

# Memorandum

Date: Tuesday, July 10, 2018

To: Members of Council

From: Fuwing Wong, General Manager, Finance and Infrastructure Services/Chief Financial Officer

Subject: Second Line Right-of-Way (Former McLaren Wayside Pit)

At the 26-June-2018 General Committee meeting, two reports on the former McLaren Wayside Pit, report #2018-78 – McLaren Wayside Pit Update regarding Financial Costs and report #2018-80 McLaren Wayside Pit Update regarding Rehabilitation, were reviewed and discussed at the meeting.

The Committee raised a number of questions related to the rehabilitation/future of the Second Line Right-Of-Way (former McLaren Wayside Pit), North of Charleston Side Road. In addition, there was one delegation on the reports and correspondence received from a resident, Mr. Shapton (see Schedule A to this memo).

Mr. Shapton's correspondence includes approximately 18 questions related to the McLaren Wayside Pit reports and history. Further, the committee raised the following questions/comments:

- Should the Second Line ROW be retained by the Town for future servicing (e.g. water/sanitary) or future fibre runs for high-speed internet?
- If the Town retained ownership of the Second Line Right-Of-Way (ROW), would the Credit Valley Conservation Authority (CVC) and Bruce Trail Conservancy be interested in partnering with the Town for a public trail?
- Does the by-law that stopped up and closed the former McLaren Unopened Road Allowance (from Charleston to Beechgrove) land-lock the three properties identified by the delegate?

Staff was requested to prepare a memo for the 10-July-2018 Council meeting to address the questions/concerns, however, given the volume of question/comments and the research required to provide a complete response for some of the questions, this memo will only document the questions/comments staff received and will be working on responses for Mr. Shapton's correspondence.

A response to the questions listed above and attached will be sent to Council and Mr. Shapton when available.

There is also one correction that should be noted for report 2018-78 – McLaren Wayside Pit Update regarding Financial Costs:

- The total amount spent on capital project #11-054 Gravel Pit Extraction project was incorrectly listed as \$397,020.53 previously. The expenditures to-date for the project should have read \$269,098.47
- This correction to the financials does not change the overall staff recommendation in the report (modified by the Committee), i.e. “That the Town of Caledon not proceed with Wayside Pits in the future as noted in Staff Report 2018-78”.

Also related to staff report 2018-78 – McLaren Wayside Pit Update regarding Financial Costs, staff received an additional piece of correspondence on the financials from Mr. Sinclair on 9-July-2018 (see Schedule B, attached to this memo). In the correspondence, there is an attempt to mathematically reduce the savings from the aggregate A & B used for Town roads and the sand savings by applying a ratio pit run cost per tonne vs. the cost per tonne of aggregate used in Town roads. Essentially, the ratio of 13.8% calculated in the document is a claim that the aggregate A&B used for the two Town road construction projects is worth a fraction (13.8%) of what has been reported using the pit run as standard for calculating worth of the Aggregate A & B. The logic behind this ratio is faulty as pit run is unprocessed material which requires additional time, resources, and money to process so it is worth considerably less than the Aggregate A & B used in the construction of Simpson Road and Kennedy Road. The correspondence also attempts to value the pit run higher than what was reported using Aggregate A & B as the standard. As noted in staff report 2018-78 and above, pit run is worth significantly less than aggregate A & B due to the processing required and the unusable material that is left over after the screening and processing (e.g. 1 tonne of pit run does not result in 1 tonne of aggregate A & B). In any case, the additional correspondence still supports the recommendation for report 2018-78 (modified by the Committee), which is “That the Town of Caledon not proceed with Wayside Pits in the future as noted in Staff Report 2018-78.

