

Appendix A: Survey Responses

HOW DOES AGGREGATE EXTRACTION IMPACT YOUR LIFE?

A gravel pit near me would cause grave health issues for me, as I have a lung condition where breathing in dust leads to life threatening health issues.

There is land owned by the provincial government that could possibly be a potential gravel pit - this would greatly impact my life.

Affect ground level water system feeding ponds surrounding my property which supports wildlife.

Noise and air pollution

Drive along Burma rd everyday-trucks, gravel, dirt etc will impact me and my vehicle

Financial investment in my home in an area zoned for residential development only-most important factor considered

Aggregate extraction at the Stoney Trail Extraction Pit and Burnco's pit affects air quality, noise and traffic in the area of mine and many others' residences - and presumably ground water eventually. I appreciate Stoney Trail pit in Calgary but presumably the County should have some ability (directly or through the City of Calgary) to set some reasonable standards for that pit and monitor to ensure those standards are maintained. And certainly the County has that ability at the Burnco pit. The County needs to do a better job at this.

The County needs to ensure that more pits aren't added in this residential area. Heidelberg has been a terrible corporate neighbour - after a lengthy process where they tried to bully the residents and were defeated eventually with the support of elected County councillors, they are now back trying to do it again through the Province of Alberta. Heidelberg should be embarrassed by their actions. And elected officials in the County and Province shouldn't facilitate this behavior.

Awful increase of industrial traffic on a previously tourist route to Ghost lake and Canmore. Near miss accidents as not adequate turn on lanes, trucks driving unsafe in shoulders kick up gravel as poor paved road, damaging 2 wind shield. No air brake rules, ruin my sleep. There will be an accident on 1A due to unwary tourists mixed with a 10-fold increase in dangerous gravel trucks. Don't let increased unsafe turn off and industrial traffic kill residents or tourists, as government decisions should rule safety first!

being 2 km away from the burnco plant, we can hear the crushing of the gravel on a consistent basis

concern about setbacks for approving new gravel extraction projects with 1800 meters being the absolute minimum so as not to severely impact residents

Can slow my drive down significantly on Burma Road. Have been late for appointments

Carcinogenic dust

Increased Gravel truck traffic

Crushing noise

Impact to quality of life.

Concern the provincial lands near Country Lane Estates. Opposed to any consideration of gravel pit development that is near any residential development. Noise and gravel truck transport is an issue. Airborne silica penetrates lung tissue and is irreversible. Please only consider gravel pits away from communities. Thank you

<p>Constant truck traffic on a narrow two lane road (Big Hill Springs Road)</p> <p>Truck traffic going up hills slows traffic so people regularly pass up hills, even when they cannot see the oncoming traffic, creating very dangerous driving conditions. The s curve near 12 Mile Coulee Rd is a particular problem.</p> <p>Gravel flies off the trucks. My car windshield was hit by a 6 inch rock, and only because it struck near the top of the windshield, did the rock not come through the glass and injure or kill the passenger.</p>
Creates unwelcome noise and dust. The noise can keep us awake at night.
<p>Currently I hear the nearest plant to me which is the bunco plant crushing gravel constantly. To paint a picture of what it sounds like it is similar to a commercial jet airliner flying about 3000" up with crunching noised added, this plant is over 2km away currently and I hear this constantly weather its after midnight of first thing I head outside in the am before 7. it is unbearable to have windows open to hear this all the time. I can't imagine what that sounds like living a few hundred meters away from an active plant. Setbacks are extremely important when approving a new gravel extraction operation and nothing under 1800 meters should even be considered. any closer will severely impact the existing residents.</p>
dust and truck traffic are the most impactful personally
Dust, noise, dangerous truck traffic on narrow roads
Dust, Noise, Traffic, Flying Rocks
Dust, pollution, trucks, noise, ugly
Excessive gravel trucks on the highways surrounding Cochrane and Calgary etc
<p>Excessive noise, dust and traffic</p> <p>Possible future damage to drinking water well and property value.</p>
<p>First My 7 year old nephew can not come visit us. He is fighting leukaemia. His immune system is compromised.</p> <p>Dust: Fine silica dust from gravel pits can cause breathing problems like shortness of breath, airway restriction, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and silicosis.</p> <p>Second Noise. We can hear the conveyor belts</p> <p>Third. Truck traffic. They are reckless. Fast driving and not monitored.</p> <p>The county continues to allow homes be built within the Bearspaw ASP. The city is building out with the new districts along 144.</p> <p>There is gravel from here to the mountains. Keep it out of neighborhoods</p>
Gravel dust decreases air quality, neighbour's farms have had their well water poisoned and deemed unsafe to drink for humans AND livestock. Decreases land value.
Gravel Mines at Big Hill Springs will harm Big Hill Springs Provincial Park and Bighill Creek water and air quality and noise. Traffic risk will increase at the Park turn off.
Gravel truck traffic can create issues on highway, impatient drivers pass trucks under dangerous conditions. Noted that dust plumes blow off both the Hillstone and the Glenbow Pits.
<p>Gravel truck traffic impacts all the local intersections. At night we hear the gravel operation working.</p> <p>Driving past the gravel pit on 85th Street is disgusting; particularly on windy days, the road is filthy, traffic just turns out of the pit practically causing accidents, the signage is alarming...</p>
Health concerns, noise concerns, traffic concerns, concerns for all people and animals great and small

Health threat with silica dust, noise pollution, light pollution, increased traffic, breaks social contract ie. chose to live on acreage for a reason not to have aggregate site in close proximity
Hi traffic volume increasing road safety concerns, allergies from dust and noise disturbance. Property values decreased making some properties not desirable for resale.
<p>Hillstone Aggregates uses hiway 567 as their gravel truck route from here to the Burnco site in Calgary. Many of us also drive on this hiway frequently. The truck traffic is concerning not only on hiway 567 east but also at the intersection of hiway 567 and hiway 22, The reason for concern is that many of gravel trucks going through this intersection do not stop at the stop sign or they pull out infront of the fast moving hiway 22 traffic causing this traffic to have to brake. Often there are rocks flying from the gravel trucks ahead of people driving east on the 567.</p> <p>The other concern is of course is the underground aquifer system being compromised -as shown from presenters at the December meeting regarding expansion of the pit west of Cochrane. These gravel pits use water to wash the gravel, etc. We currently have a fully functioning water well on our property north of the 567 but worry that if any more pits, such as the proposed one are allowed to operate in this area, we will have compromised water wells.</p>
I am a resident of Cochrane, living in Sunset Ridge and frequently visit Big Hill Springs and utilize the trails along Big Hill Creek. I also drive Hwy 567 which is very heavily used by gravel trucks which have an unfortunate habit of kicking up rocks that cause windshield damage. We all some extent on gravel but there should be limitations to the concentration of gravel operations along on Hwy and there should be much greater protection for Big Hill Springs and Big Hill Creek when it comes to setbacks, depth and concentration of aggregate extraction operations in the area of these irreplaceable and treasured natural resources.
I can't keep track of how many broken windshields, and when you have a few of them slowing down and people trying to passing them it gets very dangerous when there's more than a few in a row
<p>I didn't know that there were truck haul routes in the MD. Bearspaw Rd is always used for trucks when they should be using provincial hiways.</p> <p>We are about 5km from the provincial pit on ROckyRidge rd and can hear it in the summer. When the wind blows from the east the dust is horrendous and i feel bad for those who live closer to the pit and the new communities in the city</p>
I follow many trucks. Which means my window is hit often.
I have 2 concerns - the fact that I've had to replace numerous windsheilds and dents on my vehicles. and truck drivers who fail to obey the stop signs and have put me and my family at risk.
I hear the crushing and other operations most days. I'm concerned about silica dust. I believe industrial water extraction impacts the productivity of our well.
I hear the noise of the Rocky View County gravel pit when it is in operation, I travel every day along the truck haul routes and I use Big Hill SPrings park
I live close to Burnco and the Star Pit. I can hear the crusher operating outside of allowed hours, i.e. at 10:00 PM, and early Sunday mornings. At times the dust blows from the pits. I often see gravel trucks speeding down Burma Road east of 85th street down the hill, and also west toward 85th street from the east.
I live downwind from this area and it will impact my family's health and safety with dust and particles. It will add congestion to the roads we drive daily as well.

<p>I live in sage hill right down the road from the proposed gravel pit.</p> <p>There are already enough trucks driving through the neighbourhood as it is.</p> <p>With all the construction the dust and noise is enough as it is. We do not need more noise and dust.</p> <p>The health effects of constantly breathing that in at all times is not worth it.</p>
I often hear the operations at the gravel pit until 10pm at night.
<p>I travel along 144th Ave and 85th Street frequently and have had to replace my windshield on my vehicle at least once per year due to falling rocks from a gravel truck. These roads are messy and dirty due to the mud and debris the gravel trucks leave on the road. The trucks are slow and you cannot pass them.</p> <p>Secondly, there is constant dust in the air from the pits. My family has to breathe it in and the dust makes a mess inside and outside of our home.</p>
I worry about air quality, dust, possible ground water contamination, my well water for contamination and increased truck traffic. And how will I be reimbursed for the depreciation in the value of my property because of the negative impact of the gravel pits close to my property.
I would like to see the dirt, rocks and debris that the trucks from these sites drag onto the road where then enter addressed as it damages all of the vehicles that have to transit the area and creates a safety hazard for motorcycle as well..
Increase traffic from trucks creates safety concerns. Increase in noise and dust from operations. Decrease in property values.
increased large load truck traffic, rocks on the road, dust and noise issues.
Increased noise and traffic.
Increased traffic and site noise. Dust in the air and loose gravel on roads.
Increased traffic on 2 lane highways, no passing lanes, poor air quality, too many pits too close together.
Incredible speeding truck traffic, road dust and flying rocks which cause broken windshields to be often broken.
It causes safety concerns for our family: serious traffic related concerns are with gravel trucks pulling out in front of cars or dominating the roads and causing cracks in windshields, noise, dust, the gravel trucks wreck the roads, and the industry changes the landscape - no longer allowing for quiet living for residents and wildlife. Aggregate contributes a very small amount of money to the county per resident (under \$25/per resident per year): it is not worth the cost to its residents especially since we have several decades worth already and the aggregate is used more often outside of RV.
It directly impacts the enjoyment of our property due to the proximity of gravel extraction to our property. We are surrounded by property owned by gravel interests. We are impacted by noise, dust, gravel truck traffic and as more and more gravel operations are permitted - all on properties adjacent to each other, there is no discussion on the cumulative impacts that this will have and once it is all approved, it is too late to address. Not only are all of these properties owned by gravel developers, the lands are all adjacent to Bighill Springs Provincial Park. There is not discussion or consideration for any protection of the park as RVC continues to approved pits where the topography flows directly down a ravine to the park and the beloved springs and our Watershed. Additionally, there is no consideration for any cumulative impacts to surface and grounds water. The gravel they wish to dig is nature's "filter" for high quality ground water.

It has taken so much goodness from it. The endless trucks and noise are maddening. The pounding of the crushers well into the night all too often, the dust, the messy roads, broken car windows, multiple gravel trucks have crashed in the ditch right Infront of my house overturning, phone disconnection due to the trucks hitting Telus communication boxes.
It's horrible, most of them are speeding and the tires and exhaust brake make a lot of noise when they go down the big hill beside me. Because the roads are not crazy busy most of them don't stop for stop signs and like to pull right in front of you forcing evasive actions sometimes. I believe a good number of them are overloaded justified by how high the tarp is above the box. These heavy trucks really damage the road especially where they slow down for a stop sign or a speed curve. This damage really affects my tax dollars going towards repairing our roads instead of better uses. A good number of these trucks "short-cut" through Bearspaw. This traffic should be forced onto Lochend. Residents who have been living here should not have to deal with the affects of new extraction pits.
Light and noise pollution, traffic congestion, safety concerns about exiting and entering from a major single lane highway onto and into a hill, poor entrance site, water concern site is on the bow river, water well concerns loss of water, future concerns, as water is life, agriculture oncerns for our land and livestock
Loose gravel that breaks windshield Too much traffic This road cannot sustain the truck capacity Interferes with the lifestyle we bought into Affects house prices Noise
Lots of heavy trucks on the roads and plenty of noise not only from the increased truck traffic but also from the pit sites.
Lots of trucks going to fast, noise of trucks backing up and equipment running
moving farm equipment down the hi way . the truckers are always in a big hurry I can only do 20 mils per hr. they always pass on solid lines making it dangerous
My windshields I have to buy! (Some)Unsafe truck drivers. I hate they lowered the speed!
Noice! All the time! Truck traffic! Rock chips and cracked windshields!
Noise and air pollution are the main things that impact our life. Also, damage from debris (rocks and mud) that is left on the road from the gravel trucks moving their loads. There are crushers and loads being dumped at all hours of the day and night. Most of the time we can hear the noise from inside our house with the windows closed.
noise excessive heavy traffic and engine brakes noise
Noise! The crusher can be heard for kilometres.
Noise, dust pollution/health, traffic. Two car windshields destroyed by passing gravel trucks.

Noise, dust, encroachment on the quiet rural lifestyle we chose in moving to RVC. Also note that gravel is encroaching on all sides of us and puts seem to be approved in isolation without looking at the cumulative impact of all of them. Traffic on Highway 567 is dangerous at best, a highway we use often. Also we are VERY concerned about our groundwater since at least one of the operators is drilling to within ONE METER of our community well aquafour. How is this even remotely reasonable within gov't regulations? We, as residents have to pay to test our water EVERY DAY because its deemed so important to our safety by regulators yet gravel operators appear to have limited or no restrictions and we have no recourse if they ruin our water supply (nor would we be able to afford the legal fees to fight them)
Noise, dust, traffic, cracked windshields from gravel debris on the road being shot up at my car while I drive
Noise, dust, truck traffic, reduction in property value. Lack of accountability by aggregate industry and failure to adhere to standards required of similar mining operations.
Noise, including crushing, extraction, vehicle noise, and blasting. The harmful silica dust is a major problem. Industrial water extraction is lowering the water table that I use for my drinking water well. Additional water extraction for industrial use is very high and puts the aquifer at a critical use status.
Noise, traffic and esthetics are unfavourable.
Noise, traffic, filthy roads mud and rocks causing windshield damage. Concentration of trucks on the road is nuts. Operators do not clean the roads of mud and rocks. Very poor oversight. Dust from the operations is ridiculous. Concentration of gravel operations in Bearspaw is already too much. Incompatible with the rural residential. The Scott pit should never see the light of day.
Other than having to deal with full gravel trucks speeding along routes I take into the city, we have windshields that need to be replaced. The gravel is not secured in many of these trucks. I have reported trucks that speed down 144th. They are supposed to have GPS in their trucks but I have yet to see any improvement on speed or flying gravel. There is a school (Bearspaw Christian School) that has to deal with these trucks. There will be a catastrophic collision one day. The ASP was created by many well educated and compassionate people who did so with much input from area residents. I don't understand why Heidelberg would even be allowed to present to you. They have been fought 3 times. Their applications were filled with miss information that was challenged by our experts in the field. They are a Billion dollar company. We live here. There are pockets of homes that butt up to the land. New Calgary communities are being built within 5 km of this site. Esker Point and Glacier Ridge. The wind gusts from the current Scott Pit can be totally blinding. This is man made dust storms... When Heidelberg bought this grazing land, they paid a premium. There intention was to have the county change the zoning. Again, THREE times they did not succeed. They are a Billion dollar German based company. They can afford to move their operations closer to the mountains. We have gravel all the way to the mountains.... so why do we need it to be in out neighbourhood?
Our windshields are always cracked from the gravel from the trucks on 85thSt. We are very concerned about future development of the gravel pits (coming closer) having a direct impact on our life through noise, dust and truck traffic.

The existing aggregate extraction operations in the area have a significant negative impact on our lives already, and the proposed Scott pit operations would be incredibly detrimental. The noise pollution is unacceptable. We live just less than 5km from the Lafarge operations and we can hear them clearly 24 hours per day. The dust and the gravel on the roads are a hazard. Speaking of hazards, the hauling trucks are a significant danger to everyone in the area. If the Scott pit goes forward, it will have a meaningful negative impact on our health and well being, not to mention our property values in Silverwoods.

The gravel dust produced, the industrial sounds pervading my sense of peace and the dangerous traffic from truck drivers on deadlines is the impact on my life. There is a constant noise outside while the gravel operations are running. It is a constant industrial grinding sound with irregular loud blasting noises. This noise is incongruent with the country aspect of living in this area, it is not normal to sit amongst trees and listen to the heavy duty industrial machinery, and grinding at these work sites. The gravel trucks dominate major routes and often are driving faster than sign posted speed limits, truck drivers are trying to get as many deliveries done in a day. I have had truck drivers tailgate and almost hit me and they rush to turn left out of the burnco pit. Additional traffic from new communities is going to add to the fray already occurring.

Occasionally the gravel pits will decide to route all their gravel truck's thru our quiet neighborhood roads that have speed bumps, no warning or reason given, It is only through community involvement do we manage to get them back on the major routes. There is a fully loaded gravel truck every few minutes driving through our neighborhood when this happens. These are roads with heavy pedestrian traffic, pedestrians walk along the road as there are no sidewalks. Besides the noise

There are 4 gravel pits in our area already, the dust when the wind blows often obliterates site lines so that you can no longer see houses. This dust is carcinogenic. During the summer the gravel pits ramp up their work, and sounds from this industry are louder and more disruptive to the peaceful countryside living in this area.

The noise (day and night) incredible dust, aggressive truck drivers on roads, light pollution, unsightly property, too many chipped and cracked vehicle windshields to count, ...

The noise from the constant up & down Lochend Road is annoying, we certainly do not want more. no more pits should be opened until one closes and then replace it with only one.

The noise, dust, lights, and traffic from existing gravel pits negatively impact our quality of life.

The noise, the dust, the trucks, cracked windshields. Terrible. Moved to Bears paw for the country living, not industrial.

The occasional broken windshield from a gravel truck on Burma Road, and hard braking to avoid trucks that pull out in front of me without looking.

The Star gravel pit is approx 2km away from my acreage home, I constantly hear the noise from the crusher (s), 24-7, and believe the air borne dust has increased.

The traffic is horrible, the damage to the roads is very obvious.
Myself as a taxpayer should not have to pay for road repairs from heavy haulers. There should be direct cost recovery from the gravel industry for road damage and improvements etc.
I have some respiratory issues and have strong concerns regarding the silica dust.

<p>There a a number of gravel operations along my main travel route (Burma Road) and I share the road with trucks. I have lived here for 25 years, and in that time have replaced 5 windshield from rock strikes, plus numerous paint chips etc. I appreciate the need for economical gravel sources, and I don't have a solution for the flying rock problem other than possibly improving the load cover. I just want to ensure that I the county is aware that those of us in the vicinity of these operations do pay a personal dollar price for them in addition to any other issues such as noise, dust, etc.</p>
<p>too many collisions close to home. Air quality not always good. Property value has dropped</p>
<p>Traffic Noise Environmental impacts</p>
<p>Truck traffic Noise Dust Residential community vibe vs industrial Scenery disruption</p>
<p>Unacceptable noise from gravel pits at all times of the day (including evenings, nights, mornings, and during the day time). Rock chips in windshields.</p>
<p>vehicle damage from stones, noise and dust pollution. Gravel pit operators don't listen when their repeatedly told no and there is no reason to believe they'll be responsible if told yes.</p>
<p>We can hear the noise from the gravel pit along Rocky Ridge Rd. Within the last year or two it seems to have become more noticeable both in terms of volume and time. It appears that they operate until midnight.</p>
<p>We drive our kids to Bearspaw Christian School every day (right on Burma Road). The fact that gravel trucks are even allowed so close to the city is appalling, and it is an accident waiting to happen. Gravel pits should be only allowed farther out - away from residential areas. The small impact this has on the business' economics is worth preventing horrible accidents.</p>
<p>We live in the Silverwoods Drive subdivision directly south of the proposed pit . We also have three other gravel pits including the star pit across for the jail . We can here the crushing and experience the dust first hand , not to mention that we replace windshields in our vehicles every year . We also experience light pollution</p>
<p>We live near enough the Burnco and Star pits to hear the noise and, depending on wind direction, likely get particulate matter in our air. When travelling along routes near our home, like Burma Road, we often are behind loaded gravel trucks. From time to time we have experienced chipped and cracked windshields from gravel coming off of these trucks.</p>
<p>We live on Silverwoods Drive and constantly hear noise from the crushers at the STARS pit. We are thankfully far enough away and in the right direction, to not be exposed to the dust generated from the pit.</p>

<p>We use the roads where there is a lot of truck traffic from the gravel sites. I have experienced a trucker trying to pass on a two lane road with on coming traffic. This could have resulted in a catastrophic accident. Rockyview has not built roads to handle the increased residential traffic and the increased traffic from gravel sites. Rockyview continues to approve residential developments within close proximity of gravel sites. In many areas residential developments existed long before any gravel sites were developed. It is unsafe for many reasons not just traffic. There is an abundance of gravel in Rockyview and new sites should be developed away from dense residential areas.</p> <p>Aggregate extraction sites reduce the value of our properties even though our assessments keep increasing every year.</p>
<p>When I drive on #567, there are so many gravel trucks going fast, the dust rises with gust of wind, I don't feel safe. Plus I think of the residents living in the area and I feel for them. It is a dangerous road and it is now unhealthy because of the dust and the noise.</p> <p>Furthermore, our property extends all the way to the creek (Bighill), we walk by the creek daily. What happens to the creek in terms of quantity and fish habitat, we will see. I do not fish, but I see fishermen coming to fish below our property. I care a lot about this ecosystem and our biodiversity.</p>
<p>Wind and noise pollutants</p> <p>Concerns with traffic - for example my dog was hit and killed by a travel truck that did not stop for her.</p> <p>Water levels have dropped since gravel mining</p> <p>Lack of communication with proponent, unclear and lack of transparency with the proponent and government</p>
<p>Noise, especially from spring through fall.</p>
<p>Toxic dust</p> <p>Hauling traffic dangers</p> <p>real risk for damages to water quantity and quality (wells, springs, creeks, wetlands)</p> <p>I am for responsible gravel mining. I drive on roads etc. I am very much against much of the behavior of the gravel companies to date and I am very please that RVC us undertaking this ARP, which hopefully will have some strength to keep the gravel companies actually acting respectfully and responsibly in our County.</p>
<p>Noise from pit at night and trucks on road, beyond reasonable number of trucks on road, several rock chips in my truck window, trucks turning onto main roads at dangerous times. New extraction (Scott Property) would amplify these issues, and would decrease property value as this is a country residential area. Existing residents and new potential purchasers, do not want to live near where a new extraction pit is proposed.</p>
<p>Continual noise every day and on weekends</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>And blasting sounds</p>
<p>Often there is gravel spilled in intersections near by, which we use as we exit or enter our community.</p> <p>There are lots of ponding sounds/ banging which can scare our dog causing him to bark.</p> <p>We are worried about how the explosions can affect our well water.</p> <p>The amount of dust in our home around our windows and in our lungs is a problem.</p>
<p>Dust,noise,traffic,</p> <p>Contaminated water well, drop in property value</p>

Heavy truck traffic (replacing windshields due to gravel on road), noise pollution, dust pollution
Noise , heavy truck traffic (cracked windshields) and harmful dust pollution because we live one half kilometre from the proposed site . The approval of the gravel pit would have a devastating impact on our lives and property values.
Traffic, noise, destroys natural farming landscape and impacts ecosystem for everyone. Dust can be problematic. Hours of operation should be rigorously monitored, as should dust.
SILICA DUST, dust carcinogens, NOISE, ROAD CONDITIONS, ROAD CONGESTION, GRAVEL ON ROAD, WILDLIFE DISTURBANCES, POLLUTION, PROPERTY VALUE REDUCTION,
The crusher is very loud and goes on well after midnight! Depending on the winds, the dust can be very thick. Our home is located at the top of a rise so all this impacts us slightly more than those at a lower level.
My primary concern is in relation to increased use of area roadways. The mix of heavy truck traffic with residents private vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists is unacceptable. Gravel trucks and their trailers contribute to increased safety concerns for my family and I. The increase in noise from the associated equipment is also a detractor.
Creates dust Creates noise Creates heavy traffic county has enough gravel pits Gravel truck rocks equal damaged windshields County needs to stay within their budget, no need for more gravel pits County needs to review master plan every five years for gravel pits county needs to listen to residents when they say no to gravel pits.
I can hear the noise at the STAR pit, Lafarge Canada pit and other nearby pits crushing and extraction thus impacting my enjoyment of the quiet residential living environment I had expected. Silica dust, which is a cancer causing carcinogen (similar to asbestosis), is present in the air severely impacting human health. Further, the gravel trucks use the roads all around us, including Burma Road, Country Hills Boulevard, 85 Street NW and 112 Ave NW. The junction at Country Hills Boulevard and 112 Ave NW is unbelievable!
Noise, dust and excessive gravel truck movements, the majority of entrances and exits from my community involves dealing with gravel trucks. The Country Hills Blv/112 Ave junction is frequently overloaded with gravel trucks in both directions, that density of heavy industry traffic combined a major residential shopping area is ridiculous, yes I know its that's the City but lots of those trucks are coming from RV pits
Daily sound, dust, truck traffic, adversely impact my view.
Close off Burma RD between Bearspaw rd + woodlands. Local traffic only
It greatly disrupts the lifestyle we moved out here for. Too much traffic going through out neighbourhood close to Burma rd off at Bearspaw + woodlands - local traffic only.
Deep concerns about toxic dust, especially from our high winds. What strict measures will be in place to stop mining immediately when high winds start?
I currently deal with significant air pollution and heavy dust from nearby pit. Our high winds need to be taken into account with air monitoring and buffer zones.
Agree that prevailing winds should be taken into consideration.
Dust, Noise, Traffic (diesel exhaust / fumes)

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER ON PROPOSED MEASURES TO IMPROVE TRANSPARENCY AND COMMUNICATION?

Aggregate operations negatively impact property value due to the noise, vibration, dust and airborne contaminants, traffic, water quality and quantity caused by pit activities. As a result, very few people prefer to live near a gravel pit - resulting in deteriorating property value for home owners. A 2006 study shows properties located within a half a kilometer can reduce property value by 25% while properties located within one kilometer can reduce property value by 15%. Even a mere permit for gravel extraction can deter future residential investment and further decrease property value for current owners.

To mitigate these outlined negative impacts, it is recommended that aggregate development is conducted 1 kilometer in distance measured from the gravel company's property line to the nearest residential property line. Properties currently less than 1 and 0.5 kilometers away in distance from an aggregate site, should have their properties reassessed to account for the 25% and 15% decreased value respectively. Properties in a 5-kilometer radius should be evaluated accordingly to account for the declining property value so that their property tax assessment reflects that number. Financial remediation should be provided to property owners and the lowering of property tax thresholds should be conducted as a result of the deteriorating property value.

All applications, independent assessments and operational reports should be publicly available.

All mine operating reports must be available on a publicly accessible website at the time they are provided to RVC.

All reports etc. in connection with an aggregate application should be a matter of public record and readily available to any member of the public without a FOIP application. Summarily all county reports, complaints etc. should be available to the public again without a FOIP application. I find that often these.

All residential concerns and complaints, county follow up and inspections/assessments for each aggregate development should be online (with a tracking number - not the resident's name for privacy purposes) so any resident can be informed of the complaint, track the follow up and read about the improvements completed or stage of an application.

All sites must be located on roads built to accommodate large volumes of truck traffic.

an easy way (dedicated email address for example) for the public to report if an operator is not following the rules would be helpful

As much transparency as possible is best for residents. Having said that transparency means nothing if the concerns and needs of the residents doesn't take priority over corporations.

Better access to information in an electronic format that is easy to search.

Ensure the information is visible on the website. From time to time, provide updates in County Connection.

Follow up is important.

Gravel extraction should be distributed evenly around RVC. Decide RVC into 4 quadrants and only open equal amounts of pits in each round of approvals. And put size in each quadrant should be the same and measured in loads per day leaving Ng the pit. Share with he pain

Have the language easy to understand and not written where you have to Re-read it 4 or 5 times to understand what is being said.
I agree.
I am really pleased with this effort at communication and transparency
i support this. updating the website is good but people should be able to sign up to get the information through email. it is too easy to miss things on the website
I think this portal sounds good. More advertising in other places (newsletter, newspaper, etc.) should also be offered, as not everyone will know to go to the website. Every time there is a new or expanded proposal, this should occur.
I think we should be able to know the people who are making these applications not just faceless corporations.
I think you should add all medical interpretation of the effect of any application. A warning of implications of breathing the particulates I also feel that anyone who has financial benefit of approval by way of investment, of any aggregate applications should have full transparency. Even if their son in law owns a gravel truck Or their 3rd cousin...
Impact on how this will affect the look and feel of Cochrane.
It should already be very clear that residents do not want any more gravel pits...
Keep us in the loop
Leave the voting for approval up to the neighbours and residents. Then we would see real transparency. until then please do as we are asking and clean the industry up. Also reduce it. Much of this product is going to Calgary or the USA.....look where that is getting us. We are producing many fold the gravel that RVC needs for its roads. Is this a great positive for us or a negative on the over balance sheet of live in RVC? During the last ARP experiment the public was not listened to. The public gets to determine the future and not industry which think they should be treated equally.
Monitoring results, all reports should be easily available to residents.
More communication with the residents to make them aware of it
more community outreach is never a bad thing
Much better notification especially providing more time between the public engagement sessions and the closing for comments.
No comment
Non-compliance tracking and reporting is an important part of communication. Easy to read information as not everyone enjoys or finds it easy to read regulations so it precludes many from meaningful participation. A link would be great it would also be great if RVC and other municipalities in Alberta as Alberta Sand and Gravel Association to do the same as it not easy to report concerns to them. And/or allow for travel complaints through the county to be shared to ASGA.

Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bearspaw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable. Those seeking to develop in our area are simply moving through multiple levels of government to override the decisions of the municipality to prohibit this type of development in our community!
Notifications of proposed aggregate development for affected residents automatically.
Operators need to be proactive in communicating with communities on a regular basis not a hot dog bbq at stamped. The Star pit operator as far as I am aware does nothing but that is the Province.
PLEASE - do NOT rely on residents to get their information by going to the aggregate site to see what is being proposed in their area. Notices need to be mailed to all residents on any new proposal as soon as anything is proposed.
Please consider mailing the information as well to residents in the surrounding areas.
Post environmental monitoring data online for public review.
Providing residents with a mechanism to report compliance is a slippery slope. We already have issues with trespassers onsite looking for issues. Residents are not experts on compliance pertaining to pit development so compliance issues in the pits should be left in AEPA and county staff to properly determine.
Publicly accessible digital portals are a welcome addition for transparency and communication. Not everyone may be able to access online portals, so I hope that Rocky View County also will continue mailouts and local print media to inform residents. I also hope that the mailout area for any proposed aggregate development is expanded in consideration of the fact that noise, pollution and potential water contamination could affect Rocky View County residents and those in other municipalities far beyond the immediate area (1.61 km) of the proposed site.
Taxes collected to cover the costs of the damage. Air monitoring and water monitoring in real time. With actions associated. IF something is changing there is nothing right now that stops or can change an operating permit.
Technical studies prepared by aggregate companies for their redesignation and DP applications must be publicly available - posting them on the "digital portal" would be the easiest way to do this.
That is fine, everyone can get the proper information. Some of them have the BIMBY!! Attitude. They love having cement basements, love having good roads, but have no clue where the products come from?? Most of them work in the cement jungle of downtown Calgary, couldn't be built without gravel!
The above would be positive requirements that could go a long way towards a democratic approach to one form of invasive human activity.
the aggregate companies should not be able to manipulate the system. They are powerful companies, but they should be held accountable and compelled to follow a rigorous application process.
The county should ensure that anyone living within a 5 km radius of the proposed pit should be informed . Their input must also be part of the process .
The county should make clear any regulations regarding traffic that would accompany any new aggregate developments, and the anticipated primary route of traffic to and from that

development. If a new development is anticipated to require traffic on Burma Road, that should be stated clearly as part of the information.
The link for residents to report concerns needs to be vigorously monitored and follow up actions communicated to residents. A simple email indicating 'we have your complaint' isn't good enough. Again, it feels like a simple tick the box exercise.
This is good.
transparency to all involved in the application, including residents and especially if there has been any unfairness
transparency to who has been involved with an application and if foul play has been found that must be revealed to the impacted residents.
Who will monitor?
Why not include a subscription notice to inform residence about any developments in their ward?
I fully support this - it makes good sense economically, environmentally and removes headaches for the regulators, incl RVC staff AND elected officials. And gravel companies can get on with their work with less surprises.
An online portal is good as long as it is audited, third-party independent reviews, and on the neighbours are involved in helping in the design. Every five years there should be a review and practice is updated. Trends and forecast should project risks and thresholds should identify when there needs to be a stop
For people to participate in this process it needs to be easy to locate.
I am an impacted landowner so had access to some communication. But anyone I spoke to had no idea of the problems with gravel mining in RVC and asked "how could I have found out? Where do I look?" I knew this ARP survey was coming and looked through the RVC website to find it, using the SEARCH bar - I could not find it. I told others who also looked and could not find it. I finally emailed RVC Admin and got the engage link sent to me, which I then shared with others who wanted to participate. Please take this to heart and find a better way to reach your public.
For the Agriculture Master Plan survey, I learned about it on FaceBook which alerted me where to find the survey on the website. Perhaps consider more use of social media.
Public transparency of gravel mining issues and mitigations is needed. Landowners require real-time, transparent communication they can access from RVC. The current yearly reports that are not available until a few months later is a joke and unacceptable - how can meaningful, timely mitigation of problems occur under the current reporting system? Please ensure that communications are in fact practical, meaningful and transparent.
I value transparency. It is important that ALL information is shared with area residents through several different mediums.
Review the issues resulting from prior attempts to create an ARP. Many people spoke at meetings setup by the county & stakeholders. Take suggestions from all sides.
All environmental monitoring (water, air quality, noise, environmental protection, etc.) must be posted to the public domain to ensure transparency. The "public domain" must be a detailed website maintained by RVC or independent third party of: individual company performance; and cumulative effects of key environmental performance metrics, where applicable. Again, all incremental costs to be borne by operators or industry association.

<p>Perhaps RVC could send out notices to all households as to what is going on. I don't think many people know. Everyone needs to know as this affects Cochrane Calgary and downstream. I really can appreciate the position of all board members. There are so many facets to consider here. Thankyou!</p> <p>It would be easier on everyone if Burnco's motivation would be more than just humongous profit but a high consideration for the environment and people and the next generation.</p>
<p>Need audit and third-party expert review paid for the aggregate company that can assess impacts.</p> <p>Monitoring and reporting need to be audited and transparent.</p> <p>Burnco turbidity meter not fixed for 9 months when pit active, then spikes were noticed, then meter calibrated so significant low values. No trust or audit of the monitoring and compliance!</p> <p>For complex situations mining in water in fractured bedrock, more timely monitoring and thresholds need to be established and reported real time.</p>
How will concerns reported through the public portal be provided to operators?
How will concerns reported through the public portal be provided to operators?
I think information sharing and transparency is good. A map is a good platform for showing activities and it's always good to have information on the process available to everyone.
please work to improve user friendliness of the website to help the public find posting etc. I knew of this public engagement coming, I went through the the website to find it, including the SEARCH bar to no avail. I spoke to other who reported the same xperience. I finally emailed the County to ask.
All material files by Ag operators must be immediatley made available to the public without FOIP
Standards are useless without a robust independent review y County hired experts
A+ efforts
Independent review by County hired experts
If fees not paid application does not proceed
A process like this should eliminate sham hearings as heard for Mt. Ash.
Don't entertain more permit applications until the ARP is finally in place.
Open engagement plans are a good idea, but should not be limited to locals only - eg. There is broad public interest in aggregate. Well beyond local interest.
Much longer merge lanes for he trucks to enter onto the highway. They take 1-2 kilometre to get to speed.
Communication must be frequent so as to stop problems as soon as detected + mitigate immediatley. Then report the results. Quarterly isn't enough for impacted, individuals, landowners, businesses.
That' s a great idea - keep people informed. Have a clear source of information.
Improve the user friendliness of the RVC website. Very hard to find info + learn of public notices, updates.
What about tracking and reporting of non-compliance? Access to this alog with the link to document concerns.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING A TECHNICAL REVIEW PROCESS?

"In the event that the Applicant/Owner does not consent to payment of a third-party review cost, it may affect application review and prolong processing timelines." If this is the case, perhaps there is another step or posting for public comments. That is a lot of public engagement, but this is the health of our community at stake.

A system needs to be in place to ensure the third party companies cannot be manipulated or coerced by the operators who are paying them for the work.

A technical review should be conducted by an independent consultant - one who does not have a stake in the Calgary area gravel industry.

I think the roads the gravel trucks operate on should be part of the technical review. Gravel trucks are heavy and damage the roads faster than just regular car traffic.

agree a gravel pit should pay. Pits can make millions of dollars so they need to pay to make sure their studies can be reviewed like they do with oil and gas. this is the best thing you can what does it mean if they don't agree to an additional review that it will be noted as part of their application review. why do they get to proceed with an application. no studies no application.

All the previous applications were unanimously defeated by council on 3 separate occasions . All environmental impact studies were against open pit gravel extraction There must be a third party assessment of air and water quality not a maybe !!

And if they do not agree...does the permit still go ahead?

As I have stated before since RVC has few experts and the province has a lot of environmental "Yes Men". Might want U of C to give some technical review. Consultants only see things through the eyes of who pays them and are biased.

Cost for the third party review should be paid through the CAP Levy already collected by the county.

Disagreeing to an additional review would be a red flag; no renewal should be allowed without it. Third party reviews should be available for every aspect. Third party reviews should automatically occur at set intervals, perhaps yearly.

enforcement and shut down process should be immediate until any issues resolved to eliminate the impact against that what the review is set to protect.

enforcement and shut down processes should be immediate until issues are resolved

First two of the above to be revised to "MUST"

I believe this is a very important requirement. I agree.

I think individual people should be able to request noise and other environmental investigations to take place at private residences as I know the noise right at my house is maddening.

I would like to see what they think will happen after a pit. How the water will be returned. Costly penalties related to changing the plan in the 5 year operations review. Many of our children will only be around to see the mess these things have made.

If the county asks for these assessments and does not have the expertise inhouse, the county should bear the cost. If you cant review inhouse, do not ask for the assessment period.

It's these weak worded comments that tell residents all they need to know.

Firstly—all above mentioned items should be independent third party, no operator should or can be trusted to monitor themselves.

Second—what an embarrassment it is when the County states that, "If an operator does not agree to the additional review it will be noted as part of their application review." This is the exact problem we have in this society, it's much like the slap on the wrist situation again. Far too much lenience is given to corporations. Unless this kind of weak approach is removed from any and all policy making regarding resource extraction, we're all just lying to ourselves if we think operators won't just get an free pass whenever they wish.

Maybe the studies should be done by 3rd parties to begin with so as not to show bias??

Need technical experts to do so that are a third party NOT hired by a proponent.

No additional

No comment

No gravel pits near residential areas

Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bearspaw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.

Noted as part of there application review

This needs more guidelines as to what actions can or will be taken against them by the County

Please ensure that the 2km boundary around designated provincial parks is respected and that any reduction requires third-party technical review and no potential environmental impact. Also, please add Environmentally Significant Areas and Environmental Reserve Lands as defined by the Province and County as areas requiring the 2km buffer.

Refused 3rd party review Noted is not acceptable.

The submission should be tossed. Why are you wasting time considering a proposal that is incomplete.

Reporting back regularly to residents.

Resident groups have funded their own "experts" and that was not considered. My of the residents are professional in the fields of technical issues involving gravel pits

Why can't we give these people some credit in stating the problems. If we can't do that then gravel pits need to have 2 mile setbacks. Nearly 2000 people asked for that over 20 years ago from just one RVC neighbourhood. That believe it or not same issue is coming back! You can't even make this up.....shame shame shame.

Seems like if an operator doesn't agree to additional review, the project shouldn't move forward.

Sounds good

The County should only make exceptions to the third-party technical review process where there are sound reasons for making an exception, such as no potential impacts on water quality, no reasonably anticipated acoustic impacts to neighbours or wildlife.

The firm chosen to conduct the technical review should be chosen from a list of qualified third-party vendors provided by the County

<p>The technical review process as drafted is inadequate.</p> <p>The County should be able to request an independent third party review on any issues it has identified and should be required to obtain a third party review where reasonable issues have been raised in relation to the technical data filed by the operator.</p> <p>All reasonable costs should be recoverable from the operator and it should be a condition of the application proceeding that the costs be paid.</p>
<p>The third party review is an excellent idea; however the same party should not be conducting the reviews for the developer on multiple applications over the years. There needs to be no bias or conflict of interest, having a different third party review the applicant's next development should be mandatory.</p>
<p>Third party review is an excellent idea. If the operator does not agree to the addition review, the application process should be paused.</p>
<p>This is a good addition to the process. Communities should have the last say in who does the reviewed.</p> <p>In the last Scott Pit process the community got and paid for the work. Not right.</p>
<p>This is a welcome addition so that Rocky View County Administration and Council can have access to professional, independent review of submissions. There does not seem to be provision for funding to cover costs for other parties to provide reports. (For example, residents who need to fund their own reports/reviews to submit to Council.) Could there be provision for other interested parties (for example, residents) to have access to any independent reports that the County receives?</p>
<p>To avoid manipulation by applicants and to ensure full confidence in 3rd party technical reviews, the identity of 3rd party experts contracted to conduct technical reviews must be kept confidential. As stated, applicants must cover the cost of 3rd party technical reviews.</p>
<p>Yes to third party, unscheduled inspections and to operators bearing the costs. This should be a requirement with no option to "opt out".</p>
<p>Thank you for 3rd party review - rather than "may" consider making it a "must".</p>
<p>Good start to addressing technical assessments paid by Mining Co. Deficiencies and errors only resolved by independent third party reviews.</p> <p>Third-party review audits and transparency needs to be implemented for Burnco's northwest 13 and any other expansion that occurs. Problems exist, and nothing is being solved and expansion just will create more risks.</p> <p>For the West COCHRANE 12/4 6 km pit no further expansion should occur until there is an area structure plan for the area and there is an environmental impact assessment to determine the risks cost to society address, current contaminations, and prevent long-term problems.</p>
<p>Ensure the 3rd party is truly independent and hired by RVC, NOT hired by the gravel mining operator.</p> <p>RVC is encouraged to promptly engage expert consultants ASAP and keep the, on retainers - we know it is a strategy of gravel companies to retain A-quality experts so they are conflicted-out. There is a big difference between A-quality and B- and C-quality experts. Please strategize wisely. Our County and we public depend on this.</p>

<p>Where residents submit their own technical review(S), in opposition to an applicants technical review, both (or all) are acknowledged, treated and reviewed as an equal to any applicant review by RVC or any "independent third part reviewing body".</p> <p>This is key given that the technical review submitted by residents for a recent gravel application in Bearspaw was far superior in technical content than the review submitted by the applicant! I also note the word "may" in the first bullet point above. Replace with "MUST".</p>
<p>Technical reviews maybe required if the water quality trends and reporting are showing increase in contaminants, risks,</p> <p>If adjacent property changes occur, then technical reviews and mediators so that legal judicial; suits or not required.</p>
<p>Environmental Assessments, Surface and Groundwater Assessments and Traffic Impact Assessments are standard reports for development and should not require a third-party review. It is the County's duty to provide these services and if administration is unable to adequately review reports the County should be seeking to correct this.</p>
<p>So the County wants the operator to engage consultants to complete reports and the County isn't even going to trust them? If an engineer completes a noise assessment, then that assessment should be trusted. I don't understand why the County would need to request a third-party review, and not only that, charge the operator for the fees. Does the County realize that these costs could be thousands of dollars? Please consider how unreasonable this is. I could understand a review if a study was completed internally, but if the operator has an external third-party complete a report then it should be trusted.</p>
<p>The province sees 100s of pit application. They would know and understand best when it comes to application requirements.</p>
<p>Industry feels like the cost to review should be a 50-50 split with the County to ensure there is some stake by both parties.</p>
<p>Feels there should be an additional consultant that reviews the 2 technical submissions</p>
<p>It is impirative that 3rd party reviews are impartial regardless of the operator paying for it. The selection process + 3rd party selected must be transparent to the public. The operator cannot choose or influence the selection. The technical reivew must be thorough + not in anyway skimming, or merely lipservice to the review process. The stakes are too high - RVC has examples of issueds + fails that have occured from this very act.</p>
<p>Third-party reviews + monitoring must be truly independent + impartial. The third parties selected + slection process must be transparent to the public.</p>
<p>Reviews must be thorough + not "skimmed" + boxes quickly checked. This has been happening + one cause of the gravel mining diaster in RVC, Alberta, Canada-wide.</p>
<p>Consider leaving us alone and respect our homes!</p>
<p>To the province, remember who voted you into office and who do not vote for your if made be</p>
<p>Our Council should be ashamed that they have no regard for the rights of the home owner. Money Money Money</p>
<p>Why is the NRCB usurping the County's decision-making authority on a land use question?</p>
<p>Accumulative impacts, third-party review, enforcement</p>
<p>Technical review process should include water usage / availability / impact to aquifer by competent personel.</p>

Health consequences of any aggregate operation needs to be taken into account.
Technical review of MSDP, studies, yearly reports by third party, independent. Need audit + transparent reporting, monitoring. Timely : daily, weekly, monthly
"If the operator disagrees with an additional review, it will be noted". This is ridiculous. If the County is incapable of enforcing a 3rd party review, what are you doing? Any rule with no teeth isn't worthy the paper its written on.
Big companies often choose to pay fines when found to be non-compliant. Often it is more financial beneficial to continue operations and pay fines. Non-compliance should be met with suspension of production and fine to motivate compliance.
How would the third party would be chosen?
Are unsubstantiated claims penalized to the reporting party to discourage false claims?
If an operator does not agree to an additional review, it should automatically mean denial of their application.
Unfair to operators to involve additional consultants. Engineers have professional codes of conduct they are required to follow.
Gravel companies should not be involved in choosing the 3rd parties despite paying the fee. Must be independent selection process. Must be transparent to the public.
How does RVC impose and enforce on industry governed by OHS & Environment. Seems like an added cost without ability to force change governed above municipality.
One hydrologist will tell you one thing, one will tell you something else.
I think if you want to charge industry the full amount, I don't think that is reasonable.
Wheatland at least pays 50 per cent.
If you have a third-party consultant, they can charge whatever they want and you just send the bill to us. At least if it is 50 per cent Rocky View County will do its due diligence.
Third-party reviews should be on report conclusions, not on every little thing.
What is the selection process for the third party? I suggest your consultant works with our consultant.
Let the association create a pool of third party reviewers. If we could police ourselves with our help.
You are giving people a tool to take out their grudge on someone

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING ACOUSTICS STANDARDS?

:no noise of 5 dbm above ambient noise levels

1. Independent, Third-Party Noise Monitoring & Enforcement

The current framework relies on operators to develop their own Noise Mitigation Plans and conduct their own assessments. This introduces a conflict of interest where companies may underreport issues or implement the bare minimum mitigation efforts.

Solution: Require independent, third-party noise monitoring at regular intervals, with results directly submitted to the County for verification. This would ensure unbiased data collection and compliance with standards.

Enforcement Concern: There is no clear mention of penalties or corrective measures for companies that repeatedly exceed noise thresholds. The County should implement escalating penalties (e.g., fines, operational restrictions, or license suspension) for repeated non-compliance.

2. Cumulative Noise & Environmental Impact Studies

While Noise Impact Assessments may be required on a per-site basis, they fail to account for the cumulative impact of multiple operations in the same region.

Solution: Require regional noise impact studies that assess multiple extraction sites collectively rather than evaluating them in isolation. Noise, dust, and traffic impacts can compound when multiple pits operate in close proximity, creating a much larger disturbance than a single site alone.

3. Seasonal & Time-of-Day Restrictions

The proposed measures do not mention time-of-day or seasonal limitations to minimize disruptions during high-sensitivity periods for residents and wildlife.

Solution: Implement operating hour restrictions (e.g., no operations before 7 AM or after 7 PM), with stricter limitations for sites near residential areas.

Consider seasonal restrictions during wildlife breeding seasons or winter months when sound travels further due to snowpack and cold air layers, amplifying disturbances for both humans and animals.

4. Real-Time Public Access to Noise & Air Quality Data

Residents should not have to rely solely on operator-reported data to assess compliance.

Solution: Require real-time noise and air quality monitoring, with publicly accessible online dashboards where residents can view data and report concerns directly to the County.

5. Clear Complaint Resolution Process

There is no mention of a structured complaint resolution system for residents experiencing excessive noise.

Solution: The County should implement a direct complaint line with response timelines, where independent inspectors verify noise complaints and impose corrective actions if standards are violated.

a good start - pits shouldn't be able to damage their neighbours - set reasonable standards and police it

Active noise monitoring with records kept.

Address the cumulative impacts of noise, dust and traffic.
Where can residences find the tracking and reporting of this information on Air quality? It should be accessible to residence. Will residence need to submit a FOIP request to access the tracking and monitoring information?
All monitoring data should be continuous and be provided in detail to RVC and posted in real time on the website of the Operator. Fines should be applicable for repeated violations.
All pits operating within 2 miles of any residence must be required to fully enclose all loud activities, such as crushers. This cannot simply be an optional mitigation measure. DPs must include specific mitigation measures - not just a list of measures that might be used. The latter makes enforcement difficult.
Appoint one immediate resident to the governing County body. Limit the operating hours for retail and crushing. All new applications for exemptions be circulated to immediate residents who are impacted the most and; the residents right to refuse the application
as with any Performance standard enforcement is key. immediate and mandatory shutdowns should be implemented if performance standards are not met.
Assessments must be done by a third party (not industry, not AB Environment)
Compliance enforcement- standards don't matter when companies choose to move ahead with infractions and just pay the fines. Operations should be shut down rather than just fines issued.
County noise monitors in residential areas close to aggregate operations so County can monitor, not just depend of Aggregate companies info.
Cumulative effects. This is a critical piece that has previously not been factored in. Also, the operating times should be reduced so that impact to folks during off-work hours is reduced.
Enforceable requirements on a regular basis
enforcement is key - immediate and mandatory shutdowns should be implemented if performance standards are not met
Ensure that this Noise Monitoring Plan is conducted more often and not only when the noise is at its lowest level. Therefore, continuously would be preferable.
Frequent, unannounced noise monitoring assessments conducted by the County to ensure that aggregate operations are following the requirements; fines for noise levels beyond the thresholds and closure if the operation is unable to comply (5 infractions in a year).
good
Gravel operations are noisy, there is no getting around it despite the best efforts of the operator or any regulations. Which is all the more reason that these operations need to be located a great distance from any residential development, especially the ones in Bearspaw with 2 acre lots. The proposed setback in the ARP are a joke.
Have a neutral 3rd party do the monitoring
Have independent assessments done of the Noise Mitigation Plans and the Noise Monitoring Plans. Have independent, professional, random monitoring of noise levels. Operators have a vested interest and may not report highest noise levels.
Have testing done with residents - and not those just within a mile.

Hours of operation
Submission of a report to the county does not ensure action. I would like to see the action plan the county has after receiving these reports. Including timelines for reviewing the reports and clear escalation procedures including closure of the pit until issues are resolved to the satisfaction of the county
I am able to hear gravel pits from several km away. I don't hear neighbours cutting hay or feeding cows so what is happening now is by far not good enough. The berms don't help and the trucks are very load. maybe it is just the number of gravel trucks. someone need to limit the number.
I am in agreement with the proposed new requirements. I would like to see the allowable operating times of crushing and processing of aggregate enforced with significant penalties levied against non compliance.
I believe these requirements are sufficient
I can already here the current 6 gravel pits operating. Allowing another pit just increases the noise. Must keep in mind cumulative affect. Gravel pits should not be near people.
I think the above is great & if there was any way to make the gravel trucks quieter, that would be wonderful
If residents complain about noise, the county should come and measure the noise level asap, because wind and general atmospheric conditions can alter the magnitude of the noise being transmitted.
Implement the same acoustics standards for all industries, not just aggregate, as a bylaw.
In order to enforce any of the above will require the periodic and unscheduled inspection of gravel mine sites by someone trained and equipped to carry out such assessments.
Is Rockyview County prepared to enforce these requirements? Is someone from Rockyview County going to visit these sites on a regular basis to ensure the requirements are being followed? Reports don't mean anything if the operators do not follow them and Rockyview County does not follow up.
Late night operations and the associated noise at houses in the area.
Long term impact of noise, very noisy overnight.
Mandatory dba limits
Much higher berming requirements and no pits within 5 km of any residential properties
No additional
Noise can only be studied when a pit is operating not when it is closed. averages must be of operational hours. What happens if a pit doesn't follow the rules. what are the fines? will you close down the pit? for how long. What happens if the testing machine fails like the burnco pit where it wasn't working for weeks. do you give benefit to the people who complain or the pit? if their machines don't work it should be to the people who are complaining. other wise what is the incentive for them to make sure their stuff works. can crushers have covers to reduce noise and be placed as far away from homes. if there are homes on all sides can the crusher go in the middle?

<p>Noise caused by trucking, crushing and equipment necessary for gravel operations are burdensome for residential users. When windy, noise can substantially worsen especially when the wind is blowing from the direction of an operation towards a residence. To decrease the noise burden for residents the operation should be 1 kilometer in distance measured from the operating site to the resident's property line, as already mentioned. Furthermore, best management practices should include buffer zones that are strategically placed around an operation from privately owned properties and other areas of human activity such as schools, playgrounds and recreational areas. Fixed operating hours should be set in a manner that accommodates normal human activity, and these hours should be posted on signage on the front of the gravel property to ensure transparency.</p>
<p>Noise levels need to be mandated and need to reflect the use of impacted properties. RVC promotes the advantages of the rural lifestyle in RVC and heavy industrial use requires stringent noise controls. It is my understanding that in certain European countries some aggregate activities are actually enclosed to control noise and dust. It is not enough to simply have reports buried in County files; all reports must be easily available to the public at minimal or no cost. Sanctions must be immediate and significant for failure to meet standards. It is a waste of time having standards if there is not a strong enforcement process in place. This applies to all "standards".</p>
<p>Noise monitoring from 3rd party consultants. Standards need to be upheld consistently, it should not be up to residents to report/complain that a pit is getting too loud.</p>
<p>Noise monitoring is great, but is it really going to be monitored and what are the penalties.</p>
<p>Noise monitoring should be done, only, by an independent third party (potentially selected by a citizens group involved with this concern—not untrustworthy organizations like Alberta Environment or politicians who may have bias or a vested interest). Any noise mitigation should also be determined by third party analysis.</p>
<p>Any and all of these measures should be paid for by pit operators in full.</p>
<p>Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bearspaw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the pollutants of the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.</p>
<p>Observation, crushing is noisy! It is always noisy and dusty</p>
<p>Operators do not comply with existing requirements what would be different with new ones. An annual report card to the residents should be mandatory.</p>
<p>Plans are great. Who is monitoring this? Just like safety on a major construction site. Everyone has a plan and tell the safety officer that they will follow it, yet almost everyday someone on site gets written up. So while a plan is great who is monitoring?</p>
<p>Provide summary results to community residents.</p>
<p>Reports must be provided to RVC monthly. No averaging of data. All exceedances must be reported with response. Fines must be available to deter reoccurrences.</p>

<p>Sound levels at nighttime should be 0dB above ambient, since peace and quiet at night is why we moved to the country.</p> <p>There should be no operations at night, so no noise.</p>
<p>Where residents notify RVC of excessive noise, the Operator should be required to provide the resident(s) with noise monitoring devices they can use to monitor for noise.</p>
<p>Sound walls and berms should be mandatory. They are mandatory in many other construction areas why not gravel pits ?</p>
<p>the above new noise mitigation plan looks good.</p>
<p>The acoustic is fine as NIAs are required in other jurisdictions already.</p>
<p>The County must consider aggregate as a non renewable resource and that viable aggregate deposits are only located where nature (i.e. glaciers/rivers etc.) deposited them. Blindly applying what may be unnecessary heavy restrictions and costly assessments to applications with smaller deposits could render them nonviable.</p>
<p>The monitoring equipment should have proper maintenance and calibration to ensure proper/accurate readings. There should be a proper management of test data to ensure that the data is complete and on time according to the regulations of data collection. Proof of maintenance and data collection should be available electronically to ensure that the requirements have been met.</p>
<p>The noise monitoring plan is a computer model that is mostly theoretical BS.</p> <p>It is irrelevant what the sound level is in the pit except for the workers which are being paired to ensure it and wear hearing protection. The monitoring needs to be nearest surrounding residents. Noise level should not exceed 5 dB above ambient level when pits are not operational. RVC residents paid big dollars for quiet community.</p> <p>Back up beepers should be outlawed. Most monitoring equipment does not catch spikes in noise. Also very important is that industry uses averaged noise levels. This is a deceptive means of monitoring only intended to cheat in their favour.</p>
<p>the significant wind in the area should be considered in the acoustics studies. Particularly West of Cochrane sound can travel great distances because of the significant wind.</p>
<p>These are all good initiatives. Will they be enforced?</p>
<p>They should be able to put a house next to the pit. The particulates and sound, should not go past there borders.</p>
<p>Time of usage - should have quiet at night (after 8 pm) and on Sundays at least.</p>
<p>Well, we live where we can here the crusher and conveyor belt. So acoustic standards are obviously not an important issue.</p>
<p>WHEN these assessments take place. We've had the equipment to test for noise levels placed on our street during the summer when the plant was shut down! Seemed pointless! When the plant started up again of course so did the noise, but they felt their testing showed no problems!! Really??? I would urge the county to seriously consider their test procedure to ensure that the next test is significantly more representative of actual acoustic conditions than previous tests were.</p>
<p>Who will monitor and support this initiative in the county office who or which committee would hold them accountable</p>

Why are there no air brake rules in RVC as municipality don't allow them? There should be 80km speed reductions year around at recreational areas, as winter months just as busy road count as summer. There are not Alberta Highway approved entry and exit lanes and trucks drive dangerously at risk of accidents and breaking personal property (wind shields). Should not be allowed outside RVC noise by law hours as they are on 1A well before 7am.
Wind speed and direction
I support all of the above new requirements - for transparency, for ensuring performance, to allow the public to be informed.
Acoustic monitoring on adjacent properties with thresholds to identify above stand standards are essential
RVC MUST have strict rules and prompt enforcement for noise reduction when levels are too high or complaints are received. To date, complaints have been unmitigated and the gravel companies have been noted to under-report complaints in their reporting which has misled RVC Admin and Council. This is wrong. For RVC to ignore and not respond is irresponsible. Please ensure the APR has policy that gives protection to County and affected area residents quality of life, health and safety. Such policies must be strong and backed with enforcement. County random, unscheduled monitoring is a must to reality-check that the gravel company past behaviors of misrepresenting complaints (reducing the numbers of complaints reported) . Such behaviors on the part of the gravel companies has led to mistrust of both the companies AND of RVC with, understandable, public accusations that RVC members are paid off by the gravel companies. RVC and the companies must both earn trust. Gravel companies found misrepresenting complaints, not mitigating in a timely manner, or ignoring must be handled promptly and strongly. Trust must be built between all parties which can come from ethical, responsible, responsive actions.
When blasting occurs the continual beeping of trucks and the conveyor belt sound
Hours of operation are of greatest impact - babies go to bed early and the noise is difficult to deal with when aggregate operations continue into the early evening. Plus - people need a rest from all the noise.
You mention MAY BE monitored. Monitoring is a must and is needed continuously
The fact that noise will be a consideration AT ALL within 5km of people's homes as well as a wildlife pathway is a problem.
Hours of operation. It would be wonderful to have a quiet Sunday every week.
Bringing a multi-year gravel operation into the community takes away from the country feel we invested in. There is now way to reduce the amount of noise to a level that will not impact area residents and local flora and fauna.
Appropriate payments to adjacent land owners (near &/or on transportation corridors) dependent on proximity to operations (more compensation the nearer to the pit or impacted most) and negative impacts as a result of mining operations & transportation (including road improvements required, then wear & tear). These payments should also be dependent on if a pit exists (including time not restored after shutdown), hours when operations are in progress and who has owned/operated the properties in question the longest (the pit or the land owner). Landowners who bought their properties before the pit was operating should be compensated more than those who knew that a pit was in existence or operating and still bought adjacent properties. This should be an incentive to restore non-functioning pits and reduce operating

hours. Note what happened to oil wells that were abandoned and not decommissioned in Alberta. Tax payers are now on the hook for those wells, since many owners have declared bankruptcy or are insolvent. As the pit is operating, the owners & operators should be paying into a fund to offset restitution expenses at the end of the pit's life or at the end of operations.

