protectmono

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Dufferin-Caledon Candidate Reponses to Aggregate Question

Protect Mono Inc.

Town of Mono - June 1st, 2018 – After attending the election forums in the riding and having submitted a question regarding aggregates which was not asked, we took the action of submitting our question directly to the candidates. Given the number and scale of aggregate pits and quarries in the riding, we felt it was important for the electorate to have access to the candidate's response to this question. The remainder of this press release consists of the original email sent to the candidates and their unedited responses, in the order received.

Protect Mono Inc. is a non-profit, non-partisan community organization working to protect both social and environmental assets in The Town of Mono. Our membership consists of over 200 households.

From: Protect Mono Inc.
Sent: May 25, 2018 9:55 AM
To: All Candidates for Dufferin-Caledon
Subject: Aggregate Question - Response Deadlne May 30th

Good Morning,

We submitted the following question to the Dufferin Board of Trade to be asked at the election forums:

"What would you and your party do to protect rural communities being threatened by the adverse social and environmental impacts of aggregate pits and quarries, and how would you level the playing field for communities forced to defend themselves from these threats?"

The board chose not to ask it, or any other aggregate specific question.
We consider this a glaring miss given the number and scale of active, proposed and depleted aggregate operations in the riding. To remedy this, we are sending the question to all 7 candidates in the riding and will share your responses (or lack thereof), unedited, with our members, partner organizations and the wider community.

Protect Mono is a non partisan community group with hundreds of family memberships working to protect the communities and environment within the Town of Mono. We do NOT endorse specific candidates publicly or privately. Our focus is on issues and policy.

We respectfully require your response by Wednesday May 30th at the latest.

Jeff Harris, Libertarian Candidate, Dufferin Caledon
Like a lot of residents in the Dufferin-Caledon riding, I too live on a rural property that isn't attached to a municipal water supply. That means that my wife, my two children and I all drink well water. So, I take the issue of ground water becoming contaminated very seriously.

I think there are two issues that need to be addressed. The first issue is the time it takes to get an environmental assessment done. In some cases, the assessment for an aggregate pit or quarry can drag on for 4 or 5 years. That's not good for the companies that want to build the quarries and it's not good for residents who are left in limbo - wondering whether a quarry will get approved or not. And of course, the uncertainty drives down property values.

A Libertarian government would seek ways to streamline the approval process so that a decision to approve or disapprove a quarry could be made in a year (or two at the most). In cases where an assessment is done, but the outcome is unclear or ambiguous, we should error on the side of caution and say no to the aggregate and/or pit mining application.

The second issue deals with the penalties that should be applied when a company contaminates land or water. In cases where a quarry was approved and was later found (by a court of law) to have contaminated the water supply, a Libertarian government would demand the company make full restitution (i.e. they wouldn't just pay a fine - they would have to pay all costs necessary to restore the property and water to the condition it was prior to the company's operation). Because this could potentially cost a lot of money, companies will take extra precautions to prevent problems from happening in the first place - and in many cases they'll likely not enter into development at all, because the financial risk is just too great.

Jeff Harris

Andrew Nowell, Trillium Party Candidate, Dufferin-Caledon
Being part of the Land Owners Association for Dufferin County, is what brought me to run in the upcoming election, I believe our area needed a voice that would be for the people and oppose the aggregate companies creeping into our areas, I agree we need to protect our families and the environment. We need a process in place that would not allow this to happen with full disclosure and more rights to the people in the area Trillium Party has been suppressed by the present government, (and the so called big three) and their controlled media, because they know we are truly for the people and would expose the directions they have been taking which has not been in the best interest of the people. Especially in our riding.

Andrew

Stephen McKendrick, Consensus Ontario Candidate, Dufferin Caledon
Thank you for the question and for inviting me to publicly respond to Protect Mono!

I live on an operating farm in East Garafraxa so I certainly understand the competing interests between Food and Water First advocates and industry agendas. In furthering the development and marketing of value added, agricultural products on my own farm property, conservation authorities (and not just the municipality) took great delight in preventing my family from erecting a greenhouse. It seems the rights of private property owners are being dismissed at every turn, and it is a sad dilemma for those who only want the best for their children and grandchildren.