**Schedule A****Questions for Town of Caledon Council and Staff :**

- 1) Why was the pursuit of a Wayside Pit permit so stubbornly pursued by the Town despite clear advice from MNR officials and resident objections that McLaren Rd. clearly did not qualify for such a license?
- 2) Who stood to benefit if a Wayside Permit were obtained, and to what extent (accurate dollar figures please)?
- 3) What was the cost to the Town (taxpayers) for the staff involvement in pursuing the wayside permit for 7 or 8 years (\$ figures please)?
- 4) Why would the Town of Caledon participate in a prolonged process that involved trying to find “wiggle room” to evade established ARA and MNR requirements?
- 5) Why was this approach not abandoned when the questionable machinations became apparent?
- 6) It is obvious that the Simpson and Kennedy projects were concocted to try to legitimize a wayside pit application rather than find a suitable source, wayside or otherwise, for an already planned project. Who spearheaded this complex and prolonged effort?
- 7) Why was the Simpson project not done after all?
- 8) Why was only 18% of the aggregate extracted from the ROW allegedly used on the 2 identified projects?
- 9) It appears that the alternate uses of the remaining 82% - sale, storage, future use, etc. - violates the ARA as pointed out by Deputy Minister Carrie Hayward; what is the Town's position vis-à-vis this contravention?
- 10) Can we see the contracts involved in the 2 projects and the trucking ‘tickets’ pertaining thereto?
- 11) It appears from the report that the amount paid to LaFarge for the extraction of Town gravel from the ROW was \$397,020.53. What specifically does this include? – i.e. trucking (to where?), screening, washing, etc.?
- 12) Were there any additional costs incurred that are not mentioned in the report?
- 13) What is the market value of the 123,797 tonnes extracted if it were to be purchased or sold by the Town from an alternate source? Is it \$8.39/tonne? or \$857/tonne? or \$1.16/tonne? And why is there 3 different values in the report ascribed to the extracted aggregate?
- 14) Who purchased the 75,000 tonnes of pit run sold by the Town?
- 15) Please also refer to document “MNRchronologydocuments3” attached and answer all questions therein.
- 16) Will the new ROW/trail become or remain as Town property, and will additional expenses accrue to taxpayers for rehabilitation and/or maintenance of the trail?

Other questions remain, and the questions above could probably be improved for clarity, but the tight deadline for communicating in advance of the Council meeting does not allow for more careful thought and refinement. Such deadlines and related requirements need to be seriously reconsidered. Input from constituents should not be treated as a nuisance or made so onerous.



## Schedule A

## Chronology and Key Communications Among MNRF Peterborough, MNRF Aurora, MHBC Planning, Lafarge and Town of Caledon Regarding McLaren Road Wayside Pit Permit Application

This summary focuses on communications that indicate that the Wayside Pit Permit Application for the McLaren Road site was initiated well in advance of the time any aggregate situated at the site was intended for use in a municipal project by the Town of Caledon.

It should be noted that, per the extracts below:

- In 2010 Town of Caledon Held discussions with LaFarge re extracting gravel from McLaren Rd. and the adjacent ROW setbacks.
- In February of 2011, the Town of Caledon indicated its intent to pursue a Wayside Pit Permit application for this site, letter of intent to MNR Oct 3, 2011 advises of discussions between Caledon and LaFarge
- June 14, 2012 application for wayside permit submitted by Craig Campbell, Town of Caledon
- In May of 2013, Caledon's Works Department indicated that the material was to be stockpiled.
- In June of 2013, the public authority contract was identified as "Various Contracts within the Town of Caledon",
- In December of 2013, Caledon indicated "the gravel will have no immediate planned use and will be stored at our own quarry."
- There was no indication of any municipal project(s) being connected to this application until June of 2014.

**The correspondence suggests MNR Aurora and the Town of Caledon were seeking a process that, in the words of MNR Aurora, would eliminate *"the risk of a lengthy process requiring an Official Plan Amendment, license application and the possibility of an appeal, etc."***

Key dates:

Feb 23, 2011 – Letter from Alex Smith (MNR) to Campbell (Caledon) "MNR is of the opinion that extraction of aggregate within McLaren Rd. to be a new licence application under the ARA as it does not currently meet any criteria for MNR to deem the extraction of the road 'not' a pit."