Operating hours are far too long, significantly impacting quality of life especially in early in the morning and evening hours. If this noise cannot be mitigated operating hours must be reduced. I looked for but do not see "Cumulative Effects" mentioned anywhere! Given that we already have a number of gravel pits in the north of Calgary and Rocky View County, it is key that cumulative effects of noise be recognized and regulated.

Performance reports to be provided to Rocky View County (RVC), identifying all peak exceedances (no averaging) and fines must be large enough to be an effective deterrent.

Adjacent owners should be allowed to define requirements and standards for their property, regardless of current resident or planned.

Performance Standards section 4.03(a): daytime should be 7am to 7pm (not 10pm) to consider earlier bedtimes for children and enjoyment of an evening outside on a patio, etc.

Performance Standards section 4.04: 30 days is too long. Consider 15 days with a break in between.

Policy 4.02 An Acoustical Engineer has confirmed that a radius of 8.05 kilometres would render any noise contributions nearly indistinguishable from ambient noise levels. Their suggested radius is 2 km.

Policy 4.03 The previous noise requirements implemented by the County were based on AER Directive 038 and AUC 012. The night time requirements are in line with those policies but the daytime requirements have been raised. Can you provide the study these requirements have been

sourced from, or the rationale for the increase beyond the provincial policy?

Policy 4.03 and 4.04 repeatedly use the wording "recorded at the nearest, or most impacted, dwelling(s) or institutional building(s)". Based on a recent LPRT decision regarding Aggregate Extraction it was deemed unreasonable to ask for monitoring to occur off the subject-site. Noise levels at nearby residents can be extrapolated from on-site data. We ask that these policies be revised to remove any reference to recording or monitoring off site.

Policy 4.05 identifies soil-stripping as a daytime temporary operation requiring notification of the County. Soil-Stripping is an ongoing activity as the operation progresses through the phase. We ask

that this activity be removed.

Hard Noise Mitigation Measure Examples includes "enclosure of louder activities within buildings".

For progressive aggregate extraction it is not feasible to enclose the crushing machinery. It is necessary for the crusher to be able to move as the operation proceeds. We would like the addition

of "where feasible" to be added so that the examples listed in the mitigation section are not seen as

a one size fits all solution.

The time frames for limiting noise impacts seem relatively reasonable.
It is imperative that there be an effective & impartial procedure within the County for investigating complaints about violations by the applicant / owner of the aggregate operation.

Requiring a noise impact assessment makes sense, but some of the requirements here are very stringent. Is there a basis for where these requirements are coming from? The average noise in a house is around 40-45 dB and you are essentially asking local operators to be almost that quiet - this seems unreasonable. The County needs to consider how the limits they set will actually be achieved without severely limiting operations.

An assessment of the topography needs to be conducted as well. Depending on wind direction we can occasionally hear concerts in Mitford Park or the rodeo in the Lions Rodeo Grounds which are over 5 kilometres away from us due to our higher elevation. The gravel operations are north of us and west of the park and we are at a much higher elevation which means the sound travels up the hill. Given the fact that prevailing winds are from the north and the west the proximity of heavy equipment noise will be heard on an almost constant basis.

Do not allow gravel operators to average noise / emissions data (eg. avg operating + non-operating hours) to understate the true impact.

Specify exactly how and where and when readings must be taken + reported.

County should take independent readings / monitoring

Have noticed sound does not travel in straight lines seems to expand on air currents, humidity + density of the air

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING AIR QUALITY STANDARDS?

-good to see that more attention is being paid to air quality.

-Greater radius than 5 miles

-Unannounced, frequent County air quality testing several times per year to ensure the operator is meeting the new requirements.

-steep fines for violations, closure if the problem persists (5 violations in a year)

1. Independent, Third-Party Air Quality Monitoring & Enforcement

Current Framework: The existing proposal relies on operators to conduct their own air quality assessments and monitoring. This self-regulatory approach may lead to potential conflicts of interest, where data could be underreported or misrepresented.

Recommendation: Implement independent, third-party air quality monitoring to ensure unbiased data collection. The results should be submitted directly to the County for verification. This approach aligns with the Aggregate Resource Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee's recommendation for proactive monitoring and strict enforcement by the County.

2. Real-Time Public Access to Air Quality Data

Current Framework: There is no provision for public access to real-time air quality data, leaving residents uninformed about current conditions that may affect their health.

Recommendation: Establish real-time air quality monitoring stations at aggregate sites, with data made publicly available through an online platform. This transparency fosters trust and allows residents to make informed decisions. The Aggregate Resource Plan emphasizes the need for improved transparency and communication, which this recommendation supports.

3. Cumulative Air Quality Impact Assessments

Current Framework: Air Quality Impact Assessments are conducted on a per-site basis, neglecting the combined effects of multiple operations in close proximity.

Recommendation: Require regional air quality impact studies that evaluate the cumulative effects of all aggregate operations within a specific area. This holistic approach ensures that the collective impact on air quality is accurately assessed and managed.

4. Strict Controls on Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀)

Current Framework: The proposed standards do not specifically address the control of fine particulate matter, which poses significant health risks.

Recommendation: Enforce stringent measures to control PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀ emissions, including:

Utilizing dust suppressants on internal roads and stockpiles.

Enclosing processing equipment to minimize dust dispersion.

Limiting operations during high-wind conditions to prevent widespread dust.

5. Health Impact Assessments for Vulnerable Populations

Current Framework: There is no mention of assessing health impacts on sensitive groups such as children, the elderly, or those with pre-existing respiratory conditions.

Recommendation: Conduct Health Impact Assessments for new or expanding aggregate sites near residential areas, schools, and healthcare facilities. This ensures that the specific needs of vulnerable populations are considered and addressed.

6. Clear Complaint Resolution Process

Current Framework: While the County has a general complaint investigation process, there is no specific procedure for air quality concerns related to aggregate operations.

Recommendation: Develop a dedicated complaint resolution system for air quality issues, providing residents with a clear and efficient pathway to report concerns. This system should include timely responses and transparent documentation of actions taken.

3rd party air quality continuous assessment.

Compensation including fines for failure to uphold standards.

a good start - pits shouldn't be able to damage their neighbours - set reasonable standards and police it

Again action plan once reports are submitted

Again, as stated above. The County must consider aggregate as a non renewable resource and that viable aggregate deposits are only located where nature (i.e. glaciers/rivers etc.) deposited them. Blindly applying what may be unnecessary heavy restrictions and costly assessments to applications with smaller deposits could render them nonviable.

Again, properly equipped unscheduled inspections and reporting must be an integral part of ensuring standards are being met.

Air quality monitoring should be done by a neutral 3rd party as we all know very well, the gravel industry has a lot of money and can buy any report they want

Air quality monitoring should be done, only, by an independent third party (potentially selected by a citizens group involved with this concern—not untrustworthy organizations like Alberta Environment or politicians who may have bias or a vested interest). Any and all air quality monitoring, and alterations to operations, should also be determined by third party analysis.

Any and all of these measures should be paid for by pit operators in full.

Air quality needs to be monitored frequently - and in when in full operations and on a windy day - and testing downwind!

Air quality testing should be done at the time most likely to impact the surrounding environment. And 24 hour testing should be done multiple times during various seasons.

Alberta should review and upgrade its standards of Ambient Air Quality from 100 µg/m³ to 27 µg/m³ to comply to the Canadian standard, on the 24-hour average.
All other air pollutants of concern must be assessed too.

As above air quality monitors in residential areas by County to monitor this aspect

As above, assessments must be done by a third party.
Who develops the air quality standards?

as with any Performance standard enforcement is key. immediate and mandatory shutdowns should be implemented if performance standards are not met.

Because there are so many health issues that have been related to the inhalation of Silica particulates, it is important that these operations only be located at a safe distance from populated areas.

Clean air is what attracts people to the county. Having to continually fight with no same day response. The system is not made to deal with complaints. Continual monitoring is the only way to get this under control. Fines if it goes over that actually will want to make the operators change their ways.

Compliance enforcement- standards don't matter when companies choose to move ahead with infractions and just pay the fines. Operations should be shut down rather than just fines issued. I'm

Continuous air quality monitoring a good idea! Publicly published data reports complete with testing procedures.

crystalline silica is a serious health risk that causes miners lung. It negatively impacts people with compromised lungs and children under 18 which are impacted more than adults. Children should be able to play outside without the threat of lung damage.

Daily air quality measurements should
Mandatory 500m away from the active pit. If silica levels go beyond immediate shutdown and heavier mitigation requirements implemented prior to allowing further operation.

Dust from open pit activities such as blasting, crushing, screening and stacking have potentially harmful impacts to the human population. When particulate matter is inhaled, or settles on tissue, the health implications can be lethal since there is no biological mechanism for clearing it from the body. Once human contact is made with particulate matter those who suffer from cardiopulmonary disease, asthma, bronchitis, emphysema and pneumoconiosis will exhibit an increase of symptoms and can lead to premature death amongst those who are predisposed to those conditions.

Considering the severe consequences caused by inhaling particulate matter, dust should be eliminated (not just reduced) on gravel sites in order to mitigate health impacts. Further studies, reports and ongoing sampling should be conducted to ensure that air quality is protected. The federal government has set out a Canadian Air Ambient Standard which are now being implemented by some provincial jurisdictions. For example, Ontario regulates contaminants released in the air to limit exposure to substances that can affect human health and the environment. Rocky View County should look to other jurisdictions that prove to be more progressive when it comes to air regulations as a way to ensure that human health is not impacted in a negative manner at the hands of industry.

<p>Dust mitigation measures need to be more specific, making it clear that the DP has to include specific measures, not just a list of options that might be used.</p> <p>Using 24-hour averages needs to be more clearly specified - being able to average in the air quality when the pit is not operating makes no sense. There should be mandatory enclosure of crushers to reduce both dust and noise. There should be mandatory dust suppression barriers for all stockpiles and mandatory shut-down of operations in adverse weather conditions.</p> <p>The amount of open area permitted within an operating pit must be strictly limited to minimize dust and risks to ground water.</p>
<p>Emissions plans unfortunately do not account for non-point source pollutants and dust. Winds and dry conditions are factors as well. Residents lump all dust and pollutants to the industry which is incorrect and not factual.</p>
<p>Enforceable requirements on a regular basis</p>
<p>enforcement is key - immediate and mandatory shutdowns should be implemented if performance standards are not met</p>
<p>good</p>
<p>Gravel trucks leaving pits also liberate dust on to the highways and to adjacent properties along the route. There are visible signs of fugitive dust in ditches and peoples' yards. Could they consider a means to clean trucks prior to exiting the pit?</p>
<p>Haha! Right! I'm constantly wiping a layer of dust off patio furniture</p>
<p>Have a neutral 3rd party do the monitoring</p>
<p>I believe these requirements should be monitored by a third party.</p>
<p>I often see dust escaping the pit sites. They do not stop operations during high winds. They do not follow many rules and the County is not watching and they know that too.</p>
<p>I would like to see Rockyview County follow up and not just rely on the Operators' reports!</p>
<p>I would like to see silica speciation in the plan. Silica vs general dust are different, with silica having a much higher cancer risk. And monitoring requirements to MUCH lower size than PM10. Real damage is done between PM2.5 and 10. Note, standards are developed for worker occupational health NOT residential adults, children and infants.</p>
<p>if there are complaints can you make them do more monitoring? have you seen the dust along 85th on a windy day? what happens if it is windy will you shut them down? will they pay for residents air filters on their furnace? will crushers have covers or be placed inside buildings?</p>
<p>Implement the same air quality standards for all industries, not just aggregate, as a bylaw.</p>
<p>Independent, professional review of Emissions Mitigation Plans and Assessments and Air Quality Monitoring Plans. Independent, professional, regular, random testing of air quality. Mandating the highest standard of air quality (Canadian and World Health Organization standards) to protect citizens against the harmful effects of fine, particulate matter, rather than leaving it open to allowing the more dangerous Alberta acceptable levels and through the more open-to-interpretation language of "lowest practicable level."</p>
<p>Like much of monitoring it should be done near affected properties. It should not be averaged data as intense spikes in bad air could be worse. I have notice time and again that pit operate during strong winds. Evidently the operators can't be the judge of this so wind speed monitor should inform when to stop work. Should be at something like 35 km/hr and during chinooks enforcement person should spot check county pits with record of complaints.</p>

Like Noise and Traffic where can residences find the tracking and reporting of this information on Air quality? It should be accessible to residence.
Monitoring of smaller particle sizes for silica, long term impacts on nearby residents (longer hours than workers, consider kids and those with respiratory issues).
monitoring of the above should be done on an irregular basis by the county, allowing the gravel extractor companies to monitor themselves is like allowing the cat to babysit the mice. on an irregular basis so the companies don't comply only on the days that monitoring occurs.
Monitoring should be continuous and provided in full detail on a monthly basis to RVC. Standards should be established whereby, shutdowns of operations are required where there is evidence that weather conditions have led to exceeding standards and no preventative measures have been instituted. ie. drought conditions with high winds Fines should be applicable for repeatedly exceeding limits. Fines must be sufficient to provide a deterrent to exceeding limits or have an escalation built into the fine amounts for continued violations.
No additional
Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bearspaw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the pollutants of the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.
Not just setting standards but having the right support team at county offices to ensure that the right committee will follow up and support the residents when concerns arise
Not permit any gravel extraction where such activity would cause air quality to affect residential property or agricultural property
On windy days the county should move around sites and measure the air quality to ensure standards are being met.
Please refer to the documentation that the residents opposing the Scott Pit provided at their last failed approval attempt. It is a proven fact that gravel pits generate micro molecules that impact the health of the surrounding residents. Which again is why they need to be located far away from country residential or other subdivisions.
Poor air quality of dust and particles leads to contamination of drinking water supply for Cochrane and Calgary. Both municipality's have experienced water shortages and contamination in last couple years, RVC should not be the direct liable county responsible.
Reports must be provided to RVC monthly. No averaging of data. All exceedances must be reported with response. Fines must be available to deter reoccurrences.
See comments above re noise. Most apply to emissions as well. Emissions and noise both need to be based on a cumulative impact assessment and not just the subject application in isolation, otherwise you have the proverbial death by a thousand cuts.
Silica testing specifically - AHS has to approve
Suspend operations when threshold windspeed and directions reached
The Emissions Plan and the results need to be available to community residents.
The fox should not monitor the hen house. Or they will be their own moderators is wrong.

<p>The monitoring equipment should have proper maintenance and calibration to ensure proper/accurate readings. There should be a proper management of test data to ensure that the data is complete and on time according to the regulations of data collection. Proof of maintenance and data collection should be available electronically to ensure that the requirements have been met. Air Quality standards must be updated as the standards themselves are updated in order to eliminate outdated standards being used.</p>
<p>The operators do not do enough to mitigate dust already. Monitoring and mitigating eg high winds does not occur.</p> <p>Report card for residences annually.</p>
<p>the significant wind in the area should be considered in the air quality studies. Particularly West of Cochrane dust and particulates can travel great distances because of the significant wind. We already have significant issues with the Burnco pit. huge plumes of dust come from the pit which you can see from some distance.</p>
<p>To start with, keep it out of neighbour hoods. Than the air quality would be a standard that would be safe for kids and compromised immune people can count on having clean air.</p>
<p>Water truck onsite, Any dust on windy will shut down site immediately</p>
<p>Who holds the the operators to air quality once the research is complete?</p> <p>In my mind if a gravel pit is operating and a community is within a 50 km radius, there should be 10 min checks on air quality. and if the air quality peaks above a certain level the gravel pit has to cease all operations.</p> <p>The assesment to me is worthless, what matters to me who how is the air quality once the aggregate is operating, who is monitoring and holding the company accountable.</p>
<p>Would like to see a requirement that all operations work with the Calgary Region Airshed Zone Society on their monitoring, reviewing the data and be involved with the Airshed Zone organization.</p> <p>If all industries that impact the air quality work together to consider cumulative effects, individual monitoring plans and the region as a whole, better understanding can be made.</p>
<p>Again, I support the above -for transparency, for ensuring performance, to allow the public to be informed. A work, all data must be made public based on specified timing, no exceptions.</p>
<p>Monitoring on adjacent properties and thresholds above standards are essential. Aggregate companies do not pay adjacent land owners to destroy their quality of life.</p>
<p>RVC must have strict rules and prompt enforcement for air quality issues - silica dust is a known cancer causing agent; the heavy metal toxins (especially from the gravel mining in the Coal Spur formation in RVC) are in the gravel dust and pose great risk for animals and human health. The dust gets into the soils, grasses that livestock eats, water bodies animals and humas can drink from, and air that animals and humans breathe. The high winds in our area exacerbate the dust problem. To date, gravel companies have ignored public complaints and underreported the complaint numbers in their reporting to RVC. This is unacceptable behavior and must be called out and taken to task. Unscheduled random spot checks by RVC on the timeliness and effectiveness of dust mitigations with public satisfaction surveys is a must. Create a system for dust complaints that goes to both the gravel company and to RVC in real time, with the companies posting the mitigation performed and the time. Make this report transparent to the public in real time. To repeat the concern described in the previous section about breakdown of</p>

public trust of RVC admin and the gravel companies, trust needs to be earned. All need to do better regarding air quality/dust control .
I would also like the consideration for ground water and how it effects everyone's wells, and what happens when our wells collapse due to the ground blasting and the pits taking fresh ground water for their processes
Enforcement of regulatory components of this plan must be taken seriously. Otherwise, the performance measures for air quality are very well done. However, I would suggest that all heavy equipment used in aggregate operations be monitored for GHG emissions and monitored for impacts on the surrounding neighbourhoods. Off highway vehicles that are not regulated and controlled through licensing procedures are a big source of air quality pollution.
Air quality monitoring needs to be continuous and is a must, not A maybe...you are dealing with Silica dust, a carcinogen, which equals cancer.
The fact that air quality is impacted AT ALL within 5km of people's homes is a problem.
I would hope air quality would be checked regularly. It should be tested, not when the operators feel the air is fairly clear, but at random times.
Much has been said about the risk to area residents, with the presence of microscopic sand and silica. I am satisfied that the science supports the opinion that living in close proximity to operations like what is proposed WILL result in long-term health issues.
Air quality is far reaching and related to health & safety of people, wild & domesticated animals, water quality, plant life, etc.
<p>Silica dust is a cancer causing carcinogen, especially dust size PM2.5 to PM10. It is critical that standards be set to mitigate this significant health risk.</p> <p>Again, performance reports to be provided to RVC, identifying all peak exceedances (no averaging) and fines must be large enough to be an effective deterrent. Given the known health impact of carcinogenic dust, operations must be closed until any exceedance issue is completely mitigated.</p>
<p>Adjacent landowners regardless of location or residence, should have monitors on site, like required for Oil and Gas operations. When winds shift and conditions occur to impact adjacent properties, the monitors would identify the air emissions above or nearing health standards. Operations would stop until conditions change.</p> <p>Aggregate companies do not have the right to impact lands and residences for the Aggregate company benefit.</p>
<p>5.02 8.05 km is not in line with standard practice within the Air Quality Industry. 5 km is standard radius for cumulative air quality exposure.</p> <p>Hard Noise Mitigation Measure Examples for Emissions includes "enclosing processing plant within buildings". For progressive aggregate extraction it is not feasible to enclose the crushing machinery. It is necessary for the crusher to be able to move as the operation proceeds. We would like the addition of "where feasible" to be added so that the examples listed in the mitigation section are not seen as a one size fits all solution.</p> <p>5.08 The Air Monitoring Directive (2016) is designed to address urban emissions and does not account for aggregate operations. The monitoring stations required by AMD are energy inefficient, cost prohibitive and would not meet the needs of a community level monitoring program for aggregate.</p>

It is imperative that there be an effective & impartial procedure within the County for investigating complaints about violations by the applicant / owner of the aggregate operation.

Why hasn't the County used the Alberta air quality objectives? This is standard practice across the province. It also doesn't look like regional effects have been considered. For example, if there is wildfire smoke and the monitors show high levels of particulate, is the County going to expect operators to shut down? I hope not, because that means people won't get paid just because of regional smoke that they can't control.

Silica dust is known to be carcinogenic so, again, topography needs to be taken into account. No berm or fencing can contain the toxic dust when the prevailing winds blow it up into the air. When the operation is upwind and significantly below the level of the residences, this toxic dust will spread to the residences above. The forest fire smoke from British Columbia and Northern Alberta should make it abundantly clear that toxic air cannot be contained by even the Rocky Mountains.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS?

1. Mandatory Pre-Application Community Consultation

Current Framework: Aggregate applications are reviewed by Council, but there is no explicit requirement for early-stage community engagement before an application is submitted.

Recommendation:

Require pre-application public engagement sessions where applicants must present their proposal to nearby residents and stakeholders before submitting an official application.

Ensure that feedback from the community is documented and included in the application package, demonstrating how concerns were addressed.

Provide a formal mechanism for resident concerns to be reviewed and considered as part of the MSDP process.

2. Comprehensive Environmental & Social Impact Assessments

Current Framework: The MSDP includes regulatory compliance measures, but it is unclear whether cumulative impacts of multiple aggregate sites are considered in applications.

Recommendation:

Require Cumulative Impact Assessments (CIA) for all applications, evaluating:

The combined environmental effects of multiple pits in the region.

Long-term effects on groundwater, wetlands, and biodiversity beyond a single site.

Traffic safety and infrastructure strain due to multiple concurrent operations.

Include a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) to evaluate how the proposed site affects local property values, resident quality of life, and community well-being.

3. Independent Third-Party Review of Technical Studies

Current Framework: The application process requires applicants to submit their own technical studies, but there is no clear requirement for independent verification.

Recommendation:

Require third-party peer reviews of:

Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA)

Traffic Impact Assessments (TIA)

Noise and Dust Studies

Ensure that third-party reviewers are appointed by the County, not the applicant, to maintain objectivity.

Mandate public disclosure of all third-party review findings.

4. Strict Timeline for Reclamation & End Land Use Plans

Current Framework: All applications require an MSDP, but there is no clear timeline or defined end-use planning for land post-extraction.

Recommendation:

Require all applications to include a detailed, time-bound reclamation plan, specifying progressive reclamation milestones and post-extraction land use plans.

Mandate that operators demonstrate financial capacity to fulfill reclamation obligations before approval is granted.

Ensure that post-extraction land use aligns with agriculture, conservation, or recreational uses, preventing sites from defaulting into industrial or landfill operations.

5. Clear Criteria for Rejecting Applications

Current Framework: Applications are considered by Council, but there is no clear, objective framework outlining grounds for denial.

<p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Establish strict rejection criteria, including:</p> <p>Proximity to residential areas, schools, or environmentally sensitive regions.</p> <p>Demonstrated adverse cumulative environmental or traffic impacts.</p> <p>Failure to meet public consultation and engagement standards.</p> <p>Ensure that residents are provided clear reasoning when applications are denied or approved.</p> <p>Conclusion</p>
<p>A requirement to use the best technology and practices along with continuous improvement.</p> <p>Local benefits to mitigate aesthetic issues more than the half hearted efforts currently employed.</p>
<p>A RVC representative with adequate expertise should evaluate all aspects of these applications thoroughly. Water quality and turbidity reports of the area upstream and downstream for several years before the application must be submitted; as well as reports of the wells in the area.</p>
<p>Again this is a joke!</p> <p>We as a community don't want a pit across the road from residential properties period!</p>
<p>Aggregate development should not be occurring in mostly residential neighbourhoods. The time has past for extractions once the surrounding are residential. Plenty of risks involved including: blasting, dust, noise, increased traffic and water/well disturbances.</p>
<p>All aspects of applications must be evaluated by an RVC representative with appropriate expertise.</p> <p>All applicants must submit three immediately years groundwater data (elevation, quality and turbidity) gathered from up and down gradient monitoring wells in a pattern approved by an RVC expert.</p>
<p>All operating pits must have MSDPs - right now there are pits that began operations before MSDPs were required. DP renewals for these pits need to require the preparation of an MSDP to support further operations. Without this, there is a serious risk that there will continue to be massive scope creep for these pits.</p> <p>Commitments made in MSDPs must become mandatory conditions in DPs for operating the pits.</p>
<p>Applicants should pay for independent third-party technical assessment of various potential impacts (to groundwater, noise, silica dust, wetlands/environment, etc.).</p>
<p>Are there estimates proposed of how long it will take to extract the aggregate on a certain parcel?</p> <p>Are there plans for what happens on the parcel after the aggregate has been removed?</p>
<p>As the county needs gravel, and it is a good project for the county with taxes collected, and if it is safeguarded well to protect the public, we need to move forward with applications. Overall, Canada is over-regulated in all that we do and time frames to move forward with all sorts of projects is slower in Canada then most places on Earth!</p>
<p>Away from residential, setbacks, the FMV impact to a residents home.</p>
<p>Burnco doesn't follow suggested plans. They need to be put on hold to slow down the process</p>
<p>Council in the are should get to vote on if this is in the best interest of the county or not.</p> <p>If the county or the representatives say no, then the aggregate doesnt occur.</p>
<p>Do not approve aggregate near residential areas or schools. Simple.</p> <p>If the application does not fall within the geographical guidelines, turn it down immediately.</p>
<p>Do NOT 'consider' any further application plans!</p>

Do they really stick to their plans? Does the County have tough Development permits? Does the County take enforcement seriously? Why do our councillors approve gravel pits when it seems like there are 9 out of 10 people against them at many county hearings? We are not against all gravel pits just the majority of them because they are pushed forward by people with no credibility.
Dust, , livestock along roadways and near pits, not healthy. Proximity of yardsites.
Engage third party technical expertise to review applications as paid for by the proponent for applications > X. Put aside % of application proposed revenue or other mechanism to pay for third party expertise.
Funding provisions for residents who are required to respond to aggregate development applications to help subsidize any professional reports that may be required.
Gravel is a huge money maker. They can afford to move further away from residential acreage Keep traffic off of 85th and 144th The dust that blows up around the current pits is astonishing. Many times you can't see what's in front of you. And this is Dust: Fine silica dust from gravel pits can cause breathing problems like shortness of breath, airway restriction, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, and silicosis.
Have applications reviewed by competent experts, not simply "check the box" that the county has receive the paper work. Some of the applications presented at hearing were full of mistakes.
How many times we have to say no
I agree.
I feel the applicant will try to use provincial bodies to circumvent the county's rulings despite what the community wants. that is not acceptable.
I think gravel pits should not be allowed within a certain distance from anything residential. Existing pits should be grandfathered, but only for a few years. Gravel pit owners will than factor this into their strategic plans, and naturally move farther out. Make the economics work such that it no longer pays to be as close to the city as possible.
If an application has been previously denied by Council, the applicant should not be allowed to continue submitting applications, This creates an emotional rollercoaster for residents living in the community.
If any aggregate operation contaminates any well water in proximity to the pit. That they are responsible to provide an alternate water solution to the affected community at their expence
It is a must to use updated information, standards, regulations, etc.
It's probably coming up in the next question(s), but residents should be informed and given opportunity for feedback in a more timely fashion.
Keep present And involved when residents contact them
MSDP must factual..... like the BS many tried to sell the public about wildlife resources, traffic volumes, loads from pits, consultations with neighbours. Mostly this was BS. Unfortunately the Municipal Act allows people to be very untruthful at public hearings. Many reports in MSDPs are also far from truth. Public needs funding to determine if MSDPs are factual. RVC needs an expert or two at arms length from all parties to give guidance. Maybe in conjunction with U of C? Could be a good idea.
No gravel pits near residential areas

one submission for a particular type of land use only - residents should not be subjected to an ongoing battle applicants should pay a fee for every to impacted residents each time an application is resubmitted when the previous application was already deemed inappropriate for use
only one submission for a particular type of land use. residents should not be subjected to an ongoing battle over and over again. applicants should have to pay a fee to impacted residents every time the application is submitted after a previously one has already deemed the use not appropriate.
Perhaps expand the area that is advised regarding this development via email or mail.
Plan should have timeline and reclamation plan included.
Proposed new development should be publicized well ahead of any approvals. Each new proposal must be prefaced by public meetings and an open hearing before RVC.
Proximity to residents
Public hearing should be required on all aggregate development applications. See detailed comments above.
Public hearings with scientific reports by residents must be reviewed. If no staff qualified, third party must be provided.
Review of property values where they have allowed developments. Showing loss in value. Listen to the stakeholders/residents in the area
Set backs of all neighborhoods and homes. Access on truck only roads. Let them drive in places other than commuters that live in the neighbourhood.
should be considered by council. discretion needs to be used cautiously, is a master plan enforceable?
Sounds good.
Staggered development timelines should be considered as conditions for approval, where cumulative impacts on roads, safety, environment and residents, that would be deemed excessive. All applicants should have sufficient recorded historical data to support any reports or assessments related to environmental impacts. This should include groundwater elevation and quality monitoring. All applications and reports should be evaluated by an appropriate independent RVC expert.
Stop all aggregate development in the Bearspaw area. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.
The County could add the clause in the permit that the company (operator) must be a member of the Calgary Region Airshed Zone Society.
The county should have a long term plan where they would allow an aggregate site to have an application and not allow rural residential to be built.
The increase in slow vehicles entering highways with no passing lanes or 4 lane highways. Aggregate companies should be responsible for these highway upgrades near their pits if province/county can't do it. Citizen safety should be a priority on these transportation corridors.

The number of times the community has fought to stop a development. There has to be a limit on the number of applications and refusals -so that it is not a constant barrage of applications never accepting no as an answer.

Reapplication almost yearly is plain and simple harassment of the residents of the area who repeatedly have to fight off the applications every few years. It's exhausting and it is one of the great impacts of living near a property owned by a gravel company. They bought the land without due diligence and consideration that it was unsuitable for development they need to move on. When will no -mean no.

The proposed setbacks in the ARP are a joke. they should be multiples further away from residential than proposed.

The proximity to existing residential acreage . The most impacted will be Crestview estates in the south west corner of the Scott property . and Silverwoods directly south .totaling approx. 30 homes .

These developments have been here for over 30 years and in that time frame have successfully challenged the development of the property for a gravel pit 3 time . Always defeated on environmental concerns that have not changed

The other concern is the monitoring of dust and noise . It has been self monitoring which in our view is no monitoring !!

The public in a LARGE surrounding area needs to be notified as soon as a proposal is in. The Rocky View notification zone needs to be amended for aggregate to a much larger area - involve residents in who gets notified.

The radius for letting residents know of the application (example: for aggregate development) should be much greater than 5 miles; it should be 10 miles minimum.