Regarding the issue of aggregate pits and quarries, and your question -- "What would you and your party do to protect rural communities being threatened by the adverse social and environmental impacts of aggregate pits and quarries, and how would you level the playing field for communities forced to defend themselves from these threats?" -- please allow me to respond.

First, we need to recognize that God commanded His creation to be good stewards of both the land and the measure of water, and thus, citizens should have a legitimate right to protect the long-term interests of their community. I personally opposed the government's decision to introduce and then reintroduce SLAPP, wherein heavy handed legislation and intimidation could essentially eliminate public participation in environmental and municipal planning disputes. My family faced the same kind of attitude at the former Ontario Municipal Board wherein those who represent themselves at the OMB appeal level are repeatedly singled out. Nevertheless, in a country wherein our inherent rights and freedoms are entrenched in the Charter, advocate voices should not be discouraged by those with greater means and resources, or by a government who claims to represent them.

In terms of specific zoning applications for aggregate pits and quarries, there needs to be clear communication and resolution between all stakeholders. Most certainly, retaining precious water resources should be high on the agenda so that surrounding homes and wells are not negatively affected. In terms of noise pollution, can the driveway access points be moved? How do we deal with additional truck traffic? Establish sound barriers, like those along highway 401? Collectively, we all understand that increasing residential and road construction requires access to extracted materials (like gravel). We also recognize there are sufficient regulations in place already. The question is how to balance those competing interests.

From my perspective, I would like to see an expectation that when pit operators have decided to move on, the land specifically designated for quarry use not only restored to an aesthetically attractive landscape space, but also the land become publicly owned -- for the peace and enjoyment of everyone. Should this include a lake, wherein the populace would also have a natural water reservoir to access drinking water, should famine type conditions become the norm? How about picnic spaces so that those who

need a break from city life are not expected to drive for hours for a moment in the country? Walking trails? A place to fish?

Please note that my reference is to the land portion specifically used for quarry. This means that the corporate owner of a 100 acre farm for example, wherein only 5 acres was used for quarry purposes would still be permitted to retain the remaining 95 acres in their own name. Only the 5 acres would qualify for transfer to public ownership.

On your latter question, I wholeheartedly support citizens and advocate groups speaking up and defending themselves against projects that can negatively impact the community. And although private property rights are not currently entrenched in the Charter, I believe it is time for the Government of Ontario to create legislation to this effect. I would also like to see more research disseminated to the public, that in the end would help us all to understand how landscape changes can affect neighbouring communities. Certainly, both Albion Hills and Bolton (where I spent my childhood years) has changed dramatically, and in many ways, unrecognizable.

I recognize that this response may fall short in terms of specifics, but as a Consensus Ontario candidate who believes constituents should have the last word, I do have faith in Ontarians and a vision that we can find alternatives to satisfy all sides of the quarry spectrum.

As the elected MPP for Dufferin Caledon, I would most certainly want to be involved in ensuring the pastural landscapes that have contributed to the beauty of Mono and Airport Road continues.

Many blessings,

Stephen McKendrick
Candidate, Consensus Ontario for DUFFERIN CALEDON

Bob Gordanier, Liberal Candidate, Dufferin-Caledon
Thanks for the question -

The Ontario Liberal government created the Greenbelt and have the strongest track record of actually implementing long-term solutions to good land use policy.
But more needs to be done. That is why the Premier - if elected - has committed to expanding the Greenbelt. At the last local meeting in Mono Centre at the Town Hall, I was very clear. I outlined 11 concerns I had with the work of the consultants and with the proposal. First and foremost, was that we needed to protect our green space and sensitive waterways in this riding.

While there is room for healthy debate about what should be considered when making decisions, community engagement and lived experience should be considered in any robust hearing. I am the only candidate in this election that has challenged the

assumptions of this project publicly. If elected your next MPP, I would continue to fight for both our community and our farmland.

I have a meeting on this topic planned for Monday, June 4th starting with a meet and greet at 7 pm and the meeting begins at 7:30. The meeting takes place at the hall in Hornings Mills

Thanks for your patience, see you then

Bob.

Laura Campbell, Green Party candidate, Dufferin-Caledon
As many people who followed the Mega Quarry battle in our community know, the Greens were standing side by side with the people of Melanchton, and Dufferin County more broadly, in their fight to stop the project. We pressured the Liberal government to review the Aggregate Resources Act and review it they did. The new act was even less effective than the one that was in place before. Indeed, a new portion that promotes the use of old pits as aggregate recycling facilities is particularly problematic from a number of perspectives. Currently, the Greens are supporting community members in Tiny Township who are fighting a 10-year renewal application by Dufferin Aggregates at the Teedon Pit. At the Green Party, we know what the adverse impacts of pits and quarries are. It is our imperative to protect farmland and source water regions first. Mike Schreiner is the only party leader to have signed the Food and Water First pledge. I have also signed it. I own a small restaurant that buys a significant amount of local produce and some of my closest friends are farmers.

We don't deny that we need aggregates, but some things have to change: 1) We advocate in our Vision Book for a larger extraction royalty on aggregate companies so that we can fully recover the costs of monitoring (and strengthening municipal oversight of) this resource. The royalty increase would also push companies to prioritize conservation. 2) We cant allow aggregate extraction in significant source water areas like headwaters of rivers or sensitive recharge areas and acquifers. Again- this means putting WATER first. 3) We need permanent protection of prime farmland 4) We need to be smart about the promotion of recycled aggregates- and I personally endorse the idea of citizens groups, like Protect Mono, that recycling facilities should be located much closer to the regions in which the waste is being collected, and in enclosed facilities rather than open pits. 5) There has to be a demonstration of a convincing need during the permit application process for aggregate extraction- given the conflict that arises with protecting farmland.

There have to be significantly more resources available for municipalities to either oppose or monitor aggregate operations, since the Ministry of Natural Resources as it currently operates has approved pits and quarries even when the company plans violate provincial legislation. The things municipalities need (like by-law enforcement/staffing) could be funded through an increase in the royalty extraction rate. We should also start having bigger discussions at Queen's Park about how we can give more power back to communities to make these important decisions for themselves (and end the self-

monitoring of the aggregate companies). Anything that is unsustainable in the long term for water or farmland is not a good investment. I welcome any input from members of the community on issues I have missed. The Greens are on your side.

Your advocate,

Laura Campbell, Green Party candidate, Dufferin-Caledon

Sylvia Jones, Progressive Conservative Candidate, Dufferin-Caledon
Aggregate extraction and its impact on our community is an important discussion in Dufferin-Caledon, which is why I participated in the review of the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA). I fought hard to ensure that Dufferin-Caledon was included as a site for the public hearings, so that our community had an opportunity to speak to the committee. During the review, we heard from many residents, municipalities, experts and stakeholders from across the province. The insight gained during the hearings and in correspondence received is reflected in the 38 recommendations that were made.

I promoted the use of recycled aggregated in my Private Members Bill that required municipalities and government organizations to use recycled aggregate whenever possible in publically funded projects. I was concerned that some municipalities still have a policy that rejects using recycled aggregate.

I pressed the Minister of Environment for changes to the Environmental Registry (EBR) to make the EBR more user friendly for individuals who are searching and seeking information. The current limitations on the search engine of the EBR can be vastly improved to help those who want to be notified about applications on the registry.

In Ontario we have an application process. I believe that we must allow the process to take its course. In order for the procedure to be the most effective and trusted by our communities it should not be political, but based on facts, science and input from the public.

As your Member of Provincial Parliament, I am encouraged by the number of individuals and organizations who are willing to bring forward ideas to help improve the process. I will continue to advocate for my community.

Sylvia Jones

Andrea Mullarkey, New Democratic Party Candidate, Dufferin-Caledon
No response received