May 20, 2011 – Letter from MNR to Barnes (Caledon) – outlines options for removing gravel from McLaren ROW – licence & site plan amendment vs. wayside

Sept 27, 2011 - Letter from C.A. Campbell (Town of Caledon) to Tom Farrell (MNR). "in the near future the Town will be pursuing a wayside pit application to extract the materials from that property.

Sept 27, 2011 – letter from Campbell (Caledon) to Farrell (MNR) seeking to delay a rehabilitation order issued for the LaFarge pits adjacent to McLaren Rd. ROW pending efforts to find a way to extract the ROW and setback areas. "Any effort into rehabilitation may negatively influence the business opportunity for mutual beneficial extraction."



## Schedule A

May 2012 - Goodban Ecological Consulting Natural Environment Level 1 and 2 Technical Report done for Town of Caledon re: proposed McLaren Road allowance wayside pit.

July 6, 2012 – MNR Internal email : in reference to the possibility of a wayside permit "... there is no specific contract of road construction and a licence would be the more appropriate instrument."

June 13, 2012 – MHBC Wayside Pit Permit application prepared for Town of Caledon. Pit life expected to be 2 to 3 years with 150,000 tonnes total removed. Also provide access for reserves on adjacent LaFarge properties. Also "Rehabilitation to agriculture is not being proposed in this case."

June 22, 2012 – Internal MNR request: "An additional condition will be added to ensure that rehabilitation of the reduced [LaFarge] setback area will be completed in conjunction with the rehabilitation of the wayside permit (if approved)."

July 4, 2012 – Letter from MNR to MHBC: "staff are investigating a policy matter"

July 26, 2012 – Internal MNR email re: legality of wayside pit: "... **she cannot provide wiggle room** with policy 3.00.00 which prohibits the unopened road allowances from being processed as waysides."

*Language used reveals attempt to circumvent the letter of the law.*

July 26, 2012 – email MNR to MHBC "MNR is **working to resolve the outstanding policy issue.**"

*Obvious attempts to find the aforesaid "wiggle room".*

November 14, 2012:

Email from Steven Strong (MNR Aurora) to Maria VandenHeuvel (MNR).  
allowance. The idea of a wayside pit was floated because of the municipal connection and the fact the aggregate could probably be removed in short order. Given the road allowance is a hill between two pits, it would make sense to move the material. Both the Town and LaFarge would like to move forward ASAP – without the risk of a lengthy process requiring an Official Plan Amendment, licence application and the possibility of an appeal, etc.

*Clearly there was no intent at this time to use the aggregate in a specified project, and the intent of the Wayside Pit Permit application is for convenience, expedience, and to **avoid** "the risk of a lengthy process requiring an Official Plan Amendment, license application and the possibility of an appeal, etc."*

Nov 26, 2012 – Internal MNR email: "... it does not appear that the project you have described would meet the requirements of s. 23(3)(a) ... **if the material is just going to be stockpiled ... for future projects.**"

Nov 26, 2012 - Email from Maria VandenHeuvel (MNR) to Steven Strong (MNR).

Should the municipality choose to close the road allowance to enable extraction through a wayside permit, it does not appear that the project you have described would meet the requirements of s. 23(3)(a) *the aggregate is required for a project of road construction or road maintenance*, if the material is just going to be stockpiled in the municipal yard for future projects.

You are correct that in order to expand the boundary of the licence to include the road allowance, a new licence application would be required. If the primary purpose of extracting the material is to obtain aggregate, it appears that you have covered all of the available options, and the only option appears to be a licence application.

*The apparent intent of Maria VH's comment is to advise MNR Aurora that a Wayside Permit is not the appropriate device to pursue, and that a proper license application is required.*



## Schedule A

Mar 11, 2013 - MNR internal correspondence outlining the policy issues presenting difficulties with issuing a licence for McLaren Rd.. The idea of a wayside permit was “floated” as a way to allow the gravel to be extracted and stored for future use by the town and LaFarge.

*No mention of the problem of need for specific contracts or 18 month time frame. Also it is clear they wanted to avoid the “risk of a lengthy process...” and “... possibility of an appeal, etc.”*

May 14, 2013 - Memo from Caledon’s Works Department to Mayor and Council. “Council approved a capital budget in 2011 to conduct the necessary studies and work to acquire a Wayside Permit (Permit) and to crush & stockpile the gravel once delivered to the Town’s gravel pit.”