Notices to residents shall not be permitted to be given during a window of less than 5 business days prior to major holidays (Example: a day or two before Christmas break, a developer unfairly "informs" residents with a flyer to the home - while people are away from their homes for Christmas - this actually happened with a group that wanted to drill and haul oil around the intersection of Hwy 22 and Hwy 567 years ago: notices were given to residents a day or two before the holiday break with no ability for residents to call the numbers provided to talk with individuals because the business and county were both off for the holidays).

This also sounds great

This process is far too political now and decisions are no longer made based upon science but on sentiments and feelings from residents.

To not approve aggregate applications close to residential developments.

We would request that the application not be altered in development permits. That the application stick to the first application. The application be simplified so that one does not have to be a legal expert to solve. The back and forth approval through provincial and municipal bodies that allows the process to move forward no matter what. Even when they get a decision they come back and always ask for more. If they do we would like to see the taxation doubled or tripled so they actually follow council orders. The burnco west pit is a good example of this. 160 acre expansion approved and they came back with 480. Really. They always want more

You CANNOT approve these in isolation. They have to be looked at as a cumulative whole, regardless that they are different operating companies (which, by the way are often owned by the same few parties) Of course the applicant will ensure their 'individual' impact will be within regulation but the cumulative impact is not measured or monitored. Then, once they're all approved and operating and the dust and noise is deafening they'll all be blaming the other for the problem. It's ridiculous to think that each one is an individual entity that doesn't have an overall impact on quality of life of agricultural and rural residents. Also 'engagement' with the public seems to be a tick the box exercise by gravel operators and regulators. Individual residents are summarily dismissed as 'not being impacted'. For clarity, my residence is within 1.6km of one pit but I'm deemed not to be in the 'impact zone'. Same pit is drilling within 1m of our community well aquafour.

Zero tolerance for any level of contamination to water and air. One misstep and the pit should be shut down, not just sold to a different entity.

If the cost of doing business is extreme compliance or loss of the gravel extraction permit/licence, then and only then will operators take this seriously enough to fly straight or lose the right to do business. As I say, if here is contamination the pit should be closed permanently because, water and air, the wellness of residents must come first!

A master site development plan is required for all proposed aggregate developments as per the Municipal Development Plan. I fully support, thank you

Burnco 2024-11 MSDP states annual volumes of 125,000 M cubed per year and then Burnco in the public hearing of December 3, 2024 states that's not true that they need to move a wash plant and will be out of the fruit gravel in the first phase Northwest 13 within 2 to 3 years. MSDP's need to be reviewed by third-party independent consultants or adjacent neighbors. Independent consultants need to be paid for by the county and Burnco because the reports are often inaccurate and incomplete to allow for the project to proceed. MSDP's must be audited, and when problems are encountered, then the information needs to be revised and corrected.

Currently the studies in the MSDP are inaccurate they do not reflect fractured faulted bedrock, and do not consider the impacts on the surrounding areas. Mining in the water table along the bow river should not be allowed.. 2011 Rocky View County agreed no mining in the water table. Burnco went to the province and got approval, and now there are problems that are not being addressed, and the risks are higher than being assessed.

I agree

Ensure through careful review that Development Permit Renewal applications are just that and truly meet RVC policies regarding the intensity of use, etc. If "scope creep" (slipping in more land than the original permit, increased intensity of use, more equipment than in renewal applications is evident, DO NOT overlook it but rather insist that a proper Development Permit application is made.

Insist on Environmental Impact Assessments done beforehand. The headaches associated with the Burnco West Cochrane pit could have been avoided with a proper EIA done and proper, thorough 3rd party review by experts as the problems were predicted all along, yet only now are coming to light.

Advocate strongly to the Province on these issues if there is push-back as they are too important to roll-over on.

How about the fact the Scott Property has been applied for 3 times since 1994, and rejected all 3 times, and yet, here we go again. Can it not be mandated that 2, never mind 3, rejected applications, negate any approval in the future for that application/property/location? There are more families that live in this area now, than in 1994, making even more decisively a residential area. It is beyond obvious that this is not in the "public interest" as is currently being applied for. Please stop this redundant nonsense and add a clause in your approval process.
This application has been denied and the ASP clearly sets out that it is not welcome in this specific area of the county.
RVC to engage third party technical expertise and resources to review applications, at operator expense.
When the County approves SNAT in an Area where there is only spot zoning and no Area Structure plan, the area of pit should be only large enough and guaranteed extraction occurs within five year period. Otherwise before any changes, the Area Structure Plan should be developed to provide for all land owners to have the highest best use of the lands within the next 10 years. Committing to quarter section or more of Aggregate zoning in an area known for highest and best potential is country residential or tourism, destroys the impact of the Rocky View advantage for all residents, except the Aggregate Company.
The Visual and Landscape Impact Assessment is an unnecessary document requirement. It is common sense that there will be an impact to the landscape from extraction operations. The important thing to remember is that Aggregate Extraction is a temporary use and that with appropriate mitigations during the length of the operation such as landscaped berms the impact to adjacent landowners is minimized. Furthermore, with appropriate reclamation these sites can go on to many land uses following the completion of the extraction. Mitigations do not require a landscaping professional to design.
I would like the County to consider how tight they want to be on these restrictions. It sounds like the foundation for the assessments and inspections started with good intentions, but the specific details are way too restrictive. If the County wants to effectively prohibit local aggregate extraction then that suggests to me that they don't support local jobs or investment. The County should consider reasonable application requirements that have solid supporting information and do not overlap with the provincial regulations that are reviewed by technical experts. Please keep in mind perspectives like mine as someone who works for the industry. I am scared that we are all going to lose our jobs because the County choses to listen to a few angry voices.
I would like the County to use common sense with regard to aggregate. It is a valuable resource that the entire County needs as build out of schools, hospitals, homes and roads continue to occur. If the County puts so many restrictions on the aggregate industry, they will leave the area and we, the citizens of RVC will pay the high price of imported aggregate from outside of the County. This will result in high aggregate costs, raising the price of all building and roads and it will surely increase the heavy truck traffic. Road maintenance will then become the cost to RVC and not to the contractors using them. Common sense with this industry seems to be lacking because of a few negative anti-gravel individuals.
Overall the existing pits don't get a lot of complaints. Why should there be increased levels of requirements?
Application requirements should look at volume, rather than area of site for consideration.
The rules for gravel companies / rectifying non-compliance must be clear + strict re: timelines, the mitigations needed, the quality/standard required + subject to being signed off before continuing mining. Compare this to how food inspections showed work. Strict rules are a must.
No more gravel pits in Bearspaw

Consider your constituents for a change! Rhetoric and garbage
No extraction below water table!
Greater monitoring real time of inputs to the ground water engendering the aquifer. We all draw our drinking water from.
Take into consideration all potential pits in the area and not only the one in front of you.
Hurry up and get this done!! Stop spending more \$\$.
Do not move forward until storm/groundwater plan is improved.
AB AER requires oil, gas operators to not cause noise levels exceeding 4 dBA of nearest residence due to their operation. Will RVC implement some / similar standards.
Gravel companies should not use ground water to wash gravel.
If the County agrees to gravel extraction within a short distance of non-farming residences, then the County needs to direct operators to reimburse home owners for the loss of value that a house next / close to a gravel pit entails.
Traffic impact. Will road use be slowed by regular traffic and loaders etc?
Hours of Operation. Will hours of operations be restricted? Concerned about acoustics if pit operate 24 hours. Would like reasonable hours of operation.
Applications need to be detailed with exact scope of work, timelines, KPIs, etc. To make sure there is no scope creep and confusion between County, AE, and residents.
Traffic safety. Especially at major intersections (e.g. newly approved pit on RR43, North of Weedon Trail. Adverse affect on public safety as loaded (slow) trucks try to cross / enter Hwy 22. This intersection Hwy 22/567/Weedon Trail is all ready well known for frequent / bad accidents.
Traffic / Increased Road Use. Effect of heavy trucks on roads not designed / intended for such heavy loads. Damage / cost to RVC rate payers to repair / upgrade.
Application must include realistic plans for wildlife corridors.
Reclamation. Do Pit operators have to pay a surcharge for cubic ton of gravel removed into a holding / trust account to be applied to future reclamation costs (similar to coal extraction by Alberta Government). So taxpayers not left with costs when pit operators goes / declares bankruptcy.
The applications are so arduous we are teetering on the edge of if it is viable or not.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING ENGAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS?

A process to ensure that not only are complaints received but that the process of rectifying these complaints is completed to address the nature of the complaint.

Actual comments submitted to county not summary.

I noticed a very biased summary from the gravel pit operators.

An overall summary of the engagement process and results needs to be available to county residents.

Applicant engagement should be a 5 mile radius, not 1 mile!!! In the country, aggregate affects more than a 1 mile radius - its traffic issues, dust, and noise alone carries further than 1 mile.

The summary report should be compiled by a 3rd party - not the developer or county. If possible, could the event be videotaped as well to confirm all perspectives are related in the summary?

communication to each individual impacted resident. they can say their pc and that is documented and will move forward to all applicable applications. Everyone should not have to show up every time a new application is again submitted to live an emotional Groundhog Day of making opinion known.

Companies like Heidelberg with bad reputations shouldn't be allowed to operate in the County

Consider that Rockyview County should only be residential.

documented communication with each individual impacted resident that will carry forward to each applicable application

Ensuring access to information for all stakeholders.

Expand the geographical limit 3km to include more than just adjacent property owners.

Full disclosure

Good idea on the surface, but we are continually have to fight this same battle over and over and over.

Having engagements is great, but only if concerns are addressed. Have been to many of these engagement sessions for gravel pits over the years and administrators just ignore the concerns.

Hold the operator accountable.

I agree.

I have found that often these so called "public engagement" processes are simply an exercise that that an operator (and sometimes the County) goes through to check off a box on an application. I think it is important for the operator to show that it has actively engaged with the community or residents and the steps taken to address concerns.

i support this.

applicants should have to use the same notification area as the county. a staff member should attend open houses and take notes of the comments they receive from the public to make sure nothing is hidden

I think the people who are making these applications should have to show up not just faceless corporations' lawyers.

I would like to know what RVC has to say about "Good Neighbour" engagement which also occur. Is that an extension of the Stakeholder Engagement?
<p>I would like to see an engagement plan that has a mechanism to report falling rocks and broken windshields. It is very expensive to replace a windshield every year.</p> <p>Also a mechanism for cleaning the roads not just in front of the pit entrance but for kms in each direction from the entrance.</p>
Include the City of Calgary residents that are downwind and live in the area as we share the roads and air.
Increase the minimum number of open houses from one. Increase the notification area from one mile (1.61 km) to a much greater area of impact. Community access to annual reports.
Keep the work up
More advertising and outreach to the community
Noice, traffic, impact on the quality of roads.
One and done open house is not sufficient. There needs to be commitment for regular interaction.
One open house is not enough. Operators and applicants rely on the fact that people don't read fine print in newspapers or on websites and hence, are unaware of the deadlines for feedback or aware of feedback opportunities at all, let alone feel like the applicant actually cares about anything other than the absolute minimum bar for compliance /approval. They promise good neighbour policies and host conference calls before application and then ignore residents after approval.
Only one open house is not enough.
Open houses in RVC morph into unruly gathering. Forcing industry into open house scenarios is not the best way to engage in RVC anymore.
Public engagement needs to be required for DPs, not just for initial redesignation applications. The county should ensure that at least one staff person attends the engagement sessions so they can assess the quality of the engagement rather than rely on the applicant's presentation of what they did.
<p>Rocky View should be getting the complaints - not the applicant.</p> <p>Advertising standards at RV are not sufficient. There needs to be a way that notices like this reach the surrounding communities. The 1 mile notification zone needs to be much larger.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>the notification zone of 1 mile for "something" may only have a dozen residents in the immediate area but the "something" will impact most of the community. The aggregate plan needs to find a way to inform the wider public other than sending notices to those dozen residents!</p>
Start to figure out how to get rid of the worst operators by not extending permits. We have too many and they have done enough harm. The people around the Glendale pit like it. So there can be some that work but most don't.
Suggest County portal with applicable plans for full transparency.
Tell the truth about dangers of living next to gravel pits.

The engagement summary should be made public.
The operators should have to buy adjacent lands to create a considerable buffer zone around the mine. landowners who have farmed for years in the area should not be adversely effected by adding more and more mines and ever growing expansion. The mines can operate in more remote areas and be trucked closer in, or if it must be done in the county, it needs very rigorous processes to adhere to and should not effect existing neighboring landowners in any way.
The public engagement process is one of the main issues in RVC. Public trust is definitely suffering with the current notification and engagement process. Consider opening up the notification radius to a larger area, 5 to 10 km.
The Scott property is all farm land with no trees . We get most of our wind from the north and west , this will impact all the residents within 5 km .
There is a site close by us that has applied multiple times to set up a gravel extraction site. Thankfully it has been defeated all three times but only with residents having to engage expensive legal help. Companies should not be allowed to continually reapply.
These surveys and participant participation are hidden. There should be much broader newspaper and RVC resident mail out letters to nearby residents By keeping these project expansions secretive and seemingly pre approved, is a gross negligence by RVC to knowingly not have open communication with a lengthier time to participate as residents are not full time employees dedicated 100% to push projects like this through. More types of open communication over a longer period would allow true residential participation for those most impacted.
This is definitely needed.
transparency - easily available to residents.
Who is going to ensure that a proper process is followed. I am in construction and nothing gets followed through with as it's all about the money.
Why can't the County set higher standards for gravel mining operations (resource extraction within the County). What is there saying that Rocky View County must accept the clearly low standards held by the Province or worse over the AER
Yes, Mandatory - very very important and appropriate - this engagement will save time and conflict in the long run
I do strongly believe this needs to be conducted by an independent 3rd party to be truly meaningful. There is no trust with the gravel companies now. They have been mis-leading RVC Admin and Council. I would not support that the gravel companies themselves hold open houses for public input and report the the County - I do not believe there would by any accurate, constructive outcomes. With an independent 3rd party, there is a better chance. Advertising must be effective - please refer to my comments above wherein RVC communication is hard for public to find even if they are looking. The website is not user-friendly. Most people I have spoken to had no idea of RVC Open Houses, surveys, the Public Hearings on gravel mining issues.

Open houses are farcical. They are show and tell and little if anything occurs that can be called meaningful engagement. The process Rocky View used to produce this plan was meaningful engagement. Aggregate companies can certainly be required to do meaningful engagement with the folks who will likely be impacted. One open house is insufficient. Lists of comments is not a sufficient mechanism to determine who will be affected and how solutions will be considered by decision-makers. People need to work in groups to be presented with facts and then engaged with experts to explore the proposed development using the performance standards included in the plan. People need to talk with one another and not just be presented with pictures on corkboards for a few hours where confrontation with developers is often unavoidable and undignified.
This will be a non-starter. The applicant will not be able to win over hearts and minds as this is the MOST contentious issue facing the Bearspaw community.
I commend RVC in drafting a full engagement process, I have nothing to add at this stage.
Approach needs to be mutually respectful, win-win and consultants or legal advice paid for if required and negotiations fail or the aggregate company doesn't allow mutual benefits.
May need to have independent mediation especially if the aggregate operation extends beyond a 10 year period.
Rocky View Planning needs to support highest and best use of adjacent landowners and not to be restricted by Aggregate operators.
There needs to be a review of costs of Rocky View staff and Aggregate benefits for the County. Current reviews aren't paying for the constant scope creep, new development permits and changes for the Burnco West Cochrane operations. Audits need to be done and reported to tax payers. What are the true costs and benefits?
Operations located along Provincial Highways should not be required to circulate all landowners along its length. These are designated haul routes by the Province.
Engaging with the community is good, but the County really needs to keep in mind reasonable vs non-reasonable requests. For example, if someone from the other side of the County shows up to complain that their water well will be affected, this should be disregarded as a non-reasonable complaint. Consider that good engagement takes a lot of effort from all stakeholders, including the County, so if the County is going to require operators to meet a high standard then so should the County.
The operator engagement of public must do a better job. In a recent example, I know, the operator said to the County they engaged the neighbouring landowners but in fact they merely cherry-picked a few items. Many did not know anything about it despite being potentially impacted. Using the Cochrane or Airdire paper to post notices isn't satisfactory when rural people don't necessarily get those publications. How will the open houses be advertised to truly try to reach RVC residents + landowners?
Need open house before approval / development. Once done its too late.
Industry has no trust or credibility based on past actions.
Cumulative impact studies on all impacts.
Tougher standards & better monitoring to ensure compliance with air, water, and traffic standards
If you have performance standards, make sure they are adhered to!

Only residential traffic on Range Road 25
Updated Environmental Impact Reports
Impact to property values
Health impact to residents
Impact to wildlife
Get aggregate where people don't live!
Noise, traffic
this has all been done 3x's already. What do you not understand ?
Hurry up and get this done!!
Glad to hear the County residents worst affected by extraction, will finally have a chance to be informed, involved, and give feedback
There is no discentive to a resident bringing a relexive & frivolous complaint. Fee should be added to levy a complaint.
Residents don't have the \$\$ (money) resources for lawyers, engineers, and other "experts" that the gravel companies can bring to the "consultation" forums. We need the County to stand for the residents with an independent 3rd party consultation and reporting. Right now it feels like we as residents don't have a leg to stand on for defence of our legitimate concerns. It felt like the Mountain Ash Tribunal had the "experts" run on the information presentation.
When residents engage with gravel pit operators as part of "proof" of community engagement where can reidents provide feedback when their concerns are not addressed?
The public deserves an opportunity to weight in on rectifying actions and wheather they believe them to be sufficient.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING ENVIRONMENT STANDARDS?

Independent, Third-Party Environmental Assessments & Monitoring

Current Framework: The County requires an Environmental Assessment in accordance with servicing standards, but there is no mention of who conducts these assessments or how they are enforced over time.

Recommendation:

Require third-party, independent environmental assessments to ensure unbiased reporting and eliminate the potential for industry self-regulation.

Implement regular environmental monitoring, including groundwater quality testing, soil stability assessments, and wildlife impact surveys throughout the life of the project—not just at the approval stage.

Create escalating penalties for non-compliance, ensuring that environmental violations result in meaningful consequences, including work stoppages if necessary.

2. Protection of Groundwater Recharge Areas & Wetlands

Current Framework: The proposal states that developments must comply with federal, provincial, and county environmental policies, but it does not require specific mitigation efforts to protect groundwater recharge areas and wetlands.

Recommendation:

Identify critical groundwater recharge zones and restrict extraction activities in these areas to prevent the depletion of groundwater supplies. The removal of gravel and sand directly impacts the natural filtration process that replenishes aquifers, potentially leading to long-term contamination or reduced water availability.

Require hydrogeological studies to evaluate how aggregate extraction will affect groundwater flow patterns and local well water supply, with continuous monitoring to detect adverse impacts.

Mandate a no-net-loss policy for wetlands, ensuring that any loss of wetland area due to development is offset by equal or greater restoration elsewhere.

3. Wildlife Habitat & Biodiversity Conservation

Current Framework: The proposal states that operators must comply with federal, provincial, and county policies but does not provide specific protections for wildlife habitat in and around aggregate sites.

Recommendation:

Require Wildlife Impact Assessments that identify species at risk and critical habitats, ensuring that mitigation plans are developed before approvals are granted.

Implement seasonal work restrictions to prevent disruption of key wildlife breeding, migration, and nesting periods. Noise, dust, and vibrations from aggregate operations can drive wildlife away, disrupting ecological balance and leading to long-term biodiversity loss.

Establish mandatory wildlife corridors that allow safe passage for animals, preventing habitat fragmentation caused by aggregate developments.

4. Air & Water Quality Protection Beyond Compliance

Current Framework: The proposal requires adherence to environmental regulations but does not address cumulative environmental impacts from multiple operations in close proximity.

Recommendation:

Require regional environmental impact assessments that evaluate the cumulative effects of multiple aggregate operations, rather than assessing projects in isolation.

Implement mandatory air and water quality testing beyond federal and provincial minimums, ensuring that pollution levels remain within safe limits throughout the lifespan of an operation.

Enforce on-site water recycling systems for aggregate washing to reduce water consumption and prevent contamination of nearby water sources.

5. Restoration & Reclamation Standards with Financial Security

Current Framework: There is no clear mention of who is responsible for site restoration once extraction is complete, or how the County ensures that reclamation actually takes place.

Recommendation:

Require operators to submit a detailed reclamation plan before approvals are granted, including soil restoration, reforestation, and native vegetation replanting.

Establish a reclamation bond system, requiring operators to pay a financial security deposit that is only returned once the site is fully restored to pre-development ecological standards. This ensures that companies cannot walk away from environmental obligations.

Require progressive reclamation throughout the project lifespan, rather than allowing all restoration to be postponed until the site is exhausted.

6. Noise & Light Pollution Mitigation in Sensitive Areas

Current Framework: The proposal does not address how noise and artificial lighting from aggregate sites impact surrounding ecosystems.

Recommendation:

Require operators to implement natural sound barriers such as tree buffers or berms to reduce noise impact on surrounding wildlife and residential areas.

Enforce dark-sky compliant lighting to minimize disruptions to nocturnal species and ensure that operations do not introduce unnecessary artificial light pollution into rural areas.

a good start - pits shouldn't be able to damage their neighbours - set reasonable standards and police it

Alberta Environment and Protected Areas has jurisdiction over the environment, there is no need for the county to spend time and money on environmental standards.

Any gravel pit that close to residents would be a problem for sound.

Anyone would know that this area was quite beautiful and has lots of wildlife. The gravel guys never did anything to deal with this. Their hours of operation are also when animals move. We see the blood on the road. enough said.

<p>As we have seen with all the above, Standards if not enforced are useless.</p> <p>Scott pit is a good example. It has been turned down three times by the county because of it not being an appropriate development and negative environmental impact by the county. Now they appeal to the Province. Not right now matter was the County puts in place.</p>
<p>Broader understanding of Federal Species at Risk Act, Federal Migratory Birds Act, provincial Wildlife Act, Environmental Protection and Enhancement Act by County Inspectors and gravel developers to ensure compliance with these acts with enforcement by county inspectors. Also ensure each project has an Environmental Protection Plan detailing all environmental requirements that is posted on site and each developers has an assigned Environmental Coordinator with a professional accreditation (i.e. P.Biol, P.Ag) to ensure development meets EPP requirements. Ensure coordinator contract requirements include experience and time on site of at minimum weekly during gravel operations and daily during topsoil stripping/wetland/watercourse work, erosion and sediment control installations, reclamation and during startup after extended shutdown. Daily EC reports to be submitted to county inspector as part of a compliance assurance package demonstrating compliance with EPP.</p> <p>Operational planning and enforcement to require spill prevention and secondary containment requirements for all stationary equipment and equipment servicing similar to Alberta Energy Regulator and Canada Energy Regulator minimum standards.</p> <p>Additional erosion control requirements similar to AER and CER minimum standards.</p>
<p>Compliance enforcement- standards don't matter when companies choose to move ahead with infractions and just pay the fines. Operations should be shut down rather than just fines issued.</p>
<p>Cumulative effects and destruction of wetlands.</p>
<p>Cumulative effects need to be a primary focus of any Environmental Assessment for aggregate operations which at least in the Bears paw Area seem to be concentrated in a limited physical area. The Performance Standards assume that all adverse effects can be mitigated or compensated for which is incorrect. There should be recognition that in some cases this cannot occur and may impact the approval. The Environmental Assessment needs criteria for example "best practices" if hard criteria are not realistic.</p>
<p>Cumulative impacts on a habitat as a result of a gravel pit can cause irreversible damages to the environment, this only multiplies as the volume of pits increase in a set proximity. Right now, the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency is in the pre-consultation stages of their CEAA amending regulation. Without a final decision from CEAA, any enacted regulation surrounding cumulative effects would be incomplete in nature. Thusly, the Council should await the CEAA panel's decision to ensure that provincial regulations align with federal regulations. CEAA should be used as a regulatory framework before approving permits or any further studies completed by proponents in the Rocky View County. Studies should outline cumulative impacts to local habitat, as well as the cumulative effects of multiple aggregate pits within a certain radius.</p>

Current standards are generally behind the rest of the world. I would like to see industry be leaders in environmental stewardship and actually take a proactive approach. Kind of like lead exposure 20 years too late. We all know silica dust is a killer.
Destruction of wetlands
Develop guidance for what is required in an Environmental Assessment. This guidance should include the minimum size of a project in all industries to trigger the requirement for an Environmental Assessment. Alternatively, the County could rely on existing requirements for Environmental Assessment under provincial jurisdiction. https://www.alberta.ca/environmental-assessment-process
Development of urban crawl should be heavily considered
Do not destroy the Bow river from aggregate, it is the water drinking source for nearly 2 million people immediately down stream.
Do random checking with minimum notice, and check close to the edge of the site at random times. The enforce the standards when a site is found to have transgressed them.
Ensure that the County's Servicing Standards are clearly defined and licensed operators closely monitored
Environmental assessments are for large scale developments (oil sands, mines, quarries) and not sand and gravel pits.
Environmental studies should include a much broader swath as the area of concern for development is part of a greater ecosystem and its development impacts far more than the proposed site for business.
Given how generous aggregate reserves are within the County, it is not clear why any aggregate extraction should be allowed within riparian areas. There is lots of gravel on land that is not environmentally sensitive.
good
Have some mechanism to compensate for water. If water is wrecked for the surrounding land owners. The gravel pit will never paid for the infrastructure or water license to make that land owner have the original use of there property back. There is no means to handle this other that a super costly lawsuit. Resource development is important. But not at ruining all the lands around them.
How it affects the residents
i agree but with bigger setbacks from known environmental areas.
I am in agreement.
I hope the County will be monitoring the above (see cat/mouse comment earlier)
Independent, professional review of Environmental Assessments and random, independent monitoring/review of actual practices.
Is Rockyview County going to continue to monitor the gravel developments to ensure that the operators continue to follow the environmental standards?

<p>It is not sufficient for these assessments to be completed and not reviewed by competent environmental professionals. Too often at hearings, we hear that pit operators have submitted assessments, but no one bothers to review them. Case in point, one operator's wildlife assessment declares their site to be not a significant wildlife habitat. A year later there are Wildlife corridor signs that take in the full frontage of the pit.</p>
<p>It's clear that based on Burnco's Cochrane west operation (and its proximity to watershed and the decimating of wildlife habit and grasslands) and the great upheaval over the Big Hills Spring gravel pit, there is little concern for the environment—in any fashion—let alone the mass opposition to these gravel pits by concerned residents and constituents.</p> <p>The county seems to allow for these pits to go forward irrespective of opposition and warnings of ill-effects on the environment.</p> <p>As has already been shown by results at the Cochrane west pit, there are already problems with ground water and there is little to no accountability for Burnco. Based on what's at stake these companies should not be given chances to pollute the peoples water and air and continue operation. This can't be a three strikes and you're out situation. One time and they should be shut down permanently.</p> <p>Instead of the operators suing the county or town if things don't go their way, it should be part of any agreement for them to operate that if any infractions occur they will be shut down, and taken to court to establish compensation for damages. Not just some slap on the wrist meaningless monetary handout but real penalties that will actually make them realize the seriousness of the environment and consideration for people over their profits.</p>
<p>Listen to the resident environment impact studies too. Aggregate studies are self serving. In rural areas, the wildlife ecosystem is critical for pest control.</p>
<p>Look to the future and what leading countries are using for standards, remember asbestos was a good idea until it wasn't. European standards regarding silica dust are very stringent based on evidence.</p>
<p>No comment</p>
<p>No gravel pits near environmentally sensitive areas</p>
<p>No pit development within 5 km of any residential areas</p>
<p>Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bears paw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the environmental impacts of the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.</p>
<p>Ok to do but somebody has to actually review and enforce.</p>
<p>Operators should not conduct their own assessments. Too much room for bias. This should be done by County representatives.</p>
<p>Oversight management and reporting are critical. Ensuring that the standards are updated as legally required.</p>

People before corporations that could care less about adding anything to the community. They will destroy the roads and tax payers will be on the hook for it and the roads will be in a constant state of disrepair and dirty. The dust from the pit and particulates from the hundreds of trucks can NEVER be reduced or mitigated effectively.
Setbacks and no pits in residential areas.
Significant setback from all ESAs must be established. Fugitive emissions and direct physical impacts on wildlife cannot be mitigated without separation.
Significant setbacks from all ESAs must be established . These gravel pits have direct impacts on wildlife and can not be mitigated.
Strict rules properly enforced
<p>The cumulative impacts of numerous aggregate operations within close proximity, are something that must be considered to truly assess the broader scope of Environmental Impacts. This may be outside the scope of individual site assessments but each site must recognize and be responsible for its contribution to the cumulative impacts. RVC should have to power to assess an environmental levy on each operation, in order to independently commission a cumulative impacts assessment, where a cumulative assessment is warranted by a concentration of operations in an area.</p> <p>Significant setbacks should also be required from all ESA's in order to appropriately mitigate impacts from fugitive emissions, noise and other disturbances.</p>
<p>The environmental impact needs to be done by a 3rd party - not the operator nor the operator's "associates".</p> <p>The residents should be informed and be "in the know" on any env. impact studies proposed.</p>
<p>The people. What about the people in the county?</p> <p>I don't want to look at a gravel pit outside my front window even though "they followed policies"</p>
There are already 5 pits in our area, and looks like another trying to get in, after we've been fighting to get rid of it.
There has been no consideration for Bighill Creek Provincial park despite this "ensure proposed developments are in accordance with Federal, Provincial and County policies for environmental areas." Both the county and the province have been particularly silent in this area.
These assessments must then be acted upon and this will need enforcement, so an enforcement team will be necessary. Also, these assessments will need to be considered along with other human activities in the area, so that cumulative impact can be managed,.
<p>visual aesthetics</p> <p>animal impact studies</p>
<p>We have seen many pits get approvals in this area with complete bogus environmental surveys. We the residents, many of whom are experts are disregarded despite having proof/evidence to the contrary. All operators along 567 said there was little wildlife yet now there is a 4 km wildlife corridor.</p> <p>Science - Theories are true until disproven.</p>

work directly with adjacent land owners to also monitor their property before and during operations to make sure there are no adverse effects. Cannot only monitor the direct mine area itself.

The environmental assessment process must be public and with 3rd party oversight - this will save time and effort in the long run and ensure pits are placed in appropriate locations - and NOT 5 pits immediately upstream of Bighill Springs Prov Park

Monitoring on adjacent properties and thresholds above standards are essential. Aggregate companies do not pay adjacent land owners to destroy their quality of life.

