



To: **Committee of the Whole**

Agenda Section: Corporate Services
Division: Engineering, Planning and Environment
Department: Planning

Item Number: CCW - 2018-320

Meeting Date: June 12, 2018

Subject: Request for Adoption - County of Simcoe Official Plan Amendment No. 2 for the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre (ERRC)

Recommendation

That Item CCW 2018-320, dated June 12, 2018 regarding Request for Adoption – County of Simcoe Official Plan Amendment No. 2 for the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre, be received; and

That the necessary by-law be presented to County Council to adopt the proposed County of Simcoe Official Plan No. 2 – Environmental Resource Recovery Centre substantively in the form attached as Schedule 11 to Item CCW 2018-320; and

That a Notice of Adoption of Official Plan Amendment No. 2 to the County of Simcoe Official Plan be provided in accordance with the *Planning Act*; and

That the record of adoption be forwarded to the Province for consideration and approval in accordance with the *Planning Act*.

Executive Summary

The County of Simcoe adopted a Solid Waste Management Strategy in 2010 that provides the framework for the County's solid waste management system and diversion programs. Guided by the Strategy, and following further recommendations from Council, the County initiated a siting process in 2014 to identify a site for the development of an Organics Processing Facility (OPF) for the long-term processing of source-separated organics (SSO). The siting process was subsequently expanded to also identify a site for the development of a Materials Management Facility (MMF), a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) and ancillary uses including a stormwater management facility, waste vehicle servicing facility, and administrative facility. Collectively, these facilities are referred to as the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre (ERRC).

Following an extensive siting process, County Council selected the property located at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road in the Township of Springwater within Lot 2, Concession 1, as the preferred site.

A County Official Plan Amendment is required to permit the development of the ERRC along with amendments to the Township of Springwater Official Plan and Zoning By-law. The County initiated the official plan amendment in late 2016. The amendment will modify Schedule 5.6.1 County Waste Disposal Sites and Section 4.9 of the County Official Plan by identifying the permitted uses and associated details of the development.

After reviewing the comprehensive supporting materials and extensive public and agency comments, County planning staff recommend adoption of Official Plan Amendment No. 2 to the County of Simcoe Official Plan as per Schedule 11 to this Item as the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), conforms with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017), and conforms with the goals, objectives and general intent of the County of Simcoe Official Plan.

Background/Analysis/Options

The following provides a summary of the proposal:

Location: 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West (County Road 22), Township of Springwater, County of Simcoe
Applicant: County of Simcoe
Proposal: To amend Schedule 5.6.1 of the County Official Plan by renaming the schedule from 'County Waste Disposal Sites' to 'County Waste Management System', adding 'Environmental Resource Recovery Centre' to the map legend and adding a symbol for 'Environmental Resource Recovery Centre' to the Schedule on a portion of the subject lands. The proposed amendment will also add a new site specific section of text after Section 4.9.17 of the County Official Plan detailing the permitted uses and associated development parameters.

The effect of the amendment is to facilitate the development of an Environmental Resource Recovery Centre that includes an Organics Processing Facility for the long-term processing of source-separated organics, a Materials Management Facility for the transfer of garbage, recyclables and source-separated organics, a potential future Materials Recovery Facility, and ancillary uses.

County File: SC-OPA-1602
Ministry File: 43-OP-169096

The County of Simcoe adopted a Solid Waste Management Strategy in 2010 that provides the framework for the County's solid waste management system and diversion programs. Guided by the Strategy, and following further recommendations from Council, the County initiated a siting process in 2014 to identify a site for the development of an Organics Processing Facility (OPF) for the long-term processing of source-separated organics (SSO). The siting process was subsequently expanded to also identify a site for the development of a Materials Management Facility (MMF) for the transfer of garbage, recyclables, and organics and a Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) to process and separate co-mingled recyclable materials into core components to ship to end-user manufacturers. Ancillary uses include a stormwater management facility, waste vehicle servicing facility, administrative facility and public education area. Collectively, these facilities are referred to as the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre (ERRC).

Following an extensive siting process, which considered 502 candidate sites, County Council selected the property located at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road in the Township of Springwater within Lot 2, Concession 1, as the preferred site. The subject lands are approximately 84 hectares (207.6 acres) in size and the approximate footprint of the ERRC is estimated at 4.5 hectares (11.12 acres) with 1.0 hectares (2.5 acres) for the access road. The designed capacity for the MMF is 30 years and 30,000 tonnes per year for OPF and incorporates future growth projections for the County. In the interim, there

will be potential to accept some organics and recycling from other jurisdictions such as the Cities of Barrie and Orillia.