*There is clearly no intention at this time to use the gravel in specific Town projects. Rather the material is to be stockpiled.*

May 14, 2013 – Caledon PW-2013-015 recommending bylaw to close McLaren right of way to enable Caledon to: “... acquire a Wayside Pit Permit and to crush and stockpile the gravel once delivered to the Town’s gravel pit.” But that the MNR has advised “... that their policy requires a full licence to extract gravel from an unopened road allowance ...”

*This report also documents the history of attempts by LaFarge to find a way to access the gravel in the setback areas of the 2 pits adjacent to McLaren Rd. It states that the Town and LaFarge approached MNR in 2010 and after discussions, MNR suggested a wayside pit permit would be the easiest way to accomplish the mutual objectives.*

June 6, 2013 - Application for a Wayside Permitted by Craig Campbell on behalf of the Town of Caledon. The public authority contract was identified as “Various Contracts within the Town of Caledon”.

Dec 4, 2013 - Email from Bruce Hill (Caledon) to Andrew Palumbo (MHBC) – “We can give you a copy of the By-law that closes the road allowance. However, **the gravel will have no immediate planned use and will be stored at our own quarry.** Does that present a problem?”

Dec 4, 2013 - Email from Andrew Palumbo (MHBC) to Bruce Hill (Caledon) – “...absence of a municipal contract number may present a problem because MNR has already indicated that they require this – we’ve already attempted to set up the application by saying the aggregate will be used for municipal jobs in the Town of Caledon and they came back to us saying they need the municipal contract number ... further... “I understand that the gravel will not have an immediate use, and we have tried to express this with MNR, but they have still asked for this contract number.”

*There is a clear admission from MHBC that there is **no specific use planned for the aggregate**, yet they are still pursuing a Wayside Permit.*

April 3, 2014 - Email from Andrew Palumbo (MHBC) to Steven Strong (MNR)

- In early 2013 (Jan-Mar), MNR confirmed that in order to deem this application complete and proceed with the McLaren Road Allowance Wayside Pit Permit Application as originally intended, the Town of Caledon would be required complete the following actions:
  - i) Provide documentation confirming closure of the McLaren Road Allowance; and
  - ii) Ensure that a municipal contract number is setup in association with this wayside pit permit and included/referenced on the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA) site plan and other submission materials (i.e. application form, summary statement, etc.) that correspond to this application – this contract number represents the municipal works by which the aggregate from the wayside pit will be used.

## Schedule A

- The Town is also in the process of setting up the municipal contract number that will correspond to this wayside pit permit application.

June 6, 2014 - Letter from David Loveridge (Town of Caledon) to Steven Strong (MNR Aurora)

Since the issuance of the July 4, 2012 letter, dialogue between MNR Aurora and MHBC took place in an attempt to resolve this policy matter. Ultimately, MNR confirmed that in order to deem this Wayside Pit permit application complete and proceed with the application as originally intended, the Town of Caledon would be required to complete the following actions:

- 1) Provide documentation confirming closure of the McLaren Road Allowance
  - see attached **Figures 3 and 4**
- 2) Ensure that a municipal contract number is setup in association with this Wayside Pit permit, as this represents the municipal works by which the aggregate from the Wayside Pit will be used.
  - The municipal contract numbers and corresponding project name associated with this Wayside Pit permit are as follows:
    - Simpson Road Construction (Contract#: PW - 2013-058)
    - Kennedy Road Reconstruction (Contract #: 14-101)

June 6, 2014 – letter from MHBC indicating that extraction from adjacent LaFarge pits **must be completed by Dec 2015** due to the ‘Maximum Allowable Disturbed Area’ requirements, and urged fast processing

June 25, 2014 – letter from MNR to MHBC requesting change to anticipated time frame (2-3 years) for extraction: “Please ensure that the municipal contracts and extraction activities can occur within the eighteen month time frame, or adjust the proposal accordingly.” Also pointed out missing “estimated cost of the aggregate for the project as compared with that from alternate sources of supply.”