What else would you like the County to consider when implementing traffic safety standards? Burnco traffic often does not stop at the stop sign. The one a is not twin and as a result, the trucks going 70 or 80 for a long distance create traffic risks before any Burnco expansion. There should be twinning of the 1A

What else would you like the County to consider when implementing environment standards? An independent environmental impact assessment by third-party independent consultants needs to be performed for the 12/4 west of Cochrane and the adjacent properties to ensure water, security and water quality for upstream and downstream users.

Currently, Burnco paid reports are not reviewed. There's a lot of inaccuracies there's no consideration of fractured fractured bedrock, and there are huge potential and risks.

No further expansion should occur until this true environmental impact assessment occurs.

Mining in 12/4 6 km of water is inappropriate this close to the bow river and risks already show from the current Burnco reports of contamination.

Stop all development and ensure that there is a complete and independent environmental impact assessment

How will this be monitored ?

RVC must take a strong advocacy role with the Province regarding Environmental Impact Assessment. Currently, the Province is insufficient in their due diligence and insistence on EAI for gravel companies. I understand RVC gets told to back -off, "stay in your lane", etc., by the Province when it comes to these matters, but this is OUR County where WE reside and make our livelihoods. RVC MUST have a voice and standards that protects the highest and best use, and protection of our land, air and water. RVC MUST step up and strengthen up on this. Create a system of public transparency of the advocacy with the Province that you are doing - the public deserves to know the reality of the situation at present regarding environment standards.

Just don't allow the mine around residential

Water is important-impact on groundwater wells is critical to assess before operations, during and post operations in regard to quantity and quality. Companies should have to address contamination of wells and provide compensation as required to mitigate the harm. Surface water contamination from chemicals is also important. Wildlife corridors and habitat can be heavily impacted, especially during breeding and nesting periods if hours of operation are not tightly controlled. Monitoring for metals and for warming water temperatures are critical.

Stormwater must be properly collected, treated and released at times of year when it will not impact surface or groundwater supplies or the flora and fauna that rely on cool, freshwater to survive, for example Bull trout.

I worry about the impact on animal habitat as well as native grasses and trees.

That people moved out to this area for the quiet and the FRESH AIR. Grave extraction is not compatible with that. It should not be allowed within a sufficient distance from residential development.

I will defer to those more informed on this matter

Drinking & ground water. People's homes & quality of a rural lifestyle, domestic animals & wildlife. Air, noise, water, ground, light pollution.

Significant and meaningful setbacks must be established from residential and environmentally sensitive areas (e.g. Provincial Parks). Wildlife impacts can only be mitigated by the separation resulting from meaningful setbacks.

Cumulative effects of multiple pits must also be taken into account, especially in relation to wildlife corridors and wetland habitat destruction.

Again, performance reports to be provided to RVC, identifying all environmental standards infractions. Fines must be large enough to be an effective deterrent.

An Environmental Impact Assessment needs to involve kilometre adjacent lands, allow input from adjacent landowners concerns and risks, allow independent technical reviews paid for by the aggregate company so the fractured bedrock and local issues are understood and not ignored.

Performance standards and monitoring thresholds established jointly with independent audit and transparency.

At time of assessment conditions and performance standards defined. Data based with access be established.

Trends and thresholds should be reviewed yearly. Changes made if conditions change.

<p>Phase by phase review and audit should be conducted timely.</p> <p>Some cases the requirements for monitoring maybe daily, weekly or monthly depending on the risk potentials.</p> <p>Anything within a kilometre of Bow River and drinking water should have more audits, more levels of thresholds.</p> <p>If over time there are changes or fewer risks, then reporting maybe adjusted. Continuous improvement applied.</p>
Section 9.04 of Performance Standards - consider no tree removal within 100 feet of an adjacent homeowner's occupied property.
No comments
<p>Any Environmental Assessment reports or other documentation / technical reports to support an application for Aggregate Development (or any other type of development applications) should become part of the public record & be available for review / download by members of the public. We understand these types of reports are sometimes withheld from the public as they are considered to be under copyright, however these types of documents should be considered to be covered by the "fair dealing" exception to the Copyright Act, and therefore be available to the public for research, review, etc. provided what is done with the work is 'fair'.</p>
<p>The County should make sure they are not duplicating or overstepping into provincial jurisdiction. The environment and water is heavily regulated by the province, so don't add extra burden or requirements for operators that are outside the Municipal jurisdiction.</p>
Protect Bighills creek, park, nationally significant spring.
Enlarge park to at least 1000 acres
Environmental impact assessment needs to be completed by third-party selected by the County, not operator. Assessment should be reisted during operations (at least bi-annually)
Industry does have some concerns with the overall costs of items such as road upgrades.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING LOCATION CRITERIA?

1. Increase Buffer Zones Around Residential Areas

Current Framework: The proposal establishes a 1.61-kilometre exclusion zone around residential lands within an Area Structure Plan.

Recommendation:

Expand the exclusion zone to at least 2.5 kilometres to provide stronger protection from noise pollution, dust dispersion, and vibrations caused by heavy equipment and blasting.

Conduct wind pattern and air quality modeling to determine the appropriate buffer width based on prevailing wind directions and topographical features.

2. Mandatory Noise Barriers & Windbreaks for Adjacent Communities

Current Framework: The current proposal does not specify mitigation structures for noise and dust control.

Recommendation:

Require noise barriers (berms or acoustic walls) around aggregate sites near residential areas to reduce the impact of continuous machinery operation, blasting, and haul truck noise.

Implement mandatory windbreaks (tree buffers or engineered wind barriers) to prevent fine particulate matter from being carried into surrounding communities and agricultural lands.

Ensure that berms and wind barriers are constructed before operations begin, with ongoing maintenance and expansion as extraction progresses.

3. Strengthen Protections for Provincial Parks & Environmentally Sensitive Areas

Current Framework: The proposal establishes a 2-kilometre buffer around designated provincial parks, which may be reduced to 800 metres if an Area Structure Plan (ASP) is approved.

Recommendation:

Maintain the 2-kilometre minimum buffer for provincial parks without reduction, as ASPs should not override environmental protections.

Expand buffer zones around wetlands, riparian areas, and wildlife corridors to at least 2 kilometres, ensuring aggregate activities do not disrupt ecosystems, groundwater recharge areas, or migratory pathways.

4. Prohibit Aggregate Operations in Areas with Frequent High Winds

Current Framework: There is no wind condition consideration in location criteria.

Recommendation:

Identify areas with high prevailing winds and prohibit aggregate operations in these locations unless enhanced dust suppression measures are implemented.

Require operators to conduct wind pattern analysis before approval is granted to assess how airborne dust will affect neighboring properties.

5. Ensure Cumulative Impact Assessments for Multiple Sites

Current Framework: The location criteria apply to individual projects but do not consider the cumulative impact of multiple nearby aggregate operations.

Recommendation:

<p>Require Cumulative Impact Assessments before new permits are approved, ensuring that multiple pits in the same area do not compound air quality, traffic, and environmental issues beyond acceptable thresholds.</p> <p>Implement limits on the total number of concurrent aggregate sites within a specific region to avoid over-concentration of industrial activity near residential zones.</p>
1.6 km is a joke, it should be 5-10 km.
1.61 km seems very close to residential lands. It's only a 15 minute walk and a 1-2 minute drive. Who would want to buy a house or live this close to a pit?
Again, projects should only be approved where the road structure exists to transport the gravel. Small narrow country roads cannot accommodate heavy truck traffic and endanger the lives of all the traffic using the road.
All ESA require at least 800 meter setbacks.
All good here
All the existing "active" gravel pits should be considered. At the town hall meeting there was zero transparency on maps presented. Several active sites were left off the maps. Facilitators alleged it was and "oversight" residents felt it was a lie. Lack of transparency is beyond disrespectful.
Any plan would be better than none. But is the producer going to pay for that caveat to be put on the surrounding lands. We should be able to do what we want with our lands. They should be able to keep their stuff on their lands without using our lands that border them as a buffer. This is ridiculous
At the recent Council meeting we came to we heard that the ASP restricts ANY gravel pits be approved and developed in the Bearspaw area. Now this is coming up again as if that was a lie. WHAT can we TRUST!!!!
Buffer "time" zones should also be implemented, such that operations are to be limited to 8:00am to 5:00pm.
Consider the CUMULATIVE impact. While at 1.6km I may not be able to hear one gravel pit, if I'm surrounded by them, 1.6km on multiple directions is too close. Also consider groundwater and not just points on a map. It also seems very convenient to me that our small community is exactly outside the exclusion zone (eg exactly the boundary of one pit). Who decides 1.6km is a magic number? Shouldn't geologists, geoscientists, geologists, etc who do NOT represent gravel interests be consulted for a fair and impartial opinion of the impacts? Residents cannot afford to hire these specialists on our own and expect the Country and Regulators to hold operators accountable.
Consider the effects on the residents who will have to deal with the aggregate developments every single day!
Consult property owners and the county residents alike we all have a unified stake in this
Do not understand the variance. It should be the same for both 2 km exclusion buffer zone around any residential land, not the residence but the residential land.

Enforce the minimum 1 mile and also ensure that there is adequate road infrastructure for the trucks - keep the truck routes away from residential areas and make sure the road is strong enough to take the weight of the trucks to avoid rutting and cracking of the pavement. Also ask the RCMP to check the speed of the trucks frequently.
Expand from designated provincial parks to include Regional Parks, and provincially designated Environmentally Significant Areas where the reason for significance could be disturbed by gravel operations (air, noise, water, groundwater, etc.)
Extend the exclusion zones to 3km for residential and 5 km for parks such as Big Hill Springs Provincial.
good. what about people who live outside of an area structure proposal? what about areas where there are lots of houses on a quarter section? there should be some setbacks just like there should be from all environmental areas.
Gravel is present below us in certain spots. The County knows where that it is based upon the present gravel pits. Let the companies that are developing gravel go to work so that projects can move forward. Above recommendations are good but we in Canada are over-regulated to an extreme.
Greater buffer zones. The exclusion zones should be larger, particularly around residential lands.
Honestly, this is a complete joke. 1 mile is not nearly enough. 5 miles would be more of an appropriate minimum. The noise, dust, and traffic would be much more acceptable. There is so much aggregate in the county, I can't for the life of me understand why you are even considering locating these projects close to the city or Bears paw. I know that trucking costs are a large part of the operating costs of the operators, but that is not worth furthering the development close to the city. Please spend some time at the distances being proposed and you will see what we would be having to endure.
Human health protection should be the highest protection level, and therefore the buffer zone should be increased to 2 km.
I agree with the 2 km
I am in agreement.
I would like to see the pit locations to be 1-2 miles from residential homes. My home is 2 miles away from a pit and I see dust all the time in my yard and inside the home. And I don't want to be breathing it in.
I also think pits should be even further away from park areas because these parks are frequented by residents who do not want to dodge large gravel trucks when visiting parks.
I would personally love to see the individuals who want this implemented to actually live out here to deal with the aftermath. The gravel pit has NO business being anywhere near residential areas. They are destroying our way of living (peaceful, rural setting), our health, destroying wildlife, increased traffic of large trucks that have NO business driving through our neighborhoods on a daily basis (of which we currently already witness), and decreasing our home property values.
If the location criteria is set why would we allow any exceptions?

Impact on traffic, particularly along single lane roads that serve as primary roads for residential and school traffic.
Increase exclusion area to a radius of 5 kms around residential areas
It needs to be MUCH farther away from residential areas as the city is growing and will expand closer eventually
Lives of residents living in the area location
more authority given to those directly impacted
Most important would be to stay clear of areas that are any where near country residential development. People have moved into areas such as Bearspaw to enjoy the country residential lifestyle - not gravel crushers, gravel trucks, increased traffic, dust and noise. These properties could easily be used as future country residential acreage developments instead. 1.61 km is not nearly enough gap. The location I would be most concerned about is the Rocky Ridge/ Burma Road corner. Several attempts have been made to develop this into a gravel pit already. Lets spend more time on improving the quality of live there and not creating more traffic, noise, and dust .
Needs to be farther away from residential areas
new gravel pits not approved closer to established residential properties within 2 kilometers
No aggregate within 10 km minimum. Sound travels!! Dust travels!! Trucks speed and drive recklessly. Keep dump trucks away from school bus zones.
No ASP exceptions.
No gravel pits near residential areas
No pits near residential period!
Not near our residence
one think to consider: a council member who is not impacted directly by the pit operations has very little to lose and may be voted out at next term in worst case scenario. A resident in the exclusion zone will have to pay for that decision, and also those that use the provincial park. More authority should be given to those impacted.
Other areas where aggregate can be found
please ensure that the 2km boundary around designated provincial parks is respected and that any reduction requires third-party technical review and no potential environmental impact. Also please add Environmentally Significant Areas and Environmental Reserve Lands as defined by the Province and County as areas requiring the 2km buffer.
Projects need to be staged away from each other and should not have multiple mines open at once. instead they should be staggered based on life of mine.
provide a significant buffer from residents - make sure residents' health is protected from noise, dust, etc.
Proximity to established residential areas. My concern is primarily the Scott Pit. Given that the county has allowed the development of residential acreages bordering the Scott Pit land, it would be inappropriate at this point to have the Scott Pit go ahead - it's just too close to existing residences.

Reduced to even 800 m is too small. Hopefully 0.8 meters is a typo.
Roads locations
Same
<p>Sound and safety set back distances should be in place for all large scale industrial parks. There is no such safe setback for a TransAlta WaterCharger also proposed to be built on the Bow river within 400 meters of a larger community of the CottageClub.</p> <p>RVC appears negligent not to reject such previously approved industrial parks that were previously exempted. Now the AUC allows for RVC input, and these same noise and safety set backs should be in place for all such proposed industrial parks not yet built.</p>
That is plenty for sure! 2 kms from Parks is huge and overkill. 🤪. Most of the land on the outside boundaries of the Parks are private land and the park users shouldn't be on that land?? Big Hill Springs is an example of that! People wandering all over hell on private land!
<p>The 1.6 km exclusion zone is not nearly enough.</p> <p>I live 2.5 to 3 km from the centre of Harmony and we get a LOT of dust from the development going on there.</p> <p>A possible aggregate site is NW of us and the wind blows very hard from the NW. I don't see how 1.6 km is nearly enough distance.</p>
The 1.61 km exclusion is not enough.... listen to residents who currently live in affected areas please!
The 2 km boundary needs to be applied also to all lands under an environmental reserve or protected area, not just provincial parks.
The 2km boundary around designated provincial parks should not be reduced in any circumstance
The above seems to be appropriate.
<p>The county should rely on performance standards not location criteria. Location criteria will sterilize nearly all aggregate deposits in the county. This none renewable resources should be extracted before any permanent land use is considered.</p> <p>It would be irresponsible for the county to sterilize aggregate sources.</p>
The exclusion zone for aggregate development should be greater than 1.61km from residential lands, especially given that a boundary of a provincial park (with no human living there) may be given an even greater set back of 2km.
The exclusion zone for residential should be higher.
<p>The exclusion zone should be a minimum of 3km to residential areas for reason of sound and airborne pollutants dispersions. The distance should be increased to 5 km if place up wind of the residential location.</p> <p>Note above an error 0.8 metres, I believe it was meant to be 0.8 km.</p>
<p>The exclusion zone should be doubled.</p> <p>Traffic analysis should be a fundamental requirement. This could not been the case wrt the Royal Oak area.</p>

Cumulative effects of other gravel, cement, concrete and asphalt plants has to be integral to the location criteria.
The exclusion zones distance needs to be expanded. Not sure how these distances were decided. Gravel truck traffic should be a consideration as well
<p>The first Priority must be home owners who bought property in the country for peace and quiet and not be subjected negative impact of commercial property .</p> <p>This development will also negatively impact property values .and not just 1.6 km away !!</p> <p>It has been made clear by councillors that they don't live near open pit gravel pits .</p> <p>The noise and dust can be unbearable .</p> <p>The impact of 500 truck a day on Burma road and surrounding roads will be dangerous .</p>
The Mountain Afsh proposed pit is fully within the exclusion zone for Big Hill Springs Park.If it is wrong to mine there for the purposes of protecting the park, allowing mining for political reasons does not make sense.
<p>the number of pits needed in Rocky View County. Gravel is not an endangered commodity. Our underground water supply IS threatened.</p> <p>Also consider the noise, dust and creation of a general eyesore when gravel pits are built.</p>
The racial till deposits around NW County are attractive. This is not prime farmland but prime for parks, wildlife, and things that are getting scarce. It is also a gateway to RVC.....do people think it is nice to present our County to others as an industrial park shithole? It looks like we don't employee any planners when we have this sort of thing next to or near to our parks. Parks for All Albertans.
<p>The setbacks around provincial parks should be extended to include all environmentally sensitive areas, especially the Bow and Elbow Rivers and creeks feeding into those rivers.</p> <p>If any reduction of the 2-kilometre setback is to be considered in an ASP, the policy needs to clearly mandate that such a reduction will only be considered if the ASP limits extraction to 4-metres above the water table in the area where the setback has been reduced.</p> <p>The 1.61 km setback for residential lands within ASPs should be expanded to include any residential community with more than a specified number of houses on a quarter section - possibly link it to fragmented quarter sections.</p>
The wind knows now buffer zones. 2km is still too close to residential areas.
There has to be consideration of accumulated number of pits in one area to be considered. Not only is the distance from residence inadequate considering the scope of these archaic open pit mines but you must not ignore the number of similar sites in total. 4 gravel pits 4 times the noise 4 times the dust. Until there is a push to upgrade and invest in technology these open pit mines are a hazard to anyone living near them. As for the proposed gavel pit on Burma road using Conveyer belts -they are not new technology they are prone to breakdowns and when they do breakdown that will put a dangerous number of trucks on a very busy road already (Burma road) already inundated by other gravel trucks.
There needs to be consideration for Location Criteria as 'one size fits all development' does not work. There needs to be a greater buffer for Environmentally sensitive areas.

There should be a minimum setback of at least 800 meters from all ESA's.
There should be a minimum extraction limit of 4 meters above the maximum groundwater level.
There should be a similar buffer zone around the bow river. Expanding or adding new mines in this area is complete nonsense as the water is what allows life for millions of Albertans downstream.
These boundaries are too small. There are places in Rocky View County that simply should not have aggregate development allowed including Bearspaw.
These buffers are ridiculous and are not in place anywhere else in the province. This is a regression and a blatant disregard to the importance of aggregates to the greater Calgary market for the next 50 years.
These buffers could improve the relationship between land owners and park users. Wildlife Corridors and ESA areas should also come under consideration when siting new major land disruptions like gravel mines. This would entail serious efforts to identify key wildlife corridors and ESA lands needing protection. Time is fast running out for the identification and protection of these, making this work imperative so that it can become incorporated into decisions like the siting of gravel mines.
These distances are ridiculous. And by massaging the 2 kilometres down to 800 metres is an additional slap in the face to residents.
All too often politicians have kowtowed to business interest, whether for personal gain or an inability to be on side with residents. It's weak parameters like the above that have rational citizens shaking their heads at the incompetence of policy making process and the lack of belief that what should be done will get done. Including standing up to bully corporations and holding them to account as necessary.
these distances should be increased - existing pits are damaging local residents (who are taxpayers and electors) and who should have the right to live without being damaged by these pit operators
These exclusion zones are not enough if the area is densely populated. Noise and dust travel and any blasting that occurs still has the potential of disrupting water and wells. A couple of the most travelled roads including Burma are narrow and not designed to handle the increase in heavy/large truck traffic.
These exclusion zones are pretty narrow.
These exclusion zones sound small to me. I would not want to be living 1.61 km from a gravel pit - there's no way noise and dust - and traffic - would not be concerns.
These gravel pits require at least 800 meter setbacks from the head water, especially at the Big Hill Springs' head water.
These setbacks are ridiculously too close to residences, lets error on the side of caution and push them out further
These types of operations should not be any where near a residential community.

<p>This might be a good start but there is no protection for those not in an ASP. There are only a few Parks BHSPP, Glenbow and Bragg Creek. At the moment BHSPP has the most opposition and most stakeholders due to visitation. I think the little 70 acre park is not the only consideration. The recharge area and the natural environment around which is the basis of the wildlife corridor need consideration.</p>
<p>this seems very reasonable</p>
<p>This should be increased to a minimum of 5 km.</p>
<p>This should be retroactive as well once this comes into play.</p>
<p>Topography of the site and surrounding area, as well as predominate wind direction should also be considered as these will effect sight lines as well as sound and dust.</p>
<p>Traffic, degradation of natural beauty</p>
<p>We are in an area that theoretically is subject to the development of 3 additional gravel pits, that would put them closer than the 1.61 kilometre exclusion zone. I hope that the county takes that into consideration, as that would truly endanger our way of life, being surrounded by 4 pits, with all that noise, dust, and traffic, and of course the potential harm to our well water system.</p>
<p>Widen the boundaries</p>
<p>Would the 1.61 exclusion zone include a residence on ag land?</p>
<p>I support the above - and stay 5 m above the high groundwater level. The above 1.6 and 2 km boundaries - very very good, do this, no surprises and less endless conflict in long run.</p>
<p>Rockyview Council has a fiduciary responsibility to represent all land owners and downstream water co-ops. Rocky View has a responsible to set up a process that if there is problems that they are rectified quickly effectively and don't impact the cost of adjacent owners.</p> <p>No mining in the water table should occur. If it does, then there needs to be a secure water, pipeline and water coop to the adjacent land owners that are currently being impacted and will be in the future.</p>
<p>I agree with the proposed setbacks.</p> <p>I believe location should be the primary consideration, above all else.</p> <p>Noise and air quality cannot be mitigated sufficiently without distance, specifically from where people live.</p> <p>Please, additionally, the County must ensure that the lands where the Scott Pit is proposed remain within the boundaries of the Bearspaw Area Structure Plan, to nullify future aggregate development at this site.</p>
<p>This project seems so close to parkland and the River.</p>

Stay away from the Bow River altogether. The 1.61km exclusion zone is too narrow for this delicate area. Knowing there is plenty of gravel in RVC to last 200 years, DO NOT allow gravel mining in sensitive areas such as the Bow River, period. If a company or person happens to buy land in a sensitive area and applies for a gravel mining permit, RVC and Council currently seems to feel pressured to permit the mining, saying statements such as "we have to give them something" . But, if a company or person speculated on gravel, that was their risk - RVC and its citizens are not responsible for them. RVC is responsible for the lands and the greater public good. This greater public good must be upheld by RVC admin and Council. The gravel mining can certainly occur within RVC in areas of lesser environmental and public safety risk.
Considering existing residential
No extraction in the residential area
At least 10 km from communities
I disagree with the location overall, in its entirety. The suggested exclusion zones and boundaries are not sufficient residence will be impacted too much.
Increase all buffer zones to a minimum of 10 kilometres. We don't want this kind of development anywhere near residential areas.
A 2+ kilometer boundary
Respect for Rocky View County's Bearspaw Area Structure Plan (BASP) where land that has been designated for future "Country Living Residential" is exactly that! For decades one operator has disrespected both RVC and its residents by applying three times (all rejected) for a gravel pit in the middle of "Country Living Residential" and the land itself designated in the BASP as future "Country Living Residential". This must STOP!
I will say again because of the abundance of aggregate in the RVC County, I see no reason to set up beside our beautiful river, our most important resource and yes more important than aggregate. And it could be years to find out truly how damaging this proposal to be.
Anything next to the Bow River needs to have more detailed reporting, performance thresholds to protect water quality of the drinking water for millions.
No aggregate approval if areas can't be processed in 5 years without Area Structure Plans that protect all land owner interests.
Mandatory setbacks 2km downwind of residential areas, 5km up wind of residential areas, Designate areas where gravel extraction could be considered, sterilise all other ares
15.4 how were the setbacks to the provincial park determined. Can the County provide the policy, technical document or study it was derived from?
15.4 how were the setbacks to the provincial park determined. Can the County provide the policy, technical document or study it was derived from?
This idea really scares me because it could exclude much more aggregate than intended. Please don't sterilize local resources. Consider all aspects of an operation before excluding it from a "buffer" zone.

<p>All previous categories point to the importance of location. Who shares the aquifer, the topography as it affects noise, dust, etc. Also access roads must be taken into account. Must request third party review to be paid for by operators. Refusal of this requirement will automatically cause the refusal of the application.</p> <p>More weight should be given to the credibility of experts who have nothing to gain but the protection of clean water and air than those who represent those with pecuniary interests. Effects on wildlife: large and small mammals, birds, fish, etc. must be taken into account. Recreation: How will contaminated water, poor air quality and heavy industrial equipment noise affect the ability of people to enjoy parks, etc?</p> <p>Cumulative effects: How will additional adjacent pits affect the negative factors being evaluated ie. water quality, noise, air quality, traffic.</p>
Prioritize the resource. Allow for resource extraction before any development
Industry would like to see a mapping of aggregate in the County. More detail of what / where its all available.
Industry understands there is a huge east v west concerns
Where areas are considered to have high levels of quality aggregate, the aggregate should take priority and restrict all development in surrounding area
Locations must consider impacts + not favour the mining ease + financial opportunity of the gravel companies at the expense of the public good.
The Scott Pit has been denied 3 times. The arguments are health & safety of the residents. They proposed pit will be less than 1 kilometre from residents. When is "non means no"?
We may hear about all the proposed means of transportation, but we know, that in the end, it tends to go by the wayside! More gravel, more trucks at Bura, more gravel on the road, more broken wind shields. This affects the lifestyle and the spirit of this community. We moved out here for a quiet country living. Not Gravel Pits!
I would suggest the owners open a gravel pit close to their home and community.
Just because a gravel company (or affiliate e.g Tricycle Lane) buys up land as a strategy to reduce complaints, have control + benefit themselves financially, why does RVC feel the company has to be given what they want? They took the risk to buy. If they aren't following responsible rules + practices and they are shut down + lose, that was their risk they knew owning it. Their causing such negative impacts on neighbouring lands, water security, safety of people, livestock + wildlife needs stronger, strict rules + monitoring, immediate mitigations. RVC has an opportunity now to take a leadership role that promotes responsible gravel mining and protection of the environment that could make RVC a world leader. Or you can take the low-road + give-in, keep the status quo, and give lip-service to aggregate. Please choose the former.
I don't think 1.61 km buffer is enough. How was that determined?
If 2.0 km for provincial parks, why only 1.6 km for residential areas and residents?
Isn't insanity doing the same thing over + over expecting different results - give us a break.
Calgary benefits at expense / inconvenience of County residents.
Buffer should be larger, 2-3 kilometre

How was the 1.61 kilometre exclusion zone established? Should be greater, at least 5 km. Ground water for wells can be affected.
Greater buffer zone for residential areas, farms, wildlife
Need for buffer bow, elbow rivers (waterways). Must protect from contaminants. It is no excuse to say "not our jurisdiction". Must advocate.
There should be a comparable buffer around any water well for humans and livestock
Should not be able to reduce 2 km buffer zone for parks.
Hold tight to the 1.6 kilometre exclusion zone around the park.
There should not be the possibility to reduce 2 km at park.
There should be a buffer to protect Bow River and other waterways from contaminants.
Comparable buffers for Bow & Elbow Rivers
Need monitoring upstream + downstream.
Need protection for residents who are not in a perfect ASP. Agricultural land uses
Need reclamation standards + plans. Prevent contaminated soils.
It is unclear how an ASP would apply within the 2 km blue buffer created? 800 metres is not enough of a buffer around the park and/or ravines (topography) that feeds/downhill to the springs!
What about residential neighbourhoods outside an ASP? What will the set-backs be in those areas?
Cochrane North; Cochrane Lake ASP, are in desperate need of an update.
My understanding is that Heidelberg plans on having a gravel pit 1 km north west of Weedon Trail, highway 22. Even with a buffer zone it is too close. Traffic, dust, water, property value affected will be bad for those on Weedon Trail
Under NO circumstances should development be allowed within 2 km of a provincial park.
Before aggregate approval, need to plan area ASP for highest + best use for all.
Setbacks are needed for all residential properties.
Buffer zone around water is not big enough. All pits should be moved from the water.
Agland is used for pit development so the 1.61 kilometre buffer for residential lands does not prevent parallel pit operations. Need to address pits side by side!
We will do what we can with performance standards, the Location Criteria is too far.
It is a matter of what is reasonable.
Gravel pits don't last forever.
We need to go where the gravel is.
I would like to see the location criteria removed completely, we have to go where the gravel is.
The location criteria forgets about Agriculture land.
The east knows that we need gravel. Operators are the same on the east and the west, the only think different is the people.
It is the opposition to new sites. Opposition comes from small landowners. They permit process is creating too much conflict. I don't know how to deescalate that.
Why would you allow new development where you know gravel is?

The gravel should have been taken out before the residents went in. And that is how it should continue.
Can you create an ASP that says nothing can be built until the gravel is extracted?
There is always County discretion to relax.
This would be the first significant buffer zone I have seen like this.
This is not even compliant with the South Saskatchewan Regional Plans.
All of the hierarchy of plans above Rocky View County are supporting aggregate.
Leave it up to Alberta Environment to decide.
I don't get the provincial park setback. There are gravel pits in the Banff national park and they operate just fine.
Scrap location criteria.
If you have a quarter section, put your crusher right in the middle.
Buffer zones are too wide.
Have a mechanism to properly consider the unique aspects of the area, where a site would be planned. There is very different geology and you can't use averaged out information in a highly sensitive areas.
The rights to do what others want impacts our rights to do what we want.
Do you give Burnco 6km of the Bow River when these problems are happening?
Buffer zones will concentrate residential development within them. What happens when development encroaches on a buffer zone.
This County should stand up and make a worldwide improvement.
Make newcomers aware when they move to the County of the possibility of aggregate development.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING PROACTIVE MONITORING, REPORTING, AND ENFORCEMENT?

1. Independent, Third-Party Inspections

Current Framework: The bylaw stipulates that the County or an appointed third party will conduct site visits to assess compliance.

Recommendation: To ensure impartiality and build public trust, I suggest mandating that all inspections be carried out by independent, accredited third-party professionals. This approach minimizes potential conflicts of interest and provides unbiased assessments of compliance.

2. Transparent Reporting and Public Accessibility

Current Framework: Post-inspection, the County provides operators with a compliance report, which is retained for public inspection for a minimum of ten years.

Recommendation: Enhance transparency by making these compliance reports readily accessible to the public through an online portal. This platform should allow residents to review inspection outcomes, track enforcement actions, and stay informed about the operational status of aggregate sites in their community.

3. Comprehensive Complaint Response Mechanism

Current Framework: The bylaw allows for additional inspections if complaints are substantiated.

Recommendation: Establish a clear, accessible, and well-publicized process for residents to file complaints. This system should include:

Multiple channels for submission (e.g., online forms, phone lines, in-person).

