Springs”
6.	Application review process (third-party expert review)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13% identified “third-party review”
7.	Economic assessment of aggregate in the County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% identified “economic equity”
8.	Mapping of aggregate resources in the County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not identified on survey
9.	Additional regulatory actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County pits should follow same standards as private pits • Provincial pits should follow same standards as private pits • Clarity on the distinct County and Provincial regulatory roles • Reduce red tape for some pit renewals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24% identified “monitoring and enforcement”
10.	Respect for property rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not identified on survey

COMMUNICATIONS / ENGAGEMENT

The Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee was formed as a foundational component of the Aggregate Resource Plan project. The Committee proceedings were livestreamed, and the meeting agendas, recordings, and summary notes remain available on the County website. The Committee Report (Attachment A) also remains available on the County website.

The Survey was hosted on the County’s YourView page for a three-week period from May 23rd, 2024, to June 14th, 2024. The What We Hear Report (Attachment B) was uploaded to the County’s YourView page on July 15, 2024.

Future stages of the project should ensure ample opportunity for additional engagement from County residents, industry professionals, and impacted County departments before new policies, bylaws, or procedures are adopted.

IMPLICATIONS

Analysis of the Committee Report and development of recommended actions, a workplan, and review of budget implications will require staff resources across several departments to ensure Administration’s future recommendations are feasible and in alignment with legislative requirements.

Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee Recommendations and Final Report

Financial

No identified financial implications at this time.

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

Section 15.0 Natural Resources of the County's Municipal Development Plan (County Plan) outlines the statutory requirement for the County to develop an aggregate extraction policy and management plan.

ALTERNATE DIRECTION

Administration does not have an alternate direction for Council's consideration.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee: Recommendations and Final Report

Attachment B: What We Heard Report: Aggregate Resource Committee Recommendations

Attachment C: Letter from Hillstone Aggregates