Aug 14, 2014 - Application for a Wayside Permit submitted by David Loveridge on behalf of the Town of Caledon. The public authority contract numbers were identified as Pw-2013-058 and 14-101.

October 10, 2014 - Notice of Wayside Pit Application by Town of Caledon and MHBC, identifying the projects as:

- PW-14-093, located at Simpson Road, Town of Caledon
- 140-101, located at Kennedy Road, Town of Caledon

*It would appear that, as of October, 2014, the Town of Caledon had found projects to justify the application for a Wayside Pit Permit, as opposed to developing a wayside pit to supply planned projects.*

Aug 27, 2014 – Letter from TOARC to Caledon: “On or before the expiry of the wayside permit a **summary of the total tonnage removed** must be submitted to the MNR ...”

Sept 2014 – MHBC Wayside Pit Permit application #2 prepared for Town of Caledon. Extensively similar to the June 2012 application.

Sept 4, 2014 – Wayside pit permit profile issued by MNRF



**Schedule A**

Sept 11, 2014 – Letters from MNR to MHBC and from Palumbo (MHBC) to Loveridge (Caledon): “MNR has deemed wayside pit application complete” and public notification can commence

Sept 17, 2014 – email from MHBC to MNR advising that the contract number for Simpson Rd. project was changed.

Sept 25, 2014 – email from MNRF to MHBC re draft public notices “... material removed will be used in a **road project lasting 3 years when a wayside permit is only valid for 18 months.**” “Please explain (i.e. is the material going to be removed and stored elsewhere?)”

Oct 1, 2014 – email from MHBC to MNR re draft public notice and cover letter - “I’ve **removed references to the project duration** for each contract [Simpson and Kennedy] for which the aggregate will be used, **in order to NOT cause confusion** between the project duration and the Wayside Pit duration.”

*It appears that the intent is to dishonestly mislead and hide the truth.*

Oct 3, 2014 – Email from MHBC to MNR seeking reassurance that “an extension to the 18-month period may be applied for if necessary, correct? Please just confirm this matter.”

*This reveals an anticipation that the project(s) will not be completed in time, and coincides with information PitSense rec'd from David Loveridge when he said that Simpson Rd. would not be done before “late 2016”.*

October 6, 2014 – Letter from Jane Ireland (MNR) to LaFarge confirming that MNR will proceed with issuance of “minor site plan amendment” for 2 adjacent pits once documents are signed by LaFarge. Also letter from MNR to LaFarge: [MNR will] “Allow the importation of of aggregate from the McLaren wayside ... **for storage.** ... or audit purposes, material extracted from this [LaFarge] licence **must be stored separately from that extracted from the McLaren Rd. permit.**”

*Was this actually done, and what are the 2 locations? Is there an audit of the 2 quantities? Also it is still apparent that “storage” is anticipated.*

October 8, 2014 – Issuance of Application notification – “... operations will last no more than 18 months ”

Nov 3, 2014 – Letter from Brandon Ward (Caledon) to MHBC stating that issuance of permit is “premature” due to LaFarge site plan amendment approvals for adjacent pits being still pending and that they should be processed concurrent with the wayside pit permit

Nov 14, 2014 – Email from San Grewal to MNRF with questions regarding wayside pit appropriateness

Nov 14, 2014 – letter from Caledon to MHBC advising an application for a site “variance” and seeking details on how rehabilitation will be accomplished on both LaFarge properties and wayside pit properties jointly

Dec 5, 2014 – letter from MHBC to Caledon advising that no “variance” is needed

Jan 20, 2015 - Email from David Murphy (MNRF) to Brandon Ward, Andrew Palumbo (MHBC) – “I am pleased to advise you that your application for a wayside permit has been approved.”

**Schedule A**

Jan 26, 2015 – MHBC Notification and Consultation Summary Document for Wayside Pit Application. Contents:

**2ND LINE RIGHT-OF-WAY (FORMERLY MCLAREN ROAD ALLOWANCE)  
Notification & Consultation Binder Tab Index  
1038 'C'**

<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Tab Reference</b>
September 14, 2014 / October 8, 2014	<i>120m Notice Circulation List (September 15, 2014) and Landowner Circulation (October 8, 2014);</i>	Tab A
October 14, 2014	<i>Registered Mail Delivery Confirmation and Receipts</i>	Tab B
October 8, 2014	<i>Cover letter to MNR</i>	Tab C
October 8, 2014	<i>Cover letter to Region of Peel</i>	Tab D
October 8, 2014	<i>Cover letter to Town of Caledon</i>	Tab E
November 3, 2014	<i>Town of Caledon Initial Comments and MNRF Response</i>	Tab F
November 14, 2014 / December 5, 2014, & December 11, 2014	<i>Town of Caledon Second Comments (November 14, 2014) and MHBC Initial Response (December 5, 2014) and updated response (December 11, 2014)</i>	Tab G
January 22, 2015	<i>Town of Caledon Final Comments (Resolution of All Issues)</i>	Tab H

**Feb 2 2015 – letter from MNRF to Caledon reminding Caledon of the requirement to track/report tonnage removed on a monthly basis** and that no method of doing so has been yet identified. Permit issued.

*Where are these records and what do they show?*

**June 23, 2018 –** The Simpson Road project was never done and records appear to show that **only 18%** of the extracted aggregate was used on the so-called projects. This is contrary to ARA/MNRF regulations. We were told on Dec/17/2014 in a letter from MNRF Deputy Minister Carrie Hayward: **"If the material [from the wayside pit] is not used for these projects, it is a violation pursuant to the Aggregate Resources Act (ARA)."**



**Schedule A**



June 23, 2018 - South end of Simpson Rd. where it is supposed to continue south to Mayfield Rd.



June 22, 2018 – Simpson Rd. where it is supposed to continue north from George Bolton Parkway





**Schedule A**

June 22, 2018 – Simpson Rd. where it is supposed to continue south from George Bolton Parkway.

June 26, 2018 – Staff report 2018-78 regarding McLaren Rd. 'wayside pit' which is confusing, misleading, incomplete, and questionable in its conclusions and recommendations.

Ian Sinclair

July 9, 2018

Mayor & Members of Council  
Town of Caledon  
Town Hall, 6311 Old Church Rd.  
Caledon, On L7C 1J6

Re: Mclaren Rd. [Second Line West] Wayside Gravel Strip Mine

Residents continue to be concerned with the legality, mining process, rehabilitation and financial loss associated with the "Mclaren"/ 2<sup>nd</sup> Line West wayside strip mine organized and run by the Town of Caledon.

Mr. Shapton filed a series of questions [attached] regarding the strip mine with Council at the June 26, 2018 General Committee meeting however there has been no response from the Town to the questions.

Concerns also continue, despite a staff memorandum and report to Council regarding the financial status of the road allowance strip mine. Residents have done a financial analysis of the strip mine [attached] and found a loss to the Caledon taxpayers of \$541,690.71. Staff have indicated a substantial surplus of funds to be transferred to a reserve fund. Residents and staff are far apart.

Note the rehabilitation of the road allowance strip mine has not been completed according to the Aggregate Resources Act Site Plan which means there are substantial further costs to be incurred for final rehabilitation. In addition the substantial costs for staff time, over a period of years, to obtain a strip mine licence and deal with the mining process have not been included either.

I request of Council, a full independent audit of the financial a legality of the "Mclaren"/2<sup>nd</sup> Line West wayside strip mine be conducted and reported publically to Caledon Residents.