The purpose of the County initiated amendment is to modify Schedule 5.6.1 of the County Official Plan by renaming the schedule from 'County Waste Disposal Sites' to 'County Waste Management System', adding 'Environmental Resource Recovery Centre' to the map legend and adding a symbol for 'Environmental Resource Recovery Centre' to the Schedule on a portion of the subject lands. The proposed amendment will also add a new site specific section of text after Section 4.9.17 detailing the permitted uses and associated development parameters on the site.

The effect of the amendment is to facilitate the development of an Environmental Resource Recovery Centre that includes an Organics Processing Facility for the long-term processing of source-separated organics, a Materials Management Facility for the transfer of garbage, recyclables and source-separated organics, a potential future Materials Recovery Facility, and ancillary uses.

Site Description

County Council selected the property located at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West (County Road 22) in the Township of Springwater legally described as Lot 2, Concession 1, as the preferred site for the ERRC. A locational map is attached as Schedule 1 to this Item. The subject lands are approximately 84 hectares (207.6 acres) in size and the approximate footprint of the ERRC is estimated at 4.5 hectares (11.12 acres) with 1.0 hectares (2.5 acres) for the access road. The facility footprint will be approximately 6.5% of the total property area allowing for continued forest management activities and the use of the forest for recreational purposes.

The subject lands are located in the eastern part of the Township of Springwater with frontage on Horseshoe Valley Road West (County Road 22) and Rainbow Valley Road East. Access to the facility is proposed from Horseshoe Valley Road West with an emergency access road from Rainbow Valley Road East. The existing entrance onto Horseshoe Valley Road West is proposed to be moved further to the east to provide safer access to the site. The property is also approximately 3 kilometres west of Highway 400 and adjacent to a hydro transmission corridor to the east owned by Hydro One Networks.

The adjacent land uses to the south are agricultural, estate residential and woodlands. Agricultural lands with associated residential dwellings are located west of the subject property. Woodlands are located north and east of the property with residential dwellings contained within the forested area. There are no water or wastewater services on the property. The property is comprised of Canada Land Inventory Class 1 - 3 Soils and Class 5 - 7 Soils. Class 1 - 3 Soils are located in the northeast, southeast and southwest portions of the site with Class 5 - 7 Soils in the central eastern, western and southern portions of the site. The facility footprint is located primarily in Class 5 - 7 Soils.

The property is a managed forest owned by the County of Simcoe known as the 'Freele Tract'. The land was purchased by the County in 1948 and reforested in 1949 with smaller amounts of infill planting in subsequent years. The forest is managed for the purposes of timber harvesting with a portion of the site reforested with a plantation of pine and spruce species. Unevaluated wetlands are located in the northeast and southeast portions of the property. The forest tract is open to the public and used for seasonal recreation activities such as snowmobiling, cross country skiing, hiking and cycling.

Description of the Proposed Uses

Primary Uses:

Materials Management Facility (MMF)

- Facility for the consolidation of waste including garbage, recyclables and organics from multiple collection vehicles into larger, higher volume transfer vehicles for more economical shipment to other disposal or processing locations (referred to as a transfer facility). The MMF will likely be a multiple storey building approximately 10 to 15 metres in height and consist of a pre-engineered steel frame structure with exterior walls constructed of concrete and steel sheeting. The proposed area of the MMF is approximately 0.3 hectares (0.74 acres).

Organics Processing Facility (OPF)

- Facility where source-separated organics and potentially materials such as leaf and yard waste, pet waste and diapers are processed under controlled conditions and converted into other valuable products such as compost or fertilizer. The County's procurement process for the OPF will be open to all types of aerobic and anaerobic digestion technologies. Both types of technologies are engineered biochemical processes involving the decay of organic materials but involve different conditions and produce different outputs. The proposed area of the OPF is approximately 1.0 hectare (2.5 acres).

Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)

- Facility for the processing and separating of co-mingled recyclable materials into its core components such as paper, glass, metals and plastics for marketing and shipment to end-user manufacturers. The proposed area of the MRF is approximately 0.4 hectares (1 acre).

Secondary Uses:

Truck Servicing Facility

- Facility for servicing the County's fleet of Solid Waste Management vehicles with 2 to 3 repair bays. It is noted that this facility will not be for servicing contracted waste collection vehicles.

Administration Facility

- Facility for administrative offices, meeting spaces, washroom and changeroom, lunchroom and public education area. The proposed area of the administration area and the truck servicing facility is approximately 0.045 hectares (4,843 square feet).

Stormwater Management Facility

- Facility for stormwater management controls that will mitigate the increase of surface runoff from the impervious areas, maintain existing water quality and quantity conditions and address pre to post conditions. Components of the facility include vegetative filter strips, vegetative swale, stormwater management pond, and a drainage ditch along the access road to convey any overflow. The proposed area of the stormwater management facility is approximately 0.6 hectares (1.48 acres).

The conceptual site plan of the ERRC facility is attached as Schedule 3 to this Item.

Waste Management Policy Context

Provincial Waste Management Policies

The Province has introduced new legislation and policies that will impact municipal waste management and increase the diversion of waste from landfill. This recent legislation and waste management policies include:

- *Waste-Free Ontario Act, 2016 and Resource Recovery and Circular Economy Act, 2016*
- *Climate Change Mitigation and Low-carbon Economy Act, 2016*
- *Strategy for a Waste-Free Ontario: Building the Circular Economy, 2017*
- *Food and Organic Waste Framework, April 2018.*

Generally, these policies require the Province, municipalities, producers, commercial, industrial, institutional and waste management sectors to further provincial interest in waste reduction and resource recovery as it relates to products and packaging, food and organic waste, lowering recycling costs, and reducing greenhouse gas pollution that results from the landfilling of products that could otherwise be recycled or composted. It is anticipated that organics processing capacity will be required to support diversion initiatives.

In particular, the Food and Organic Waste Policy Statement states “Ontario will need to support existing resource recovery systems and develop additional capacity to process food and organic waste. These facilities must be well-planned and suitably suited to ensure the long-term effectiveness of our resource recovery system. Strategic infrastructure planning is important for supporting the development of efficient and effective infrastructure capacity. When siting new capacity or re-designating neighbouring land uses, promoting compatibility, preventing encroachment and mitigating adverse effects are critical to ensuring that existing and planned facilities can contribute to building a circular economy in Ontario.”

These policies further emphasize the need to develop the Organics Processing Facility (OPF) and Materials Management Facility (MMF) to further provincial waste management interests.

County of Simcoe Solid Waste Management Strategy 2010 and 2016 Update

Developed in 2010, the Solid Waste Management Strategy was intended to guide County waste management planning for a 20 year period. It contained clear direction, upheld to date, that no new landfills would be sited in the County. Therefore, development of transfer and processing capacity was a significant component. The Strategy considered options for organics processing within and outside the County with short term recommendations to continue to export organics to a facility outside the County and long term recommendations to assess the construction of an OPF within the County. The Strategy also recommended development of transfer capacity. The MMF will be an integral part of the County’s waste management system. The 2016 update of the strategy noted the selected location, development strategy, and potential procurement process for the OPF and MMF.

Siting Process

The County undertook an extensive siting process from 2014 to 2016. Although not required, the siting process mirrored the Environmental Assessment (EA) process with a comprehensive consultation process with the public, Indigenous communities and agencies along with a detailed set of evaluation criteria including environmental, social, cultural, technical, economic and legal components. A commitment was made to undertake the siting process in a transparent and defensible manner.

It should be noted that an EA is not required for this project under the *Environmental Assessment Act, 1990* as an EA is only required if more than 1,000 tonnes per day of residual waste is transferred from the site for final disposal. Based on the design capacity of the facility with growth over a 30 year period, it is estimated that the County will manage approximately 435 tonnes per day of waste for final disposal.

The County chose to adopt the EA methodology with the understanding of the sensitive nature of siting waste management facilities. The extensive siting public consultation process is detailed in Schedule 4 to this Item.

A three stage screening process occurred starting with 502 candidate sites that were selected from County-owned properties and privately owned properties sourced through Multiple Listing Service (MLS) and a Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEI). The assessment of the potential sites involved a comparative analysis of each site by applying over twenty environmental and technical criteria such as avoidance of wetlands, floodplains, vulnerable areas under Source Protection, prime agricultural areas and sensitive receptors. As a result of the screening process, 50 sites were identified on the long list and

from these properties, 7 sites were short listed for the OPF and 5 for the MMF. It was also determined that 5 sites were suitable to host a co-located facility. Through the evaluation process, site visits and further public and stakeholder consultation, one preferred site at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Township of Springwater was determined from the original list of 502 sites for a co-located facility.