Timely acknowledgment and investigation of complaints.

Regular updates to the complainant on the status and resolution of their concern.

4. Defined Enforcement Actions and Penalties

Current Framework: Operators found non-compliant are required to rectify issues within an agreed timeframe, with potential referral to the County's Enforcement Services for further action if non-compliance persists.

Recommendation: Clearly outline a graduated enforcement protocol that specifies:

The range of penalties for various non-compliance levels, including fines, operational suspensions, or permit revocations.

Timelines for corrective actions.

Criteria for escalating enforcement measures.

5. Cost Recovery and Funding for Monitoring Activities

Current Framework: The bylaw indicates that operators are responsible for fees associated with compliance visits, as detailed in the County's Master Rates Bylaw.

Recommendation: Ensure that the fee structure:

Adequately covers all costs related to inspections, reporting, and enforcement.

Is reviewed regularly to remain fair and reflective of actual expenses.

Includes provisions for additional fees in cases requiring repeated inspections due to ongoing non-compliance.

6. Regular Review and Update of Performance Standards

Current Framework: The bylaw enforces compliance with existing performance standards.

Recommendation: Implement a schedule for periodic review and, if necessary, revision of performance standards to align with evolving industry best practices, technological advancements, and community expectations.

actual and continual monitoring power given to those actually impacted by offenders
Actual enforcement and more power given to those that have lives effected by offenders.
All inspections for aggregate sites should be unannounced during the year, so the assessments can be conducted without additional preparation by the developer. Fees should escalate after each violation; after 5 violations the site should be closed for a mandatory 6 month period.
As responsible as the industry has portrayed itself you need an enforcement officer armed with ticket books and likely a six gun at every pit entrance. After that their lawyers will waste all our tax dollars. better to let farmers and ranchers do the mining like when they built this hisar in the first place.
Compensation from the Aggregate operators - both in financial terms, and also in "time" terms (ie. a complete shut down of operations for non-compliance)
Compliance enforcement- standards don't matter when companies choose to move ahead with infractions and just pay the fines. Operations should be shut down rather than just fines issued.
Continuous monitoring should be implemented. Spot inspections too.
Do random checks outside of the four visits in the close neighborhood of the site.
Drive behaviour - if standards exceeded shut down immediate - do not get to keep operating
Enforcement would be a joke. The time for action is before the operations are allowed to be located anywhere near country residential subdivisions.
Ensure that the County can pull in additional resources from outside parties for inspections as personnel and resources are limited. Be able to enact STOP-WORK action by County personnel or inspection third parties as needed immediately. Post compliance monitoring publicly for transparency.
Ensure that the people doing the inspections are qualified to conduct audits, and that the details of the inspections are made public.
Evidence of a willingness to respond to complaints! What measures must a resident go to to be heard? If there's a problem, one deserves to be heard! What will be done to rectify non-compliance? It's one thing to tell a multi-national corporation that they're non-compliant with local laws, it's another thing to make them care.
Fewer pits within a certain area with surrounding land owners. We have four within a couple of miles!!!!
Fine but close the site down until they confirm and have had an inspection
Fines are viewed by many as a cost of doing business. The best enforcement is an unscheduled inspection. Multiple infractions should be serious and lead to suspension or loss of DP. As residents we know all these players play hardball. Have tons of money and lawyers and politicians in the bag. You can't play nice with them. They don't worry about our feelings or losses so they should understand it is not their right to have the business but treat it as a privilege.
Full disclosure on Councilors vested interest in the projects.

Gravel extraction should not be adjacent to residential developments.
How does the county substantiate a complaint?
I believe that the county is the best suited to monitor and enforce operational standards that the residents need. The county is very supportive and reactive to residents and residents are "on the ground" and are the first to see and report issues.
I would like to see the cleanliness of the roads and falling debris/rocks from trucks as part of the monitoring process.
I think that random drone overflights with LIDAR and photography should be used to monitor these mining activities. There should also be significant fines for non compliance. An RVC
I think that there needs to be a two sided criteria when the county is doing inspections. There are people who are unable to be pleased, no matter what. This should be considered as a possibility when investigating.
If a site is found to not be in compliance, operators shall immediately completely shut down operations for an equivalent amount of time that the complaint, inspection, and review process took to conduct.
If non-compliance is not rectified, the site is shut down.
If they don't comply shut them down!!! Adopt a three strikes rule. Listen to the surrounding residents!!! Appoint an immediate resident to your committee.
Include consequences for noncompliance.
Increase the schedule of inspections with severe penalties for non-compliance
Inspections should be conducted monthly...bimonthly at the most.
inspections should be regular
Inspections should not be "scheduled" but should be without notice to the operator. Additional inspections should be at the discretion of the County presumable based on credible complaints or otherwise but it should not be a condition of additional inspections that the complaints must b "substantiated" whatever that means. Looks like this language was drafted by the operators. Inspection reports and complaints must be publicly available. Timelines for any rectification must be established and sanctions for failure to rectify such as shutting down the mine until it comes into compliance are required.
Inspections should not be expected by operators as this will open the system to corruption. Inspections must be random and unexpected in order to be trusted.
It has been proven that no matter the bylaws that are put in place, aggregate sites are not healthy for humans, for the environment, or for wildlife.
It is not only the site, but the area around the site and the operations of the site in reference to vehicle movement.
I've seen the STAR pit blatantly disregard operating hour restrictions. Offenders need to be shut down until non-compliance is rectified
Keep out of neighborhoods. I see the lack of enforcement
Keep this a priority yo protect the residents and properties

Lighting Plan must ensure there is no light pollution at night so that residents can continue to enjoy the clear sky star views. All lights should be directed downwards and not create ambient lighting.
hours of operation should be reduced from 6am - 7pm to 7am -6pm. weekdays.
monitoring should be done without notice and there need to be serious repercussions for violations. These large companies need to know they need to protect the land we all share.
Monitoring, who is going to monitor, if the only monitoring is going to be complaints that isnt going to work.
More transparency, results easily available to review.
Must have full time staff to monitor and visit existing sites
Need to be continous monitored to standards. The current complain system does not work for same day compliance. And favors the operator to lazyness.
neutral 3rd party engagement paid for by the gravel folks
Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bearspaw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.
Only four inspections? Probably need more.
Our big concern is about water. Water is complex, moving around under the earth. When it is drained away by a gravel pit, new liquids/gasses fill the vacuum. How does a developer or regulator monitor impact when water table is toyed with to access aggregate?
People before corporations that could care less about adding anything to the community. They will destroy the roads and tax payers will be on the hook for it and they roads will be in a constant state of disrepair and dirty, muddy and gravel riddled with no clean up. A way of responding to noise complaints effectively.
Random drone overflights with LIDAR and photography must be used to monitor mine activities. Fines for noncompliance.
Random site visits and inspections should be done on a regular basis to ensure compliance with approved plans and regulations. Fines for non-compliance.
Reporting and access to data must be required to ensure proper enforcement is being made.
Require operator employed/contracted Environmental Coordinator to be on site (similar to AER and CER requirements) to ensure environmental requirements are implemented and met (see comment for "Environmental Requirements")
How will complaints be substantiated without conducting an inspection? Detail this please.
Requirements for administrative or other penalties for excessive or continued non-compliance?
Residential area close to sites
Residents need to be notified of the 4 inspections and the results sent to residents. Often inpections are sent by the wayside for lack of resourses.

Safety Issue - Maybe there should be a video monitoring system that fines drivers who fail to come to full stops and/or cut into the line of traffic. The rest of us have to come to complete stops. That's probably better than having a police presence all the time.

Financial issue - Loose gravel on the roads have caused considerable damage to my vehicles - trucks could have clear identification markers on them so we can report incidents to some sort of advisory board and have these drivers or the board cover the cost of windshield and vehicle damage.

Dust/Noise/traffic issue - I'm far enough away where I live that dust or noise or traffic does not impact me but those close to these sites must not like it. Some type of dust and noise monitoring should be implemented.

Struck monitors which doesn't change in a few years

Sure! This is a joke!

That is fine, if the business is inspected 4 times a year that is more than other types of business.

The ability to levy meaningful penalties when non-compliance is found.

The County can inform all operations that any complaints and responses for air quality issues, Calgary Region Airshed Zone Society is available and willing to work with all parties.

The dust on 85 st across the Remand center is seldomly contained and monitored.

there has to be additional random inspection in the first couple of years and after a complaint is received. they shouldn't all be planned. if found in non-compliance then they need to be fined in a progressive way.

There should be substantial incremental fines for violations, the fines need to be substantial as this industry just laughs off small financial fines.

they are digging too deep which will affect the local water table

This bylaw needs to be written in a manner that makes it enforceable and not up for interpretation. For example, the text includes 'contravention of any relevant conditions'. What is a relevant condition?

This is a great addition.

This is great for aggregate sites in general however this one should not be built inside long developed rural residential properties.

This is the same idea of taking action after the horse has escaped the barn.

Again, rectifying things after the damage means little to nothing to large corporations. Large scale fines should be levied and/or revocation of the gravel extraction licence should come into force.

This process is doomed to fail. Too much subjectivity in this plan as residents could lodge endless numbers of complaints without actual reasonings. If anything, inspections should be done concurrently with AEPA.

This seems comprehensive.

This sounds great

We have had limited issues east of Crossfield with our gravel pits. Still would like to ensure they follow the rules and clean up their weeds but we haven't had any issues with the operations near us.

<p>What about fines for noncompliance, Automatic shutdown orders with non compliance. Yes I do believe they are not interested in innovation or improvement in their industry, yes I do believe they have to be pushed to do better.</p>
<p>What does 'rectify areas of non compliance' mean? It seems to have no teeth. The only way these companies will adhere to strict rules about noise, dust, groundwater control, etc is through rigorous and surprise enforcement. And the penalties have to be substantive enough to change their behaviour or they just view it as a `cost of doing business'. Residents are a nuisance to them. Penalties need to be stiff fines, requirement to pay for residential water monitoring and testing and written and regular communication with residents re what they are doing to eliminate their presence from our day to day lives.</p>
<p>Where and how will non-compliance be tracked and reported for residence to stay informed?</p>
<p>While the county may need to provide prior notice for its scheduled inspections, the amount of notice needs to be minimized to avoid pre-inspection "clean-ups". There should be clear penalties in the site monitoring bylaw for non-compliance that increase significantly for repeat offences - a three strikes and you're out approach should be used: first finding of non-compliance results in a specified penalty, second offence, a tripling of the penalty, third offence, a mandatory shut-down until the cause of non-compliance has been rectified.</p>
<p>Who are you kidding! You don't listen to residents and you do what You want such as going ahead with the Proposed gravel pit just west of Big Hill Springs. Shame on you.</p>
<p>Will resident feedback (complaints) be considered?</p>
<p>Rates Charged by County to Aggregate Site Operators, item 8 - ogod plan, very good. We all need gravel for construction but let it been done in an open transparent manner with all aspects of impacts addressed and publically reviewed. This will save time and dollars over the long run - AND ensure pits are NOT built where risk and reality of envir impacts are too great.</p>
<p>An agreed online proactive monitoring system that services the gravel and the adjacent land owners needs to be mutually agreed to and audited. Proper thresholds, risks and reporting of risks and trends need to be agreed by RV, aggregate and neighbours. Every four years practises and monitoring need to be reviewed and updated to ensure compliance and best practises</p>

Some of inspections each year must be unscheduled and random despite what the Province might say - advocate for change to that ridiculous "rule". If Health inspectors only inspect restaurants on scheduled visits, how many infractions would they find compared to daily occurrences and how well does that protect the public?? The same goes for inspections of gravel mines where toxicity and contamination of soil, air and water are at play.

Monitoring and report review must be independent 3rd party by experts who can truly see and properly read/understand the documents as to what is going on and look for the tricks the gravel companies use. For example, Burnco's well hydrocarbon contamination results that were within safe levels were reported at the beginning of their document, yet the hydrocarbon contamination levels that were above safety levels were buried much later in their document. RVC Admin, Council, and the public deserve honesty, clarity, readability and transparency. We do not deserve tricks like this. It is disrespectful and undermines our ability to trust them. If RVC lets them get away with such actions, the public can't trust RVC Admin or Council either.

Updated monitoring such as dye-tracing, drone overflights, real-time remote monitoring/reporting must be incorporated - these technologies exist do not need to be expensive, save costs on manpower and the budget, and give the public the transparency they deserve.

Enforcement should take place regularly to encourage compliance. All complaints should be investigated and operations put on hold until the investigation is completed. Most complaints are based on real issues faced by neighbouring landowners. Most complaints can be substantiated if monitoring and proper investigation is done in a timely manner and non-compliance enforced and publicly reported.

A slap on the wrist? Fines need to be significant and harsh.

How many times per year? How seriously will complaints be taken, really?

Unannounced site visits and aerial monitoring to effectively monitor mine activities. RVC to engage third part expertise and resources to monitor operations, at operator expense. All monitoring to be placed in the public domain, for transparency. All non-compliance must be fined, large enough to be an effective deterrent. To stop/close operations must also be an enforcement tool, for RVC, until any infractions have been remedied and to ensure future compliance.

I strongly feel that the inspections should be RANDOM! Third party! And someone who is knowledgeable of the Aggregate world!! Who knows what to look for.

Standards should vary based on risks.

Higher for pits:

- near Bow River, important water bodies, even private springs, wetlands, creeks.
- mining in water aquifer.

- mining in faulted, fractured, complex hydrogeological areas, near "Coalspur" regions

Standards should be reviewed minimum every five years and after independent audits reveal issues or adjacent lands are impacted.

County should develop a compliance and issue plan when adjacent landowners discover compliance issues.

Now water level or quality issues are left unresolved and land owners have to employ consultants and lawyers to try to address.

Water should be replaced immediately for residences and agriculture properties impacted. Long term a water pipeline and water cooperative need to be provided by the aggregate company and Rocky View Council who approve the development. This is critical if Rocky View Council intends to approve even a quarter expansion for Burnco Cochrane West. Be responsible ensure existing contamination and issues fixed as per Development permits, before approving any more extraction, proceeding or changes.

Automated monitoring of noise and partial pollution, link to an automated immediate operation shutdown on violation

How does the County intend to deal with nuisance complaints? It is unreasonable to expect Operators acting in good faith and meeting their requirements to pay for bylaw visitation.

Inspections make sense, but I saw a line in the Bylaw that said the County can charge a fee for these inspections. That doesn't seem fair and sounds like a money grab. Operators already pay a levy for the material they excavate, so why increase the fees even more? Are you trying to put these operators out of business by bankrupting them? If so, I and many others would lose my job and the local County residents would have to pay a lot more to have their aggregate trucked in from other Counties.

Industry feels like the cost to inspect should be a 50-50 split with the County to ensure there is some stake by both parties.

Feels that the CAP levy payments should be put into a pool to pay for inspections

Indsury considered the concept of doing as ASGA based internal review / inspection of sites

The monitoring must be transparent to the public.

I disagree that inspections are scheduled. I believe there is enough history of gravel companies operating poorly that the random inspections are warranted + necessary

Monitoring + reporting in sensitive areas must be monthly or as often as necessary. Quarterly is not enough. How can the County ensure a damaging act is stopped + mitigations started if the monitoring / reporting is not transparent and in real time?

Consider leaving us alone and respecting our homes!

Need to change "are responsible" to "shall"

Make pits clean roads better

Don't rely on pre-scheduled inspections. Should be random and unannounced.

Count should install + monitor 24-hour noise + air quality monitors at prescribed locations at gravel pit boundaries. Data collection should be continuous, and should be available to the public.

Should be allowances for site specific tests for individual residences.
Repeat offenders should have their pits shut down and/or development permit revoked.
Apply escalating fines for non-compliance.
Does anyone remember [REDACTED]???
Frequent monitoring + sampling of water (ground) + air emissions by independent third party.
Not allowing removal of gravel below the watertable.
RVC standards to specify noise levels standards at nearest residence / similar to what AB AER does for oil & gas operators. Enforce the installation of noise abatement measures until standards met.
What, if anything, will the standards provide for. Cases of non-compliance, cases of repeated non-compliance. Will they be used to issue stop work orders?
Strict rules needed for: timelines, and thorough best practice rectifications of non-compliance.
Are those inspections pre-determined or unannounced?
Is the effect to housing cost, roads and all building materials being considered when giving 3rd parties a blank cheque.
Operation should not be given prior notice of inspections. They should be allowed to inspect without notice at any time.
Inspections must include random visits as well. We know what happens for scheduled inspections.
What is required to substantiate a complaint?
Requirements should allow for random inspections without notice.
What is being done to ensure that water table / aquifers are not impacted? There needs to be more site-specific independent investigation to prevent contamination. Once the aquifer where we draw our drinking water from is contaminated - it's too late.
Use independent 3rd party inspectors. Will improve confidence of residents.
How do you substantiate a complaint? Should that be outlined in the plan.
How can we (residents) get more transparency as to where operations are at?
There needs to be consequences for non-compliance. Slap on the wrist treatment will not discourage poor management.
Monitoring of water and air quality must include water at nearby farms. And air monitoring which accounts for out high winds in the area. Cannot only monitor the site itself.
How do you ensure the neutrality / veracity of inspectors?

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING RECLAMATION STANDARDS?

1. Strengthening Long-Term Post-Reclamation Land Use Planning

Current Framework: The County requires an alternative plan after five years of inactivity, but additional clarity is needed on how post-reclamation land use is determined.

Recommendation:

Require operators to provide a detailed post-reclamation land use strategy, including options such as agricultural use, reforestation, or public green space to align with community and environmental priorities.

Implement a public consultation process where residents and stakeholders can provide input on the intended future use of the land, ensuring the site serves a beneficial long-term purpose for the community.

2. Ensuring Water Table & Wetland Restoration Post-Extraction

Current Framework: The County aligns reclamation with provincial regulations, but there is no clear local policy on water table and wetland restoration.

Recommendation:

Require hydrogeological assessments as part of the reclamation process to ensure that groundwater recharge and natural water flow patterns are restored.

Implement wetland compensation policies, requiring that if wetlands are impacted, an equal or greater amount of wetland area be restored within the County.

3. Enhanced Monitoring & Enforcement for Compliance

Current Framework: The County requires financial security for reclamation efforts and has enforcement measures in place, but transparency on compliance reporting could be improved.

Recommendation:

Require annual reclamation progress reports to be publicly accessible, ensuring that the community can track ongoing efforts and hold operators accountable.

Establish a public reporting mechanism where residents can submit concerns about non-compliance, triggering an official review.

5 years is way too long.

a good start - pits shouldn't be able to damage their neighbours - set reasonable standards and police it

A mandatory reserve fund creation to set aside funds for reclamation, so taxpayers aren't left footing bill for reclamation once site is abandoned

A sufficient monetary bond or security must be maintained and proof provided, to ensure that all reclamation costs are covered by the Operator. Organic soil's and till must be restored to the same quality and thickness as a minimum requirement. The reclaimed area must be re-vegetated to a sustainable condition and in an environmentally compatible manner with the surrounding lands and with recognition of the environmental assessment requirements and conditions.

A revised ground water management plan, including monitoring, must be submitted for the reclaimed area, to ensure that it is sustainable and environmentally appropriate.

Again, the success of implementation will depend on having an assessment team able to maintain inspections. In order to ensure reclamation is carried out, each mine must be required to submit a reclamation fund prior to operating approval.

<p>Again... keep it out of neighbourhoods and there would be no need for reclamation. I would suggest you come and visit the scott pit on a windy school/work day and experience the frustration of residents that have to contend with the pit.</p> <p>When the pit first started, there were few homes or neighbourhoods. 40 some years later, the increase in both city and Bearspaw development should be heavily considered.</p>
<p>All county residents within a 5 mile radius should have input on the reclamation plan. Once residents have agreed to a reclamation plan with the developer - since residents have to look at it for the rest of their lives on their property - the developer must follow through with the standard. Deviation from the plan should result in fees, by the county, that are directed to those most impacted. Furthermore, any future development aspirations by the developer would not be considered until the reclamation standard had been met.</p>
<p>All old gravel pits eventually turn into high density housing. look no further than Cochrane. they will never turn back to farm land Ha ha ha what as silly question.</p>
<p>As for reclamation, plans for such things should be done, only, by an independent third party (potentially selected by a citizens group involved with this concern—not untrustworthy organizations like Alberta Environment or politicians who may have bias or a vested interest). Any reclamation must be carried out in full and under the guidance of the independent third party (mentioned above) and paid in full by the operator in question.</p> <p>Relying on operators to assess the monitoring of air and water, or reclamation of lands—is like allowing criminals to decide whether they have broken the law or not.</p> <p>Any and all of these measures should be paid for by the pit operators in full.</p>
<p>Bonds must be put up front to cover the cost of reclamation.</p>
<p>choose location carefully, do not allow a pit to impact existing residents</p>
<p>Ensure all liability for reclamation is with the gravel pit owner.</p>
<p>Ensure proper protection of groundwater aquifers.</p>
<p>five years is to long for an unused site, if they are not using it they are not going to go back and use it so it should be cleaned up and re-purposed, within 3 year max.</p>
<p>Full assessment of the application</p>
<p>good</p>
<p>have a good plan that benefits the community when extraction is done.</p>
<p>I am in agreement with the above.</p>
<p>I think all the money should be collected upfront for the reclamation, that way if the business falls apart or goes under the money to reclaim the area is already there in a trust.</p>
<p>If an operator does not follow through, will the taxpayers bear the costs of reclamation similar to the orphan oil wells that now exist in Alberta?</p>
<p>Implement firm timelines for continuous reclamation, minimizing unreclaimed open pit area. Require a provincial reclamation certificate prior to release of a "safe operations and reclamation bond" to ensure sites are operated and reclaimed to county standards</p>
<p>Include closure funds or bonds as a requirement for initiating a pit. Ensure that the end use plan protects groundwater, consider post-closure monitoring plans as well.</p>

Independent, professional review of any Reclamation Plans.
Its not even possible for reclamation. Its a fallacy
Lack of conservation of reclamation materials has been a common management failure amongst aggregate sites. Operational practices often trump adherence to reclamation practices. Best management practices are not always implemented, causing further impacts to human activity and the environment. Proponents should be required to consult on reclamation practices to ensure the aesthetics and natural habitat is restored to the previous condition; furthermore, recessed areas should be filled in completely. Prior to receiving an operating permit, proponents should be required to have in place closure and reclamation best management practices. The County should be responsible for ensuring that these plans are completed so that normal habitat and human activity can thrive again off the impacted area.
Leave it as you got it....
Maybe sooner than 5 years! A lot if soil can erode fairly quickly!! It is important that an erosion prevention plan be in place to ensure we don't have dust bowls blowing across Rocky View before the 5 years is up!
Native grasslands, etc. can never be properly reclaimed and should not be allowed to be used as sites; all reclamation should be done with native plants and with minimal use of herbicides (i.e. industry must adhere to environmental standards when doing reclamation.)
no more than 20 acres open at a time. the S.T.A.R. pit has way too much land open and is allowed by the province. the county can do better.
No sure
Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bearspaw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to any of the pollutants and environmental impacts of the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.
Ongoing reclamation should be a consideration.
Ongoing, never more than 25 acres open at a time. Overburden to be replaced with equivalent depth removed.
Organic soil's and till must be the same quality and thickness as original. Ground water monitoring must continue for at least five years and the until approved by RVC.
Overkill again. Duplication with provincial responsibilities. Reclamation is provincial jurisdiction under EPEA. Submission and disclosure to RVC as part of an application to AEPA and RVC is fine
Oversight management and reporting are critical. Ensuring that the standards are updated as legally required.
Performance bond needs to be required to meet any costs related to site reclamation.
Permanent reclamation is under jurisdiction of Alberta Environment and Protected Areas through Code of Practice for Pits. The county should restrict their interest to interim reclamation only.
Public review of the reclamation. Hard to make a pit 150 feet deep into something that looks good.
Reclamation implies returning the land to its original land use. Aggregate extraction is the removal of a thick protective filter pack, and protection of the underlying soils and groundwater with thin cover is not adequate. Proper reclamation plans, including adequate bonds must be in place. Suggest smaller scale extraction pits, limiting the extensive multi-decade extractions. The

extractions must be monitored as they go at smaller scales to assess and mitigate environmental impacts.
Reclamation is always put off cause it is super expensive. We would like to see the original agreements held to, rather than changed every 5 years through the operating permit. This is ridiculous that we have to fight a gravel pit changing there size every 5 years. Where they can change the open pit size to reduce reclamation. Reclamation should be done after the resource is used. This is not helping country residents.
Reclamation is not enforced currently so enforcement is and has always been the issue.
Reclamation needs to occur on an ongoing basis over the life of the mine. Once a specific physical area has been mined it needs to be reclaimed. Operators need to post bonds or other security to ensure reclamation is carried out and we don't have a repeat of the orphan well fiasco.
Stop rapid expansion as not needed and can be done in slower safer stages. Preventative safety stages, avoids a massive huge reclamation problem in the end.
The county should take a percentage of yearly profits and hold the funds and manage the reclamation. Do you remember the Cochrane diamond railway site issues and orphan oil wells. When the profit is gone so are the companies
<p>The industry's own standards say that the very deep pits like we have can't be reclaimed to anything very useful. That worries most.</p> <p>We also worry about size of open areas before reclaiming. Rather than a phased approach we should have progressive mining. Smaller scale.</p> <p>I am hugely concerned about the duration of these pits. 30/50/100 years of mining in the same area is far too disruptive to residents. 5-10 years max.</p>
The land must be returned to its original quality: organic soil and till. Ground water monitoring must be continued for at least 5 years for sediments will continue leaching for some time.
the operators should deposit an amount annually with the County or with lawyers so that if they go bankrupt there is still money to reclaim the land
The performance standards indicate what details must be included within the submitted plan but no metrics that must be met within the plan. Are these to be reviewed and approved by the County? What are the implications if the reclamation plan is not followed? Who enforces this?
The reclamation plan needs to be suitable and acceptable for the area not just a plan that detracts from the community.
The reclamation plan should be done in accordance with input from the surrounding landowners.
<p>The wording in the performance standards does not make interim reclamation plans mandatory - they should be. The performance standards need to mandate progressive reclamation as a condition to move into subsequent phases of extraction.</p> <p>The reclamation plan must demonstrate that the reclaimed areas will have sufficient overburden/topsoil to ensure groundwater quality. Reclaimed areas within an operating pit should not be used for pit operations.</p>
There are many fantastic uses for the pits when they are done with extraction. They should be agreed upon with local community prior to starting extraction operations.

there is no putting the gravel pit back in the 200' hole created by extracting the gravel. choose carefully to no allow such a hole dug right next to existing residents. and 1800m set back should be implemented to keep an unsightly hole to be there for the next thousand years.

We owe it to future generations to reclaim to better standards to what it started as. We should be improving our land, not only maintaining it.

As the auditor general advised, there is no audit or progressive reclamation occurring in the majority of gravel pits in Alberta. This is a huge risk to the taxpayer like the orphan well program. Council improvement 1 acre or one phase open and then reclaim. Now there is to be 40 acres open and 48 acres for processing that's not the same as what council approved. Check out Burnco in his pit and spring bang pit. The opening extraction areas are significant larger, and there is no progressive Reclamation to previous standards. As one counsellor said Burnco mines then weights for a residential or some other development. Like the Town Of Cochrane Burnco pit becomes a gravel pad for residential and commercial development. Cochrane West Gravel Pit was to be mind and reclaimed to agriculture and proper drainage. This is not occurring.. There is no audit or compliance.

In the Burnco West Cochrane pit example, we all know their sister company is a developer company and houses go on the expired gravel pit yet this pit's documents say they will reclaim to "agriculture". all photos I have seen of Burnco's "reclamation" within RVC shows gravel pads and water filled holes, not proper reclamation. How can the pubic trust RVC and Burnco with reports like this ("agriculture" when houses/development is actually planned) being passed? These discrepancies must be called out. This Pit being 500 meters from the Bow River and the heavy metal contamination risks that result from the bedrock thrust faults along the Coalspur Formation, for RVC to allow the insufficient reclamation that can result in the contamination being sped up and increased into the Bow River is truly unethical and criminal by many parties, RVC included. Please insist on the highest standards, not minimum standards of EXISTING pits, not just new applications - there are too many risks from leaving old permits to continue without re-direction to improved behavior.

Is RVC going to contribute to the pathetic statistics in the Auditor General's Nov 2019 report entitled Management of Sand and Gravel Pits Followup or is RVC going to take a strong stand and leadership role with strict rules and enforcement of reclamation?

The gravel company deposits to RVC for reclamation must be vetted by RVC as realistic to cover reclamation should the company fall short on their reclamation. Costs SHOULD NOT go to the residents/Alberta tax payers. If you take Oil and gas as an example, later mitigation costs can be millions of dollars. The public should NOT be bearing these costs for sloppy, incomplete, or ineffective gravel mining. In the case the Burnco Cochrane West pit, their impacts on neighbouring lands and the Bow River are serious. If their reclamation is not sufficiently deep AND of the correct mix of soil (versus the sand/clay they are planning now that will let toxins flow into the Bow River) the costs are drastic and some toxins CANNOT be removed from the drinking water. Reclamation is a very serious matter.

Not sure

Well done - the problem is that reclamation should be done in one area before another area is started. How is reclamation enforced if a company is bankrupt? Does the community require a bond to clean up abandoned sites?

This is of no consequence to me. What is being proposed will not impact me as I will be dead by the time reclamation is required.

Preliminary contributions to cover total escalating restoration costs at any point of the pit's existence. Bankruptcy & insolvency should not leave the general public to pay for restoration. Implications of surrounding property values should be taken into account and neighbors shielded from & compensated for loss of property values because of a pit and anything associated with it's operation and demise.

Aggregate extraction requires the removal of large amounts of overlying burden, including a thick layer of protective soils, in turn, protecting underlying soils. Reclamation suggests returning the land back to its original land use. This means that all overlying burden, including the thick protective layer and all underlying soils are replaced to their original thickness. A thin veneer of soil is not reclamation. To ensure enforcement a "toll" should be levied on all gravel production, over the life of the mine (front end loaded), and all receipts held by an independent third party to ensure adequate funding is available for full reclamation at end of mine life.

Once again I was involved in the Aggregate world for about ten years and got to see a different angle to what actually goes on. I was very lucky in that I worked with a small responsible Aggregate company. They were amazing with the Reclamation and passed with flying colors. I was there personally with the Reclamation testhole research team. They were very impressed and said it was unusual. Others were not so lucky and couldn't afford to take their aggregate companies to court.