Sincerely,

Ian G. Sinclair

**Questions for Town of Caledon Council and Staff:**

1. Why was the pursuit of a Wayside Pit permit so stubbornly pursued by the Town despite clear advice from MNR officials and resident objections that McLaren Rd. clearly did not qualify for such a license?
2. Who stood to benefit if a Wayside Permit were obtained, and to what extent (accurate dollar figures please)?
3. What was the cost to the Town (taxpayers) for the staff involvement in pursuing the wayside permit for 7 or 8 years (\$ figures please)?
4. Why would the Town of Caledon participate in a prolonged process that involved trying to find “wiggle room” to evade established ARA and MNR requirements?
5. Why was this approach not abandoned when the questionable machinations became apparent?
6. It is obvious that the Simpson and Kennedy projects were concocted to try to legitimize a wayside pit application rather than find a suitable source, wayside or otherwise, for an already planned project. Who spearheaded this complex and prolonged effort?
7. Why was the Simpson project not done after all?
8. Why was only 18% of the aggregate extracted from the ROW allegedly used on the 2 identified projects?
9. It appears that the alternate uses of the remaining 82% - sale, storage, future use, etc. - violates the ARA as pointed out by Deputy Minister Carrie Hayward; what is the Town's position vis-à-vis this contravention?.
10. Can we see the contracts involved in the 2 projects and the trucking ‘tickets’ pertaining thereto?
11. It appears from the report that the amount paid to LaFarge for the extraction of Town gravel from the ROW was \$397,020.53. What specifically does this include? – i.e. trucking (to where?), screening, washing, etc.?
12. Were there any additional costs incurred that are not mentioned in the report?
13. What is the market value of the 123,797 tonnes extracted if it were to be purchased or sold by the Town from an alternate source? Is it \$8.39/tonne? or \$857/tonne? or \$1.16/tonne? And why is there 3 different values in the report ascribed to the extracted aggregate?
14. Who purchased the 75,000 tonnes of pit run sold by the Town?
15. Please also refer to document “MNRchronologydocuments3” attached and answer all questions therein.
16. Will the new ROW/trail become or remain as Town property, and will additional expenses accrue to taxpayers for rehabilitation and/or maintenance of the trail?



Other questions remain, and the questions above could probably be improved for clarity, but the tight deadline for communicating in advance of the Council meeting does not allow for more careful thought and refinement. Such deadlines and related requirements need to be seriously reconsidered. Input from constituents should not be treated as a nuisance or made so onerous.

**McLaren Wayside Pit Update**

		Tonnes	Percentage	Savings?	Cost/Ton		
<b>Authorized Uses (alleged)</b>							
Simpson Road	#14-093	4,043					
Kennedy Road Construction	#14-101	17,920					
		<u>21,963</u>	<b>18%</b>	184,188.94	\$	8.39	
<b>Unauthorized Uses</b>							
Pit Run Sold		75,000		86,948.75	\$	1.16	
Sand for Winter Maintenance (stored)		15,000		130,000.00	\$	8.67	
Overburden or unusable material		<u>11,834</u>					
		<u>101,834</u>	<b>82%</b>				
<b>Total Extracted</b>		<u>123,797</u>	<b>100%</b>	<u>401,137.69</u>			
		Sale Price of Pit Run		=	\$	1.16	= 13.8%
		Value (cost) of Caledon's Own Gravel			\$	8.39	
	OR	Value (cost) of Caledon's Own Gravel		=	\$	8.39	= 7.23
		Sale Price of Pit Run			\$	1.16	

My thoughts:

- (1) Authorized uses (alleged road projects) 18% vs. Unauthorized uses (sale, storage, winter sand) 82%
- (2) We valued the gravel we used on our own projects at more than seven times the value we sold it for OR our pit run gravel was sold for only 13.8% of what we paid for our own gravel!
- (3) Are we really expected to save \$130,000 on sand??

Total purported savings	Gravel		184,188.94		
	Sand		<u>130,000.00</u>		
			<u>314,188.94</u>	314,188.94	
	Gravel	worth 13.8%	25,418.07		
	Sand	worth 13.8%	<u>17,940.00</u>		
			<u>43,358.07</u>	43,358.07	
Therefore, savings over-estimated by:				<u>270,830.87</u>	
Alternately, Pit Run Gravel was worth \$7.23 more what we sold it for:			86,948.75	628,639.46	
	x	7.23	<u>628,639.46</u>	86,948.75	
			<u>Therefore loss was:</u>	<u>541,690.71</u>	