Mr. Kazmierczak:

I remain deeply troubled by the County’s approach to gravel policy as reflected in the revised Aggregate Resource Plan. Many residents submitted feedback on the earlier draft of the County’s ARP and had hoped that the revised ARP would reflect some of their widely shared concerns.

Earlier submissions highlighted the serious impacts on health, safety, and quality of life that are imposed on people forced to live close to gravel pits. Those concerns have not diminished. The reality is that open pit gravel extraction and people are not compatible. No matter how effective performance standards are, they cannot mitigate all the harm caused by ongoing gravel operations. As a result, it is critically important to have meaningful setbacks between people and gravel.

At the end of the last round of consultations, Administration acknowledged that, in response to the significant feedback, they would do a thorough rewrite of the ARP. That is what residents thought was happening in the year’s lag before the release of the revised draft. Unfortunately, it has become clear that this did not happen since the revised ARP does not address any of the substantive concerns repeatedly identified earlier.

The County received more feedback on the original draft ARP than it has on any other policy initiative. An overwhelming majority of residents (80%) clearly stated that the proposed 500-metre setback was completely inadequate. Three-quarters of them recommended setbacks of at least 1,500 metres.

I remain convinced that the **minimum setbacks should be**:

\_\_\_\_ 100m / 500 m (as per ARP);

\_\_\_\_ 800 m / 1,500 m (as per Lac Ste. Anne County);

\_\_\_\_ 1,000 m;

\_\_\_\_ 1,500 m; or

\_\_\_\_ 2,000 m or more

The **setbacks should be measured from** \_\_\_\_ the closest edge of the dwelling to the aggregate operations (as per ARP); or \_\_\_\_ from property line to property line.

The new **setbacks for Area Structure Plans,** which will allow new and expanded gravel operations inside of ASPs, with a setback of 800 metres if there are at least 20 residences in the adjacent quarter section (500 metres if < 20), \_\_\_\_ are adequate; or \_\_\_\_ are not adequate.

The revised ARP left in provisions that **“safeguard” potential gravel resources** (now called “managing the resource”). Almost 60% of residents criticized these provisions as an unjustified infringement on landowners’ property rights, especially since gravel is an abundant resource throughout the County and elsewhere in southern Alberta. I think that this protection for the gravel industry at the expense of local landowners \_\_\_\_\_ is appropriate; or \_\_\_\_ is not appropriate.

I remain hopeful that our new Council will re-examine the approach taken on gravel policy to date. The County’s responsibility is to represent and protect its residents, not the gravel industry. Residents are counting on our new Council to listen to their residents and direct Administration to come back with a resident-focused ARP that will still allow the gravel industry to operation in Rocky View.

Please sign, date, and print your name & address: