

Resource Extraction Regulatory Review

Responses to Public Questions from June 22 Public Hearing



Submission from William Rudko

“The County outlines that the distance should be increased to protect livestock. What type of livestock to they have in mind – avian?”

Sand and gravel extraction operations may impact different types of livestock in different ways. The proposed resource extraction direct control land use district would allow us to set site-specific setback distances. If a specific setback distance between the resource extraction operation and the livestock operation can be scientifically supported, that setback distance could be set. Council would consider any demonstrated impacts to livestock when making its decision for a rezoning application.

Submission from Vivianne Pambrun

Various questions – Please see June 22-2023 Public Hearing Record of written and verbal submissions bylaw 1607/22

Sand and gravel extraction operators will be required to submit all information and plans to support their site-specific applications. This submission would include any necessary Traffic Impact Assessments, communication and engagement records and adherence to the Groundwater Monitoring Program. For proposals under the Resource Extraction direct control applicants will be required to provide all necessary information that support a reduction of setbacks as set out in Section 11.3.6 including Noise, Air Quality, Traffic, Hydrogeological, Stormwater, Emergency Response and visual impact assessments or plans. These assessments and plans will inform council on what measures will be applied to that specific proposal.

The County recently hired a development compliance officer who is focussed on making sure development permit conditions are met. This individual would investigate development and land use complaints – including those related to resource extraction operations – and take enforcement action, as needed. This specifically includes investigating and coordinating enforcement of noise, air quality, and road use.

Submission from Brian McBride

I would like to also know why Silica Sand only and not all mineral extractions would be subject to an 800m setback?

Silica Sand projects have been determined to require a greater setback due to unique impacts than other aggregate operations.

Submission from Neil Yakimets

So why are Sand Operations being treated differently then Sand and Gravel when they clearly have less of an impact to surrounding landowners? Does the County have the expertise to make decisions based on the various areas of expertise like the province does? (Regarding Environmental review)

We encourage you to view [Aggregate Pits: Municipal and Provincial Processes](#), which was published by Alberta Environment and Parks in 2021. This document outlines the application process in which provincial approval is initiated before applying for municipal land use districting/zoning changes. The County reviews the application after the provincial experts have reviewed and approved the project.

Silica Sand projects have been determined to require a greater setback due to unique impacts than other aggregate operations.

Submission from Rose Domshy

What is the purpose of the 800m setback? (Regarding how it affects sand operators)

Silica Sand projects have been determined to require a greater setback due to unique impacts than other aggregate operations.