Is Burnco actually going to reclaim or is it proposed for housing, thus they won't have to do it. Will the ground water in that area be contaminated?

Also the Reclamation deposit should be very high to cover all reclamation cost plus possible unknowns. Albertans should not have to pay for a Corporations lack of Integrity. Also reclamation be carried out when both extraction and processing reach the forty acre limit(which includes the 7.5 acre wash area).

Check out what is happening at Indus Burnco site, Burnco Springbank site... Auditor General report. lack of audit, compliance and risks.

Expansion beyond Rocky View 40 acres for aggregate processing and extraction occurs without any audit.

Putting wash ponds with sandy clay liners, then not testing water quality when aggregate annual reports show contaminants above health standards, very risky! Only independent consultants checking.

Rocky View, Alberta Environment seem to check the box and file away.

Extremely risky!

No Comments

The language in the Performance Standards document differs from the above statements, so as to delay the requirement for an Interim Reclamation Plan. In Section 17.01, it states, "Where an aggregate development has been inactive for one year, over and above seasonal fluctuations in activity, the County MAY request an Interim Reclamation Plan to ensure that the extraction area and associated infrastructure does not generate adverse amenity, safety, or environmental impacts." (capitalization added for emphasis) --> "may request" is not the same as "will be required". Perhaps the language in the Performance Standards document needs to be clarified.

This one was a big red flag for me. Aggregate pits may be inactive for a year or two depending on market fluctuations (as with any natural resource). Also, reclamation is covered under provincial regulations. The County should only have input on the end land use and ensure that the operator is following their provincial approvals. Similar to above, this is duplication of the process. It sounds like the performance standards want a pit to be reclaimed if it is inactive for 5 years. This is very concerning because I know of more than a handful of pits that have been inactive for that time period due to changes in market demand (e.g. Covid caused everything to slow down for years).

Pristine water quality cannot be reclaimed once it is contaminated or the flow disrupted. This needs to be addressed in the application process and the application refused. We are not talking about reclaiming a manmade structure, but a natural resource hundreds of years in the making.

Technically qualified , knowledgeable staff must be available to review and evaluate the monitor reports, not just someone to verify that all boxes are checked and completed. There must be staff dedicated to this process and the process must be prioritized to ensure timely responses. These reports must be submitted on time or a stop work enforced. On site inspections need to be conducted without previous knowledge of operators to ensure the actual operation is adhering to all rules. This is especially important when a complaint has been received about a possible infraction.

Berms should be removed once operations are complete within a reasonable time periods.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING TRAFFIC SAFETY STANDARDS?

-No hauling at the intersection of hwy 22 and Big Hill Springs Road: that intersection has had many deadly and serious accidents. The intersection is 100km an hour and completely unforgiving. Tourists, RVs, families staying at the Shell RV park with bikes, and residents use that intersection; gravel trucks should avoid that intersection at all costs.

-No hauling during school bus transportation hours.

1. Independent, Third-Party Traffic Impact Assessments & Ongoing Monitoring

Current Framework: The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) is conducted by the operator to evaluate increased traffic levels and haul route suitability. This self-assessment model lacks independent oversight, which could lead to an underestimation of impacts and necessary mitigation measures.

Recommendation: Require third-party, independent TIAs to ensure unbiased reporting on expected traffic increases, road safety concerns, and necessary infrastructure improvements. Additionally, ongoing traffic monitoring should be implemented post-approval to confirm that the predicted impacts align with actual traffic conditions.

2. School Bus & Pedestrian Safety Considerations

Current Framework: There is no mention of how haul routes will interact with school bus routes, pedestrian crossings, or cyclist corridors, which are common in rural communities.

Recommendation:

Require mandatory haul route mapping that identifies all school bus stops, pedestrian crossings, and known cyclist routes to assess potential risks.

Implement restricted operating hours for haul trucks, ensuring they do not operate during peak school bus pickup and drop-off times.

Install additional signage and flashing lights near school bus stops and pedestrian crossings along haul routes.

3. Road Maintenance & Heavy-Haul Route Suitability

Current Framework: The TIA only requires operators to demonstrate that haul routes and access points are "appropriate" for aggregate development. However, rural roads in Rocky View County were not originally designed for sustained heavy-haul traffic and will degrade significantly over time.

Recommendation:

Require pre-construction and ongoing road condition assessments to determine the actual impact of aggregate truck traffic on local roadways.

Mandate that operators contribute to road maintenance costs, including repaving, widening, and dust suppression along haul routes.

Ensure proper shoulder reinforcement where truck traffic is expected to increase, as gravel shoulders are particularly vulnerable to degradation from heavy loads.

4. Enforcement & Penalties for Unsafe Trucking Practices

Current Framework: The Traffic Management Plan focuses on ensuring "safe use" of roadways, but there are no clear enforcement mechanisms to address violations such as trucks failing to stop at intersections, operating with unsecured loads, or leaving debris on roads.

Recommendation:

Establish a strict fine and penalty system for aggregate operators and truck drivers who violate traffic safety regulations.

Implement random compliance checks to ensure trucks are adhering to posted speed limits, stopping at required intersections, and following all safety measures.

Require dashcam or GPS tracking systems in aggregate trucks to monitor speed, braking habits, and adherence to designated haul routes.

5. Debris Prevention & Cleanup Enforcement

Current Framework: The Traffic Management Plan requires operators to “prevent debris from being left on roads,” but does not specify enforcement or cleanup responsibilities.

Recommendation:

Require mandatory wheel washing stations at all aggregate sites to prevent mud, gravel, and dust from being tracked onto public roads.

Implement a debris cleanup response protocol, where operators must immediately dispatch cleanup crews if material is spilled or tracked onto county roads.

Mandate weekly road inspections along haul routes, with operators held responsible for any necessary cleanup or maintenance.

6. Noise & Vibration Impact of Heavy Truck Traffic

Current Framework: There is no mention of noise or vibration impacts from constant heavy truck traffic along haul routes.

Recommendation:

Conduct Vibration Impact Assessments near homes, businesses, and sensitive structures along haul routes, ensuring that prolonged truck traffic does not cause property damage or structural issues.

Implement quiet operation requirements, such as limiting the use of compression (Jake) brakes in residential areas and establishing buffer zones where truck noise mitigation is necessary.

a good start - pits shouldn't be able to damage their neighbours - set reasonable standards and police it

Again, as stated above. The County must consider aggregate as a non renewable resource and that viable aggregate deposits are only located where nature (i.e. glaciers/rivers etc.) deposited them. Blindly applying what may be unnecessary heavy restrictions and costly assessments to applications with smaller deposits could render them nonviable.

Again, monitoring by a third party.

All increase in traffic should cease, until a safe Cochrane 1A / 22 highway improvement completed 100%

- air brake control as they break the RVC noise bylaw sound limits and hours

- the highway entrance and exit lanes are not long enough as they do not comply with Alberta Highway requirements at comparable high traffic interchanges

Do you wish to promote tourism? Obviously not as now this is a busy industrial road without dual lanes or adequate safe passing lanes.

Any adjustments ended in roadways should be completed PRIOR to opening any gravel pits and traffics increases. Too often changes are reactive not Proactive. Accidents will happen if roadways are not improved first

Any road damage immediate remediation required and charged to operator.

as above

Burnco west's entrance and exit is just off of highway 2a, a busy corridor. Whorish monitoring this site fir traffic, winters are slow but summers are crazy. That turn is off of the grand valley road which is a big hill, the traffic gets so busy and we all know time is money trucks pull onto the highway to keep moving and many a miss has happened who.is monitoring traffic

cleaning roads of gravel and debris should be mandatory as well as properly securing loads.
County to develop preferred haul routes mapping to guide haul routes and ease enforcement of haul route adherence
Enforce the standards. I've been almost driven off the road by speeding dump trucks!! I can't count how many windshield cracks and chips I have had to repair!!!
<p>enforcement is key - immediate and mandatory shutdowns should be implemented if performance standards are not met</p> <p>recuperation of monetary value when vehicles/windshields are damaged by gravel hauling vehicles</p> <p>maintenance of roads provided by pits</p> <p>secondary roads off limits to gravel hauling</p>
Ensure that there is someone responsible to check these requirements daily. The mess on the roads is weather dependent so if the inspection isn't done within a reasonable amount of time, the mess gets worse on the roads thereby making it harder to clean. Also, merge lanes and traffic flow needs to be monitored so that traffic isn't congested and the trucks can get in and out of their locations safely. Some of the merge/turning lanes are too small.
existing traffic at peak seasons and creatin of new roads paid for by the pits to keep dangerous gravel trucks off of secondary roads . strict enforcement for trucks breaking laws. easy recouperation for individuals who have had their windshields broken and vehicles damaged by gravel hauling.
Future land use development. Traffic plans would need to be revised based on new developments.
get the RCMP to do stop-checks on the trucks at random times so that residents can be assured the trucks are safe and their loads are properly covered.
good, ensure tarping is working on trucks
Gravel trucks frequently don't stop at stop signs. Consider how to enforce basic traffic rules.
Haul routes need to be mandated and sanctions applied for failure to adhere to those routes. Any representations made by the applicant as part of the approval process need to be incorporated into the approval with significant sanctions for failure to meet.
<p>Highway 567 is far from an ideal haulage route as it has no shoulder, steep hills and sharp bends within coulees. All of the gravel traffic goes east on this road to Calgary and Airdire. There is no space for Commercial Vehicle Inspections to take place to ensure safety. Residence are left to "chase down" gravel trucks that throw rocks that shatter windshields and not all trucks can be reported to Alberta Sand and Gravel Association. It is not easy to report there anyway.</p> <p>Ensuring that they follow haulage routes seems absolutely impossible. Independent truck counts seem necessary to validate what the industry is reporting as traffic levels in their Traffic Impact Assessments.</p>
How does Rockyview County reduce traffic when there are already too many trucks on the inadequate Rockyview roads? As you are aware the roads are two lanes. Increased truck traffic will only exacerbate the problem.
<p>I believe that from the get go of MSDPs pits low ball traffic from pits. They should state a maximum and average and be obligated to not exceed this by more than 10 percent or ask for new DP.</p> <p>Each pit involved traffic accident should be investigated by county. If accidents with other motor vehicles Ann or wildlife show an increased trend, a new and safer plan needs to be implemented.</p>

I believe the roads need to be widened with appropriate shoulders with appropriately long turning lanes at the pit and all intersection
I urge you to take 30 minutes at any point during a weekday and stand on 85th street around the Lafarge operation and tell me that it is not an absolute hazard to local traffic. The haul drivers are a menace. Just stand at the corner of 112th ave and 85th street or 112th ave and Country Hills boulevard. The running of lights to make turns, plus speeding, and tailgating of vehicles is unbelievable.
I would like to see driver training requirements be reviewed on an ongoing basis. Frequently driving on Burma Road, we have come across drivers that are eating lunch or on the phone while driving. It would be helpful if there was a number to call and a vehicle identification number that could be used to call in and report these instances.
Implement the same traffic safety standards for all industries, not just aggregate, as a bylaw.
Less gravel pits on already busy roads!
Limited route choice, speed cameras on routes.
LONGER MERGE LANES FOR TRUCKS EXITING ONTO HIGHWAY PLEASE!!
Longer merge lanes for trucks to enter through traffic at highway speeds
Maintenance of the County's road network where a proposed haul route should be upgraded to an adequate commercial / industrial standard by the companies using that haul route and not the county.
My road has haul restrictions on it yet the trucks still come by. Enforcement seems nonexistent and road cleanup is very poor. like I stated before, multiple trucks have flipped over in the ditch Infront of my house.
Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bearspaw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the safety hazards of the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.
Operators must become responsible for the costs of traffic calming measures and for the building of wildlife under or over passes in key areas. Such a key area(s) on Highway 567 include the area around the junction with RR 35 and the Big Hill Springs Park access road. This area may require several strategically located safe wildlife crossings to stop the slaughter that has occurred largely from gravel trucks over the years.
Provision for repair of roadways damaged by heavy haul trucks by the aggregate resource extraction companies (instead of through taxpayer dollars.)
Restrict travel on school bus routes
Same as for air quality testing comment
Scale tickets must be provided monthly to allow RVC to access peak periods and cumulative traffic on haul routes and to allow for audits of CAPP payments.
Scale tickets must be provided monthly to RVC to allow monitoring of cumulative traffic volumes from sites and on Hwy 567 and other haul routes. This will also allow for auditing of CAPP payments. Any change or variation of haul routes and access points must be submitted by the Operator in a timely manner.
Some of the problem rests with Alberta Transportation. The call this 567 a heavy haul route.....It doesn't have a shoulder and it is in an area with steep hills and lots of wildlife and more car traffic. Someone in government can not assess the highway and traffic. not doing a good job and the county may not have anything to say about it so should not all the pits here or greatly reduced.

Speed and operator licensing requirements and truck hygiene standards re loose gravel on truck trailer bodies as well as trapped rocks between dual wheels on trailers. Cleanup of quarry entrance and exits along highways of mud and loose sand buildup by sweepers and blowers or some other means
Speed limits MUST be honored by those truck drivers. Our road is narrow (2 lanes) with residents esp. children being endangered by some of those huge trucks zooming by at well over the 50 km speed limit! These are our homes! We expect courtesy and caution from these drivers. Safety FIRST!! It is imperative that the county guarantee that they can ensure these industrial vehicles obey all local laws in the future (unlike now).
Strict penalties for reckless operators
The concentration of gravel and cement trucks in the Royal Oak Plaza area is a disaster waiting to happen. The area is not cleaned and is a mess. Dust and gravel. I feel sorry for the people living there. No oversight.
the County should monitor to ensure the companies are complying with the Traffic Management Plan
The gravel pit owners should be paying to fix and upgrade the roads. The gravel trucks cause a lot of damage to the roads.
The haul routes identified in the TIA must become mandatory in the pit's DP. Those haul routes need to minimize use of county roads. The maximum trucking volumes identified in the TIA must be enforceable - the number of trucks / day the TIA and MSDP say the pit will have must be part of the DP and monitoring needs to be in place to ensure that those trucking volumes are not exceeded.
The increased volume of gravel trucks overburdens public roads resulting in deteriorating road conditions and increased traffic on public roads. An increased volume of road traffic correlates with a growing number of safety concerns to the public. Gravel companies accessing public roads should be required to conduct road studies and publish the study's results prior to receiving a permit to operate. Proponents should be responsible for the infrastructure and maintenance of municipal roads of which they utilize. Safety measures such as speed bumps and stop signs should be enforced near pits. Levies should be established in Road Use Agreements after a road study is complete. Finally, all levies should be linked to usage; for example, if a proponent expects a 50 percent increase to traffic, then they should pay 50 cents per tonne to the County.
The percentage increase in traffic on affected roads should be reported.
The roads in our community were not made for increases traffic and heavy trucks. They have school buses on our roads and many cyclists . The shoulders are not big enough to give heavy trucks a place to go in an emergency.
The run up intersections onto main roads is insufficient. Wear that is put onto the roads is not being paid for by the revenue. More tax revenue needs to be collected to provide for the improvement of roads.
The traffic assessment needs to be done by 3rd parties - neither Rocky View, nor any associate of the operator. Traffic assessments in our community have not been satisfactory.
There needs to be a "pay to play" scheme implemented with road use fees to cover the damage they do to the roads. They need to do a better job sweeping up gravel that falls off their trucks when they leave the pits. The gravel pit owners should be forced to pay for road improvements IE: turning lanes and acceleration lanes for safety and common sense.

There should be turning lanes and acceleration lanes near all the gravel facilities paid for by the gravel industry
They need to make sure trucks leaving the pit are free of gravel and they the entrance to the road is also free of gravel.
This is laughable. There is NO traffic impact assessment movement when you build in a neighbourhood or close to neighbourhoods
This should be updated regularly as other developments get approved.
This will always be a problem, when loaded they are heavy and slow and turn out when vehicles are coming. Need some type of light system that would indicate they can go when no vehicles in are close.
Traffic also impacts the air quality in the area and again would like those companies to be involved with the Calgary Region Airshed Zone Society.
<p>Traffic impact assessments should be done, only, by an independent third party (potentially selected by a citizens group involved with this concern—not untrustworthy organizations who may be able to be coerced by operators or politicians who may have bias or a vested interest). Alterations to traffic routes should also be determined by third party analysis.</p> <p>As it stands today, there have been road alterations to serve the Hillstone Aggregate location which seem entirely insufficient to allow for trucks entering traffic to get up to a reasonable road speed when exiting the yard.</p> <p>Any and all of these measures should be paid for by pit operators in full.</p>
Traffic impacts have to be considered along the full haul road, not just at the entrances to pits. Highway 567 is becoming particularly hazardous because of the hills and coulees and the lack of shoulders on the road.
Traffic threshold values that would trigger road improvements.
<p>Truck drivers are just rude and dont follow laws.</p> <p>I dont know how many trucks I've seen that dont stop at stop signs or run lights.</p>
truck routes should not be along roads that are zoned for residential like Burma and Bearspaw Rd. traffic should use provincial hiways. We need gravel but trucks are a problem. can it be railed in - they want to supply gravel. trucks are dangerous and conveyor belt technology doesn't work. what happens if the conveyor breaks down. trucks cannot travel within residential country developments
We moved from Calgary past the aggregate sites on purpose because of the number of incidents we witness with gravel trucks going through red lights, speeding, reckless driving. Why bring this to a rural residential road. This isn't just for those who live here but those who come from other areas to enjoy the country biking etc.
Right now on Hwy 567 on a given 10 h work day there are 300-400 trucks per day - add another pit such as Mt Ash and double that number. This MUST be regulated.
Burnco traffic often does not stop at the stop sign. The one is not twin and as a result, the trucks going 70 or 80 for a long distance create traffic risks before any Burnco expansion. There should be twinning of the 1A
Observations of Burnco's trucks from West Cochrane Pit have revealed the trucks were not stopping before entering Hwy 1A, then after they were warned, the action of no stopping is reportedly still continuing. This is unacceptable - traffic disruption and accidents are waiting to happen.

<p>Strict rules/policies must in place. A strong, cooperative relationship between RVC and the RCMP/highway patrol must be created to communicate on gravel company trucker behavior. The highest safety standards for the highest public good must be upheld.</p>
<p>Noise and traffis</p>
<p>Again the PM are well done. Monitoring of impacts is important. As well, hours of operation are important. Gravel trucks and school bus schedules should not mix.</p>
<p>Burma road is already being abused, and laws broken. No one monitors the roads now, what makes you think it will happen. Co tinuouse policing is required</p>
<p>Go ahead an manage the traffic safety - on a longer route, please! Away from the homes of citizens.</p>
<p>When we first moved out here, Burma Road west from Rocky Ridge Rd. Had restrictions on large truck traffic. The sign is still up, but there are numerous gravel and other large trucks traveling past the residential areas now. Why? Crowchild Trail can be accessed off 144th ave. Long before it becomes Burma Road.</p>
<p>There is no-way to mitigate this risk to satisfy my concerns. It is the human-factor, which includes equipment maintenance (like brakes). I understand the gravel hauling business better than most. This traffic is highly unwelcome in the community I call home.</p>
<p>Consider: School bus routes, avoidance of main traffic corridors if possible, create appropriate entrance and exit lanes & roadways at county road entrances and exits, wildlife corridors, avoidance of parks, schools, populated areas, etc.</p>
<p>Again, given the number of pits operating in north Calgary and RVC, cumulative impacts of all traffic originating from all gravel pits in this area must be regulated! Any week day hour of observation at the junction of Country Hills Boulevard and 112 Ave NW shows what a disaster the gravel traffic flow and congestion can be! Granted this is in Calgary but RVC must avoid such dangerous road conditions ever arising in Rocky View County.</p> <p>Traffic planning must be based on all potential/planned new infrastructure and development. Questions that I have: (i) Are the gravel haul trucks subject to any safety standards (e.g. tire condition, etc.)? (ii) Are trucks weighed to ensure that they are in weght compliance? (iii) Are there weight restrictions?</p>
<p>Burnco Cochrane West study was done 2013, and hasn't considered the increase in traffic volumes.</p> <p>Constant no compliance with the stop sign at Range Road 51 and highway 1A. Infractions stop while legislative services watches. Otherwise, sign is yield and go. Friend advised they got \$400plus ticket and 3 demerit points for a similar yield on a stop sign. Maybe that would address issue?</p> <p>Collector lanes aren't long enough to allow trucks to get up the speed before going through Grand Valley. Trucks slow traffic from site to Cochrane 70-80km for most of the way. Cars try to pass, risky. Whole commute is impacted.</p>
<p>The haul route on 144 Ave and Burma Road is terrible and loaded with trucks! Including all of the trucks that are turning left off of 112 Ave NW onto Country Hills Blvd - That is a brutal intersection for gravel trucks. The neighborhoods are too close. There has to be a better route.</p>
<p>6.07 c) Not all operations include their own truck hauling operation. Road ban weight restrictions are the responsibility of the trucking company and language should be revised to ensure financial penalty is placed on the appropriate party</p>

6.07 c) Not all operations include their own truck hauling operation. Road ban weight restrictions are the responsibility of the trucking company and language should be revised to ensure financial penalty is placed on the appropriate party.
<p>It is not clear how the following requirements will be enforced by the County: The Traffic Management Plan shall include: ...</p> <p>k) measures to prevent the generation of dust from truck and other equipment traveling on County roads; and</p> <p>l) measures to ensure all vehicles leave the site in a state that will prevent aggregate materials or debris from being deposited on the road network.</p>
Requiring a traffic impact assessment makes sense, but the scope should be limited to the County roads. Does the County expect the operators to know exactly where the product is going to end up every time and what provincial roads their haulers will use? From my experience, most operators hold traffic safety in a very high regard already so it doesn't make sense for the County to be extremely stringent here.
The nature of the roads, such as width, twists and turns, steepness of hills need to be taken into account. Also, what other roads intersect with the transportation route of the gravel trucks. The thousands of visitors to Big Hill Springs Park must enter Hwy. 567 where gravel trucks will be travelling at high speeds. These heavy trucks cannot slow or stop quickly.
Burma road at Bearspaw Christian road not sufficient / not safe. Need merge lanes + turn lanes that are sufficient.
Hwy 567 is already hazardous with trucks each minute and lots of wildlife kills. This highway needs wildlife under or over passes - at gravel operator expense.
Pits need to be held accountable to their promised trucking volumes - if they exceed TIA volumes, trucking needs to stop.
Additional traffic from for-profit industries need to be accounted for, and the company called to invest in upgraded intersections, prior to any approvals. Upgrades after safety risks present themselves is not sufficient.
Heavy truck traffic. Traffic safety needs to be monitored.
Gravel on road. This is an issue now. I live less than 1 km from existing pit. 4 windshields last year.
When you talk about impacts, that could be one vehicle. It is as simple as that.
It is not about the traffic, it's the people driving the trucks.
Consider traffic. Especially on the 766 hwy.

WHAT ELSE WOULD YOU LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER WHEN IMPLEMENTING WATER QUALITY STANDARDS?

1. Independent, Third-Party Groundwater & Surface Water Monitoring

Current Framework: The County requires a Groundwater Investigation Report and monitoring for below-water-table extraction, but does not specify whether operators can conduct this assessment themselves. Self-reporting by operators creates a conflict of interest and increases the risk of underreported or misrepresented findings.

Recommendation:

Require third-party, independent groundwater monitoring to ensure unbiased data collection on water quality and aquifer levels.

Establish mandatory baseline groundwater testing before approvals to create a reference point for future assessments.

Implement continuous groundwater monitoring wells, with data collected and submitted directly to the County rather than relying on operators to self-report.

2. Protection of Groundwater Recharge Areas

Current Framework: The proposal requires operators to assess how their activities impact groundwater, but does not restrict extraction in critical groundwater recharge areas.

Recommendation:

Identify and designate protected groundwater recharge zones where extraction is prohibited to prevent long-term depletion and contamination.

Require hydrogeological impact studies to determine how gravel removal affects groundwater flow, particularly in hydrologically sensitive areas that supply wells and natural springs.

Mandate that below-water-table extractions be minimized or restricted entirely in regions where they could permanently alter aquifer levels.

3. Stormwater Contamination Prevention

Current Framework: The Stormwater Management Report ensures that operators manage surface water storage, but it does not require them to actively prevent contamination from industrial runoff.

Recommendation:

Require on-site water treatment systems to remove fine sediments, hydrocarbons, and heavy metals before stormwater is discharged into local water bodies.

Establish mandatory buffer zones around rivers, streams, and wetlands where no stormwater discharge or aggregate processing can take place.

Mandate the use of permeable retention basins and filtration wetlands to naturally remove pollutants from runoff before it reaches sensitive ecosystems.

4. Groundwater Contamination from Fuel & Chemical Use

Current Framework: There is no mention of specific safeguards to prevent contamination from fuel spills, lubricants, and other chemicals used in aggregate operations.

Recommendation:

Require secondary containment systems for all on-site fuel storage, preventing leaks from reaching groundwater.

Prohibit the use of chemical dust suppressants or washing agents that can leach into aquifers.

Implement routine groundwater testing for hydrocarbons and industrial contaminants near processing and fueling areas.

5. Cumulative Water Quality Impact Assessments

Current Framework: Each aggregate development must assess its own impact on water resources, but there is no requirement to consider cumulative effects from multiple pits in the same region.

Recommendation:

Require regional water impact studies that assess the combined effect of multiple extraction sites on groundwater and surface water systems.

Implement watershed-level planning to ensure that water extraction, stormwater runoff, and contamination risks are managed holistically, not site-by-site.

6. Long-Term Water Quality Protections After Site Closure

Current Framework: There is no mention of long-term water quality monitoring after aggregate operations cease.

Recommendation:

Require operators to monitor water quality for at least 10 years after site closure, ensuring that post-extraction groundwater contamination does not occur.

Mandate that pits cannot be converted into unregulated water bodies or landfills, preventing long-term contamination risks.

Establish a reclamation bond system, requiring operators to set aside funding to restore water quality and land stability post-extraction.

3rd party regular monitoring.

No gravel extraction near hydrological sensitive sites like the big hill spring site, why would we risk damaging this beautiful site?

a good start - pits shouldn't be able to damage their neighbours - set reasonable standards and police it

Again Plans are great but useless if they aren't followed and someone makes sure.

Who is going to monitor water quality before, after and during operations of any aggregate.

Once the Aggregate is operating this is all about before, what about during and after?

Again proper studies need to be in place initiated by the county from a neutral 3rd party paid for by the gravel industry and submitted to the county without gravel industry interference.

Again, locating the operations away from Country Residential zoned subdivisions will limit the impact on any water resources that are needed for residents.

Again, water monitoring, and any plans for mitigation of contamination, should be done, only, by an independent third party (potentially selected by a citizens group involved with this concern—not untrustworthy organizations like Alberta Environment or politicians who may have bias or a vested interest).

I repeat my previous statement, as per a third party involved in the Burnco west pit, there has already been contamination to groundwater with the potential to make it into the Bow River.

Any and all of these measures should be paid for by the pit operators in full.

Alberta Environment and Protected Areas has jurisdiction over the environment which includes the use of water. Additional restrictions imposed by the county are not necessary.

Be sure there is something to stop extraction near any water wells !

Clearly aggregate mining should not occur where is a connection to an aquifer.

Compliance enforcement- standards don't matter when companies choose to move ahead with infractions and just pay the fines. Operations should be shut down rather than just fines issued.
<p>Consider the groundwater extraction and drinking water supply. The Paskapoo aquifer is heavily taxed, such that drinking water supply is impacted. Groundwater monitoring focuses of contaminants, which is critical, but overall usage is also critical and must be considered, and reconsidered over time.</p> <p>The County has spent a lot of tax payer dollars on protecting Nose Hill Creek. Aggregate development puts this surface water at risk, and goes against the efforts and money spent the last few years.</p> <p>Restrict mining below groundwater. Case specific modeling for infiltration from surface for protection of aquifers.</p>
Don't allow excavations below the phreatic surface. Operators should not put pits in domestic use aquifers. Do not accept grandfathered pits in exclusion zones. Ensure that groundwater monitoring reports are submitted and are completed on time!
from what I understand they go very close to the water tables or even under them. This is nuts. we use wells and some of the livestock use surface water from dugouts. what do you want to bet that is there is an issue it will be impossible to find out who did it and the gravel companies with be all lawyered up. The and oil companies never take responsibility for anything.
good
Groundwater extraction impacting residential drinking water supply. Protection of aquifers.
Groundwater monitoring does not prevent water contamination below the water table. Is Rockyview County prepared to take action if the water table is compromised? Will extraction be stopped?
Groundwater quality and turbidity well beyond the site borders must be evaluated regularly and reports must be submitted monthly to RVC.
guarantee no impact on existing residential water wells in the vicinity, with alternate potable water supply provided in the case of any negative impact on well performance.
Has to be something if the water goes bad? The zoning does not work for ag without water. So what do we do?
I don't understand enough about the impacts on water quality however again that close to this many residents is just too close.
<p>If drinking water. No fluoride</p> <p>If storm water. Flow to the bow</p>
If using water, the aggregate companies must consider how their water use will affect landowners living on adjacent properties.
<p>Independent, professional review of any Surface Water and Groundwater Mitigation Plan, Stormwater Management Reports and Groundwater Investigation Reports. Independent, professional, random testing of groundwater quality and the water table throughout any operations. Provision for ceasing operations and mitigation by the aggregate company should groundwater and the water table be affected by aggregate operations.</p> <p>Clear guidelines for considering aggregate operations to be too risky to water sources to be approved.</p>

instant and mandatory payment to residents when water is impacted by gravel pit damage to the table.
instant and mandatory payments to residents when water table and quality impacted
Make this all very easy to access for the public
monitor by a neutral 3rd party
Monitoring wells beyond site borders are necessary in many cases in order to adequately monitor groundwater elevations, turbidity and quality. Reports should be submitted monthly to an RVC expert.
More frequent monitoring, similar to the level required for drinking water as they are operation in an domestic aquifer. Drinking water rights need to be given precedence over industrial development.
There are well in the area that would have right to access over these developments, and yet this is never assessed. Hydrology reports need to be independent of the aggregate development and should require the fund independent monitoring of residential wells withing a certain radius of operation as a best practice and to ensure broad based, independent data can be collected.
New ARP should not consider gravel mining under water table that is connected to anyone's well or body of water. The Burnco West Cochrane for example. Bighill Springs. Gambling with precious resource. If/when issues appear all the different pit operators and the oil industry will be pointing fingers at each other. We the residents know that but we also know that RVC governance were the aiders and a betters to this problem. The execution zone around the PArk is not large enough. You really must consider the spring recharge area and wildlife corridor for increased protection. Certainly the sign alone for the corridor is not enough! Not even a reduced speed limit and now adding more trucks?
No extracting within areas that have significant water tables that freed above ground creeks/watersheds
Not allowing aggregate extraction in the Bearspaw area at all. We are a residential community that should not be subject to the water pollutants of the proposed aggregate operations. This is non-negotiable.
Obviously all standards should be considered.
Once again, the success of assessing and mitigating water quality issues will depend on a trained and equipped assessment team able to carry out long-term program. Alberta Environment must become more responsible regarding stringent assessments of the impacts of gravel mining to groundwater as well as surface water.
Ongoing monitoring with quarterly reporting of Groundwater Investigation Report with public posting and maximum of 3 month delay in posting. Implement groundwater monitoring for extractions above water table in valley bottoms or below escarpements (i.e. Bighill Springs valley, Horse Creek valley, Nose Hill Creek valley).
Only ever to no less than 3 meters above water table

Overkill again. Duplication with provincial responsibilities. RVC should require a monitoring plan for surface water but groundwater is provincial jurisdiction under the Water Act.
Oversight management and reporting are critical. Ensuring that the standards are updated as legally required.
Regular reviews of the Management/Plan and Report with commitment to accountability
same comment as for environment
Sample water from all surrounding properties that are on a well. Samples to be taken regularly and at aggregate cost. Aggregate to post a bond for to cover the cost of digging new wells or connecting residences to water. COOP should their well be negatively impacted.
Shouldn't be going into the water table period. What about using water to wash gravel. Owners close by may have an impact on their personal wells.
Stop allowing the damage of our environment
Take more into account the loss of wet lands an protection of ground water flows. Especially downstream effects such as the impact on Nose Creek. A great deal of technical work was done with respect to Scott Pit that could provide guidance.
telling people if there wells get wrecked they will pay to put in cisterns is not right. many people move to the country to live on a well. removing this from people should come at steep cost like having to buy the owner out. no going below the water table. we will have a water shortage in this area in a few years and we need to protect clean water.
The county should check that the standards are being met on site and check relevant water bodies regularly to ensure that there is no contamination or change in water flow - so you should know the flows before the pit starts operations.
The performance standards need to be more specific regarding how close to the water table extraction is allowed. No extraction should be permitted below 1-metre above the water table unless it can be demonstrated that the need for gravel from that specific location overwhelms the risks to the area's groundwater aquifers. In environmentally sensitive areas, extraction needs to be restricted to at least 3 - 4 metres above the water table. Extraction below the water table must be totally prohibited in environmentally sensitive areas. Asphalt plants must be prohibited at pits in environmentally sensitive areas or where extraction will leave less than 2-metres of gravel above the water table. The amount of open area in a pit must be strictly limited to minimize risks to groundwater.
There not be any extraction below the water table.
There should be NO penetration of the water table. They should not be permitted to dig until they penetrate the water table then back up one meter. There has to be a better way to determine where the water table is and stay well above it. I know they currently try for 1 meter. But it should be at least 4 meters
These are already existing requirements to get a Water Act approval under provincial legislation.
Third party monitoring.

this is of utmost importance. The water in the area, both rivers and groundwater not only is a source of water for millions of Albertans (Bow River near Burnco pit), but also the source of water for livestock which is our food. This needs to be protected at all costs.
Un sure
Up and down gradient wells beyond the site borders are required to monitor groundwater elevations turbidly and quality. Reports submitted monthly to RVC exxpert.
Water assessments on nearby lands need to be 1x a month for as long as the development is in operation. Residential water quality assessments should be paid for by the developer for all residents and businesses within a 5 mile radius (or perhaps greater) and should be allowed to have their water tested on a monthly basis.
Water is critical to residents of RVC. In the face of climate change negative groundwater impacts of aggregate development must be precluded. All groundwater reports MUST i.e. SHALL demonstrate no negative impact of the mine on groundwater. Aggregate miners shall be required to provide an indemnification for any damages caused to groundwater users by its activities.
Water is life, the more action at the pits the more need PRIOR abd during use do not allow a company to bankrupt the water needed for our agriculturefuture.
We are concerned that their extractions do not in any way affect our wells! There has been significant disagreement surrounding the impacts of blasting on wells and ground water reservoirs in the area. If industrial blasting damages our ground water, that would cause irreparable harm to many, many residents.
We had our well go dry after blasting at the pit. We had to tie into water coop. The gravel pit said there was no definitive proof the blasting caused the well to go dry....
We want the highest known standards used to protect our land and water. gravel pits are a blight to the land and reclamation is a myth for the damage they cause.
Weekly tests of aquiver- if standards exceeded shut down operation until mitigation completed and results under standard.
What will be done if water is contaminated, despite these requirements? For all these requirements (previous), what are the consequences if they are not met? There should be clear legal requirements that industry pays for and does any clean up; taxpayers must not be held responsible. By the time contamination hits the water table, it's too late. Sites should be nowhere near fresh water - streams, rivers, lakes, springs.
Groundwater monitoring is required for mining above the water table as well. The plan must go beyond prov standards which are minimal - the Surface Water and Groundwater Mitigation plan should be reviewed by a 3rd party before being accepted. Surface water flows and quality - in nearby streams also requires a monitoring plan -a appropriate to the recognized risk - based on a 3rd party opinion, not just the proponent and their paid consultants.

No mining in the water aquifer should occur until there is a complete environmental impact assessment and there is a baseline monitoring of all adjacent Wells Springs wetlands, and creeks.

Independent and third-party audits are required to ensure risks are assessed and appropriate actions taken.

Online monitoring of Burnco's area and adjacent land owners and downstream water are required. Independent audits are essential to ensure current problems are mitigated and to prevent future ones.

A comprehensive monitoring program with Burnco adjacent land owners independent consultants needs to occur first before any further work

Ongoing monitoring of any washed ponds or areas around asphalt plants are essential to ensure that contaminants are not leaked into the water, aquifer and fractured bedrock.

I strongly believe that water quality protection is an sadly under-managed area in RVC, the Province. There must be real-time 3rd Party monitoring with public transparency, drone over flights, dye-tracing etc. .Establish the highest level standards possible - do not settle for minimum standards. Water quality is just too important to settle for less. RVC has the chance to put themselves on the world stage for leadership in this regard. Protect our springs, creeks, rives, ground water, aquifers, wetlands. Have policies that are a PREVENTATIVE as possible. Have policies that should contamination occur, that REAL TIME MONITORING can detect it and have policies for IMMEDIATE MITIGATION with FREQUENT, transparent public reporting of the occurrences and mitigations. Quarterly is not frequent enough. Yearly reporting is unacceptable.

They should only use captured rain water and not fresh water from our ground wells

Floodplains and setbacks from rivers, creeks and wetlands. My biggest wish is that the county would have a strict prohibition on extraction from within floodplains. There is plenty of gravel in Rocky View and not enough water. It makes sense to protect floodplains and known surface water infrastructure from development of any kind, especially mining that completely destroys the natural infrastructure. To me, this is a no brainer. It makes no sense to me that gravel operators continue to destroy natural infrastructure that should be protected in the overall greater public interest.

Way too close for comfort near our Rocky View Water treatment plant and the reservoir.

During a meeting regarding water table perforation, the company said, if it happened, they were repair it! Once and aquafer has been compromised it affects the ENTIRE water reserve, not just where the perforation occurred! Our fresh water MUST be protected!

I will defer to those more informed on this matter

Many residents use ground water for wells/potable water. The quality of groundwater must therefore be protected. All gravel operations must be restricted to operate only at a significant height above ground water to ensure its security. Land topography, external to any (current and future) gravel operations, must also be considered for any potential external impact.

Groundwater impacts do not end at the mine site perimeter.

Again, performance reports to be provided to RVC, identifying all groundwater infractions and disturbances. Fines must be large enough to be an effective deterrent.

<p>First off, why is it necessary that Burnco set up right beside the river. I read a report that there actually is around a 200 year supply of aggregate in this area without risking our waters and rivers that supply millions with safe drinking water.</p> <p>I had a small gravel pit at one time and can of course visually see the abundance of gravel in RVC. I would insist that water in the river be monitored before action start and during and by a third party!! I would also insist that a die be used to actually trace where Burnco's waste water travels and thus the hydrocarbons. Third party monitoring!!!! Any reports that need to be completed must be third party, not someone who works with Burnco.</p> <p>Since Burnco is using river water for washing, how will they guarantee that it doesn't flow back into river since they will be using so much. Where will all this water and hydrocarbons end up over time? It must go somewhere.</p>
<p>Water Quality and performance measures need to be established with adjacent landowners regardless if agriculture or residential. Independent and third-party reporting, audits and risks standards need to be established mutually by the aggregate company and adjacent landowners.</p> <p>Can't rely on Burnco, Alberta Environment or Rocky view. A paid technical stamped report may not be accurate or address the real issues.</p> <p>Alberta Environment agrees privately that practices are out of date. Code of practices, roles responsibilities among the Alberta Dept Directors, Auditor General, Rocky View are complex, risky, lacking in audit, transparency and compliance.</p> <p>Auditor general report shows risk to tax payer for lack of audit, monitoring and compliance with aggregate companies reclaiming. Another tax payer risk?</p>
<p>Please clarify when a Groundwater Monitoring Plan would be required. Policy 11.06 states operations extracting "at or less than 5.0 metres above the identified groundwater table would require a plan however Appendix D states that the Groundwater Investigation Report will identify the groundwater table and a monitoring assessment will be required for extraction below that level</p>
<p>Please clarify when a Groundwater Monitoring Plan would be required. Policy 11.06 states operations extracting "at or less than 5.0 metres above the identified groundwater table would require a plan however Appendix D states that the Groundwater Investigation Report will identify the groundwater table and a monitoring assessment will be required for extraction below that level.</p>
<p>Section 11.06 would permit extraction at less than 5.0 metres above the identified groundwater level, provided a Groundwater Monitoring Plan is undertaken. We support the position of [REDACTED], that in order to protect the groundwater, NO aggregate operation should be permitted to encroach into a minimum 4 metre recommended buffer above the water table.</p>
<p>Similar to the environment section - water is governed by the province. Why does the County feel the need to duplicate or exceed provincial regulations? Monitoring and mitigation are managed by the province already so why require the same thing?</p>
<p>The annual variation of precipitation needs to be considered in determining the depth to which excavation is allowed. Another consideration is what does this water feed. In the case of the pits west of the park it feeds both the residences, the springs in the park, the creek and ultimately the Bow River.</p>
<p>Cumulative impacts noise, dust, truck traffic, water (drinking water source of residents)</p>
<p>Need mechanism to provide water if water wells, springs, wetlands impacted.</p>
<p>Need ground water monitoring for agricultural residents wells, springs, wetlands, within 1 km.</p>

Performance Standards must protect out water. No more mining in the aquifers below water table?
Impact on adjacent water sources. Dust. Accountability on responsible development of pits.
Stop more subdivision and development until a groundwater protection plan is prepared + implemented.

IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE YOU WOULD LIKE THE COUNTY TO CONSIDER IN ITS WORK TO IMPLEMENT AGGREGATE RESOURCE PLAN INITIATIVES?

. a MUST setback (800 meters)

Actually listen and action concerns.

appropriate gravel truck traffic routes must be considered when planning gravel pits.

As a long time resident and having gone through the ARP process numerous time, we always find it stressful having to "fight off" an open pit mine being setup on our doorstep. Knowing that if it were to happen, financially the value of our property would be greatly depreciated and our health and happiness would also be deminished.

Balance. I keep hearing that county is balancing between industry and residents and maybe society. Excuse me but this is our county, our staff and our local government and as residents we should be heard and weighted more than just a balance. We pay the most taxes and own the most property in that equation.

The other thing is these multiple attempts for getting permits for Aggregate. 6 months apart if they wanted to. Prime example is Scott Pit. How many times must they say NO? Now the crybabies want to go to the province. What don't they understand about not being wanted?

The issue about Aggregate is that there is nothing in it for the neighbours and the industry has done a darn good job of alienating most of us.

Next moves for ARP is to determine if there is any fact to the Hite Study. There is but everyone wants to sweep it under the rug. As Planners you may want to see what the rest of the world thinks about negative affects.

Bearpaw is a high desired residential location and gravel pits do not belong in its vicinity.

Buffer "time" zones should also be implemented, such that operations are to be limited to 8:00am to 5:00pm.

Build the roads entering and exiting the pits away from busy roads and schools

Develop an Aggregate Resource Plan balances aggregate development and residential opposition. RVC is still grossly missing the mark, especially with the mandatory buffers and assuming and asking for studies that are clearly provincial jurisdiction.

Ensure appropriate review is available and inspection and enforcement tools have sufficient support to be functional and fast acting.

Ensure honesty and show diligence.

Gravel is important but the time frame is important for extraction. If it is a temporary use only give 5 year zoning. If it is permanent longer, then zoning planning is pretty important. Because as soon as one comes in more follow. Because they suck to be beside. Scope creep through development permits really sucks and does not enforce usually what was agreed to in the initial approval. There has to be some type of penalty so this does not happen. So everyone knows what the extent of the development is when the first approval comes up.

heavy consideration to impact of land value and a reduction of ability to use that land after resources have been pulled. land used for housing befits residents and county for hundreds to

thousands of years vs 20-30 benefitting only the operator and counting at the cost of the residents in the area.
heavy consideration to impacted land value and reduction of ability to use the that land after resources have been pulled land used for housing benefits residents and county for many more years vs 20-30 years of gravel benefitting operators at the expense of county residents
High priority needs to be placed on allowing the extraction of aggregate in the county which can be done with the use of performance standards to mitigate the impacts to local residence. Viable aggregate sources are limited within Rocky View County. Industry nor the County have the luxury of choosing the location of viable aggregate, it is where nature deposited it. Sterilizing any aggregate source in favor of a permanent land use is irresponsible now and for all future generations to come.
Hold all operations to the same standards.
How many folks are aware of this survey?
I can only speak to the Bearspaw area (however, I am sure this applies to other sites too) where there are several large quarries currently in operation. We can almost always hear the noise from the big quarry operating on 85th and the dust from this and other sites on windy days is heavy which has been shown to increase respiratory issues when breathing this in. The increased heavy traffic in the area make also has increased the traffic noise level and makes it difficult to make turns onto major thoroughfares from smaller side residential roads. There is always pressure to do more resource extraction but in a now mostly residential area this puts residents health and welfare at risk. There is a reason we moved to the country and it was not to be by gravel quarries and to cope with heavy truck traffic.
I don't believe so, the County appears to have listened to its residents, as it should. Thank you
I feel strongly that the ARP was worked on, agreed on and should be accepted . Why are we here again?
I think the residents that live near should get final say. Who is holding these companies to ensure that the plan and estimates air quality are to their estimates? what happens if the are not. In all the documentation it all talks about planning, but no accountability, fines, or monitoring. Which is what should matter. If you speed down the highway, police are watching and thats a risk. Maybe you get cuaght, maybe not. Who is watching these agggregate companies to ensure noise pollution, air quality and water quality is not damaged?
I want to thank the County for taking this initiative. It is already a much better approach that previously followed
I will be attending the ARP meeting in my area as this was a lot of information to read through and it was hard to get this all done in one sitting.
I would like to see the County do a cost benefit analysis of aggregate operations in RVC. We can talk about the "public interest" in aggregate developments in the County but while most of these so called "public benefits" flow to the aggregate operator by way of profits the costs are born by residents and other landowners in the County through a reduced quality of life and diminished property values.
Identify key wildlife corridors and ESA lands and apply buffering them as well.

I'm grateful that the new Initiatives are being formulated and discussed. Industry is powerful and will run roughshod over this, nevertheless, if they are allowed to. The plan must include third party monitoring and significant consequences for noncompliance.

Impact on wildlife

In the case of the Scott Pit, for example, the proponent has applied to the provincial government and the Natural Resources Conservation Board, having applied to the county and failed 3 times. Does the County still have any say in this matter? This proposed project will contravene most of the requirements of this ARP.

Industry can't be last into an area. They can't have a late trump card. Local gravel pits offer nothing but grief to their neighbors or the beauty of a rural area. There are only negatives, traffic, dust, noise, increased vehicle damage from stones, decrease in property values, loss of wildlife in the area. If I move into an area with an industrial aggregate operation or that is expecting one, shame on me for being unhappy when it brings all those negatives. If I settle into a community and pay for the blessing of a quite pristine environment and you allow someone to come along and destroy that simply because they didn't plan far enough to ensure that it was known that they would be there, shame on you.

No, the promises of mitigation of issues by the industry are hollow. In real life gravel truck operators are rude inconsiderate neighbors. I already know that all too well.

It appears bias and only an act by RVC to implement noise and safe set back rules. Just this type of project, as such good rules should apply to all types of industrial parks in the Rocky Mountain corridor for residents and tourists. These distance set back must be applied retroactively to all previously exempted projects not yet constructed, else RVC appears bias and grossly negligent.

Just a bit of general feedback... I took a look at the 38 page "Aggregate Development Performance Standards" document and I took the time to read through this survey. I have a university degree, I'm an entrepreneur... This is not easy to understand when you're not familiar with the aggregate world and it is way too much information (and time!) for a survey. I appreciate the work that the County did on public engagement and transparency, it's a big improvement from how things were done just a few years ago, but I found this survey a bit intimidating. It felt like I had to have a professional opinion on the matter to be able to comment. I know that the county also hosts open houses that I could attend and that might be the right place to ask questions to better understand all the aspects of this resource plan. The schedule for these open houses is not very convenient for parents of young children!!

Just REALLY keep in mind these are our homes! Many of us have worked long and hard to make our area the best we can. Huge aggregate operations or threats to our water would have a huge impact on our quality of life and our land value.

Keep asking for input from the community - it is important.

Keep it away from residential areas. Understand the financial impact a gravel pit has on the value of an existing property.

If the aggregate company wants to operate within 10 km of a residence, aggregate must come to an agreement with each resident.

Keep up the good work in supervising and owning this issue - it is very important for us residents to have a strong voice in this matter.

Limit the number of operations in a given area, and ensure they are sited where there is short access to major roadways.
Materially increase the setbacks!!!! There is no way these operations should be located close to Bears paw or other relatively densely populated country residential areas.
More communication, more transparency about the long term (eg 25 year) plan for the entire area, not just chipping away application by application at a pristine residential rural area with accumulated industry that will eventually negate the beauty, calm, wildlife, health benefits etc we all enjoy by living out of the city.
no
NO MORE GRAVEL PITS!
No more gravel pits, enough already. No means No
No pits anywhere near residential build up communities ie Bears paw
No, I believe the plan as outlined covers most areas.
No, thank you.
No. Just have the guts to implement a resident friendly policy
Not at the moment
Nothing at this time.
our family owned a gravel pit we where only allowed to go 1 meter deep on the grade of the local road it was to protect the water table
Place yourself and your family in the homes where these pits are proposed and use common sense. Simple.
Please don't let them build too close to our houses and affect our family's lives
Please protect residential areas in Rockyview
Property values are based on living in a peaceful area, with landscapes of nature. Not a big industrial operation.
Put out some stats on what the RVC gravel pits put out for buildings, roads, jobs, reclamation projects, community support from the owners etc? What do those active pits mean to the economy?? The past NDP government shut down pipelines and energy initiatives, and look where it put the Province now?
RVC needs to make sure that they stand up for the right to access to potable water for all county residents regardless of how residents access potable water regardless of the means of access. They need to stop deferring water rights to the province and represent their residents on ensure water sources remain viable for current and future generations.
Thank you for asking for community input. This is very important to the ecological, environmental, and human protection of our community.
Thank you for bringing the ARP to this point. It will be a significant step forward in mitigating conflict between residents and resource extraction operators.
The county needs to address the councillors that are in the gravel industries pocket. Some of the councillors really like to stick it to Bears paw.
The County needs to stop acquiescing and kowtowing to corporations wanting to do business in Rocky View County.
It's one thing to allow a company to do business in our County, but it's only worth it if the

wellness of the residents and their environment are considered to be of prime importance in the decision making process—no business should be more important than the people.
<p>The fact that this has been defeated on 3 occasions and still keeps coming back affects our daily lives .</p> <p>We need to put a stop to this every 4 years .</p> <p>The county should not have allowed for high tax residential properties in close proximity to open pit .</p> <p>They should not have approved the subdivisions to be approved in the first place .</p>
The financial support by the aggregate industry to the county amounts to only approximately \$24/per county resident a year. Perhaps residents would like to be asked if they paid \$24 per year, could any new or expanding aggregate industry be eliminated from developing in their division? If there is a division that embraces this industry, aggregate development should be located there.
<p>the plan looks thorough and thoughtful, seems to cover the bases necessary for data gathering, presentation, representation etc. There are 2 issues not considered fully:</p> <p>1) the complexity of the issues and the amount of work required for non-expert citizens to meaningfully evaluate and react and organize. A priori, this weights the process and decision outcomes heavily in favour of industry. I think you need to support more the processes of resident input and reaction to these industrial proposals to provide a meaningful countervailing input - not just by this type of survey exercise.</p> <p>2) all the consultation and analysis in the world will end up being meaningless if the county government is able to take decisions that run counter to the wishes of significant groups of stakeholders. This is a fundamental issue in a democracy. There needs to be a kind of ombudsman structure that allows quick, professional review of decisions made by county government when certain thresholds of reasonableness in their decision-making have been compromised.</p>
The proposed hours of operation in the performance standards are too lax. The standard hours of operations on weekdays should be limited to 7am - 7pm. The hours of operation must also clearly prohibit the queuing of trucks on the property before hauling hours. This is a common practice at some pits and results in significant diesel fumes in the area.
<p>the provinces rules are the minimum. there is lots of gravel in the MD. keep pits as far away from people and if you want to build one close to people then they should have to buy people out. if the gravel is there that should work for everyone.</p> <p>i want to thank council for lots of good work.</p> <p>gravel on the east is different from gravel on the west. if the councillor in the east doesn't want it don't say no because of people in the west. as the industry said most people don't mind good rules other than some bad apples.</p>
<p>The residents of bearspaw live with already a number of gravel pits, even so they have been harassed by the internationally owned Heidelberg co. (Scott pit) repeatedly. It is stressful and time consuming to fight these proposals, especially when you have just finished fighting the last proposal. There has to be limits on proposals and there has to be a firm commitment to uphold decisions.</p> <p>The gravel pit industry is archaic and needs to be pushed to upgrade technology they just keep offering the same old technology, only through increasing standards, constant 3rd party monitoring and heavy fines will they evolve. The protection of our water and special natural areas</p>

(big hill springs) are paramount in this day and should over ride any company proposal that endangers these valuable resources.
The work done on this Plan is commendable and a great step towards better planning, approval and management processes for this industry. It should help to ensure that developments are more compatible with the public interest.
There should be large distances between different aggregate sites eg. 3 sites within 5 km on Hwy. 567.
This stuff needs to be done in a timely manner. We have been facing gravel extraction issues in the Bears paw area for around 30 years and it seems like they may be no end in sight.
Understand the cumulative impact of multiple simultaneous gravel pit operations in a single location such as the HWY 567 corridor.
Very cynical about the process but appreciate that some important changes have been put forward. There is little trust in the operators and how operations and monitoring are conducted once activity is started. The fact that Heidelberg is going to the Province after being turned down three times is appalling. The fix is in sadly.
WATER SAFETY !!!!!
We appreciate the work that the County has done to create this revised Aggregate Resource Plan. We appreciate that initiatives have been included that reflect concerns of residents from past aggregate resource development applications and through the committee consultation process. We understand that there has to be a balance between resource extraction and resident, health, water and environmental concerns. We hope that a few further protective measures can be included with respect to proximity to residents, health concerns (e.g. mandating lowest particulate matter standards) and water protection. Thank you for your work on this plan.
We don't want another gravel pit in our neighbourhood. Find another site away from people.
Thank you so much for this opportunity to provide input - best wishes with this - a good move forward
Rocky View County should work with the rural municipalities and the Alberta Gov't to implement new and responsible policies for the aggregate industry. No mining in the water aquifer along the bow river a critical drinking water source for a few million people should occur. Problems already exist, and the risks are not examined by independent audits, and third parties to reflect the true long-term cost to all the downstream water users.
I appreciate all the work that has been done, and I'm very hopeful that it has teeth in preventing so much discord between residents and industry.

The levies charged to the gravel companies and the contracts must take into account the responsibilities for clean-up mitigations should problems such as contamination occur. In Oil and Gas, mitigations can cost millions of dollars. Gravel mining can be similar. The public/tax payer should NOT have to bear these costs. It should not be left for public and impacted parties to prove it was the gravel company who contaminated their land - there should be no place for "he said-she said" back and forth. There needs to be ethical, independent 3rd party assessment, and proper, respectful treatment of landowners in RVC. At present, there is a lack of respectful, fair treatment and also breakdown of trust with the gravel companies.

Please do your part to insist on trustworthy behavior from the gravel companies, and take action when they act in ways that undermines trust. These breaks in trust spread to breaks in trust with RVC admin and Council when strong action against 'bad behaved' gravel companies is overlooked.

I do want to praise RVC Admin and Council for establishing this ARP, which is long overdue. I do challenge you all to ensure the final Policy is strong and meaningful and will not be merely a lip-service document that continues to allow the gravel companies to just do what they want in our County as they have been doing for far too long.

Thank you for your time and efforts.

Just don't put near existing residences that pay taxes and moved to RVC for nature

Don't consider a gravel pit in the residential neighborhood

Keep it away from high density rural housing.

At this time, no - except for community engagement in meaningful dialogue to ensure good planning and understanding. Assessment pre-development of water, noise, traffic, etc.; protecting neighbours' health and well-being and their air, land and water supplies before, during and post development and operations; monitoring and enforcement during and post operations; and sufficient reclamation are all aspects that I am concerned about. It appears that this plan reflects that the county has considered all my concerns except public engagement and prohibitions on mining in floodplains. It is not a perfect plan but with better community engagement, it can be amended from time to time to address where aspects need to be tightened up or relaxed.

It's criminal to be considering a mining operation in an established community.

Continue to oppose this application as we prepare to make our case with the Province.

These gravel pits are affecting the value of our properties. STOP allowing these pits anywhere near residential. They can find gravel anywhere in this province, tell them to go find it elsewhere. They can afford to travel further away and not affect people. They don't care about the people they are affecting and it seems like the county doesn't care either. Bottom line is greed.

Do not implement plans for new gravel pits. Period.

I truly commend Rocky View County on an excellent process to gather community input and feedback on this extremely important document (ARP). It is key to maintaining the wonderful life style that we all experience in Rocky View County. It's why we live here!

There are plentiful aggregate resources in Rocky View County therefore it is critical that the County establish limits on where and how the aggregate resource industry must operate.

It is NOT the County's role to maximize corporate profit. It is the County's role to (i) regulate the industry and (ii) direct where it may operate. It is up to individual company's to then decide whether they wish to operate under those parameters. Companies who choose to disrespect the County and its residents should be treated with the contempt they so richly deserve.

I highly recommend that in meetings with Burnco that a third party Professional Aggregate Interpreter be there to assist all in interpretation of stats. It may cost, but in the long run could save millions.

Thanks for being proactive.

Rocky View ask the Province to improve the Aggregate Resource policies, performance, reclamation, and coordination with the County and residents.

AER changed the policies after the Billion dollar orphan well costs all levels of government and tax payers. Prevent similar problems already noted by the Auditor General Reporting.

Mandatory gavel reserve reporting for existing pits and only allowing addition pits where reserves are dwindling

Operator property taxes and levies provide significant benefit to the County. Operators deserve development certainty. We are in favour of clear and appropriate standards and requirements. We would recommend the County further engage with technical experts to develop achievable standards that match industry best practice.

Operator property taxes and levies provide significant benefit to the County. Operators deserve development certainty. We are in favour of clear and appropriate standards and requirements. We would recommend the County further engage with technical experts to develop achievable standards that match industry best practice.

Allowing the removal of too much overburden from overtop of the groundwater table, and allowing aggregate mining too close to Big Hill Springs, presents too much of a risk to the groundwater & surface water in the area, and will result in potentially permanent impacts on the Bow River and those downstream. The applicants / owners should not be able to transfer the risk of environmental damage & any resulting environmental remediation from their operations to the County, or the City of Calgary. Therefore, it is imperative that STRONG regulations are in place to ensure public resources like our water and the habitat required by wildlife, including fish, are protected from damage.

Just want to reiterate that we all depend on aggregates and local is better. This is a finite resource and if the County makes the barriers too high for operators to achieve then it will result in a loss of jobs and local investment. Aggregate will have to be trucked in from elsewhere in the province. There is a balance to be had here, I just hope the County can find it. Try to listen to the operators and the public, as a municipality should. It feels like a lot of the proposed conditions are driven by public voices as opposed to actual information from operators.

Use the same standards for all aggregate applications in the County. If the County cannot manage to use common sense with regard to implementing the Resource Plan, then perhaps it is time to hand all decisions and planning to the NRCB that handles such things as feedlot applications. It would take the bias and political posturing out of the County and allow both sides to have a fair and unbiased hearing.
All standards have to be supported by cumulative impact studies?
Robust enforcement
Review + assessment of ag industry material
No gravel extraction in residential areas
How many times do we do the same talking ?
Should be allowances for site specific tests at specific residences
Specific rules, not plans, mitigations + guidelines
Vague - /lack of standards
No County Standards
Would like to see ater resources prioritized over extraction for profit that benefits private corporations or other jurisdictions with aggregate supply. Take care of residents within the County as a first priority.
There needs to be strong linkage between performance standards & DPs - DPs can list options and mitigation measures. That is not enforceable.
Land owners adjacent or adjacnet +1 should get a property tax break + an evaulation done to the reduced value of their property. Gravel companies should be reimburse them for that.
Implement the non-concensus recommendations of advisory committee.
I understand there is enough gravel in the existing pits last Calgary + area for 100 years. I also understand that much if not most of the newly extracgted gravel is shipped out/of province. So my house value loss is subsidizing a private company?
KPIs key performance indicates needed for major milestones of operations outside of mitigation plans. Proactive approach not reactive.
Concerns around water scarcity and new operations drying up old wells.
The further you haul, the bigger the carbon footprint.
We get taxed big out here because our deposits are shallow.
We already so restricted in Rocky View; the restrictions will force us to go elsewhere.
When you try to paint everyone with the same brush with one set of standards... the standards are the same, but the pits are not the same.
Not a lot of issues when it comes to performance standards as long as the are reasonable and reasonably monitored.