Further details on the site selection process can be accessed through the following reports available on the County website as noted in the reference documents to this Item:

1. County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 – Planning – Site Methodology and Evaluation Criteria prepared by Conestoga-Rovers & Associates dated February 2015
2. County of Simcoe Materials Management Facility Part 1 – Planning – Site Methodology and Evaluation prepared by Conestoga-Rovers & Associates dated February 2015
3. County of Simcoe – Organics Processing Facility Part 2 – Long List Evaluation prepared by GHD Limited dated July 2015
4. County of Simcoe – Materials Management Facility Part 2 – Long List Evaluation prepared by GHD Limited dated July 2015
5. County of Simcoe – Organics Processing Facility, Materials Management Facility and Co-Located Facility Part 3 – Short List Evaluation prepared by GHD Limited dated February 26, 2016

Public Consultation Process

Business Case Development

While not required under the *Planning Act*, the County prepared and provided business cases for the OPF and MMF to Council on September 26, 2017 (see Reference Items CCW 17-222 and 17-223).

The business case for the OPF was completed by Ernst and Young Orenda Corporate Finance Inc. to assess the business and operational impacts, associated risk and cost/benefit of various options for the organic processing submitted via a Request for Information (RFI) process in early 2017.

The business case for the OPF examined five project options including status quo (continued export to current operator), export to other facilities owned and operated by a merchant partner and three technology options for a County owned facility. Based upon the RFI submitted and estimated site development costs, the development of a County-owned facility utilizing dry anaerobic digestion (AD) with in-vessel composting technology had the lowest 20 year nominal costs and net present value (NPV) of all five options. Development of a County-owned facility noted to be the most advantageous option.

The business case for the MMF was prepared by the County Project Team including the County Finance Department with the assistance of GHD Limited who were retained to refine the conceptual design and associated costing based on their knowledge of site conditions and transfer station design and operations.

The business case for the MMF noted that the development of a County owned facility to manage the long-term transfer of garbage and blue box recycling until 2022 would have the lowest costs over the 20 year time period. During the 20 year operating period, the analysis indicated considerable annual savings as greater tonnage of garbage are managed with the closure of County landfills. The development of County-owned transfer capacity was the recommended approach in preparation for long-term, secure management of waste. The *Waste-Free Ontario Act* may require sections of the business case for the MMF to be updated once the impact of the new policies is clarified, most notably, the impact of the changes to the blue box program.

In considering risk, it was noted that while exporting of organics is convenient in the short-term, it is expected that increasing pressure on municipalities in the form of waste-related regulations and

legislation such as the *Waste-Free Ontario Act* could lead to market capacity and availability issues. Additionally, with limited transfer capacity in the region, the County could be vulnerable to pricing increases associated with the transfer of recycling and waste. This will be critical as County landfills close over the next decade.

The business case for the OPF noted that a County-owned facility could provide a solution that is advantageous, comparably low risk, financially viable and in alignment with the County's objectives included in the Strategy. Ernst and Young also outlined that the County would benefit from a 'technology neutral' procurement process for the OPF that would give proponents greater flexibility in the development of a solution to meet the County's organic processing requirements.

Siting Consultation

The County undertook a two year comprehensive siting process that mirrored the Environmental Assessment (EA) process as noted above. The public consultation process engaged stakeholders from local municipalities, indigenous communities, neighbouring landowners, agencies and the public. The siting consultation is further detailed in Schedule 4 to this Item.

It should be noted that the proposal requires Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) issued by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). An ECA is overseen and enforced by the Province and will cover waste operations, air, noise and surface and ground water monitoring and controls at the facility. The ECA will govern how the facility will be operated and monitored with respect to preventing offsite impacts. The approvals process for the ECA will require additional technical submissions along with public, indigenous communities and stakeholder consultation through the Environmental Registry of Ontario process.

Planning Consultation

A copy of all circulations and notices are attached as Schedule 5 to this Item.

December 22, 2016 Agency Circulation – Request for Comments on Proposal and Supporting Studies to All Provincial Ministries, Federal Agencies, Local Municipalities, Separated Cities, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority, School Boards, Health Unit, Indigenous Communities, Forestry Stewardship Council, and Utilities.

January 9, 2017 Internal Departmental Circulation

January 24, 2017 Agency Circulation – Request for Comments on Supplemental Figure (Buffer Distances) to All Agencies included in December 22, 2016 circulation.

April 13, 2017 Statutory Public Meeting Circulation

Circulation included installing a sign on the subject property; mailing a copy of the notice and draft official plan amendment to all agencies noted in the original circulation and all property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands; publishing the notice in ten local papers throughout the County; sending a media advisory; and posting the notice and meeting information on the County's website and social media platforms.

County of Simcoe Solid Waste Management staff mailed a copy of the notice, draft official plan amendment, and a covering letter to 18 landowners within 121 m to 500 m of the subject property. Solid Waste Management staff also

emailed all interested parties that requested information on the project through the siting process.

May 9, 2017

Statutory Public Meeting was held at the County of Simcoe Administration Centre starting at 11:00 AM. Minutes and a transcript were prepared following the meeting and are attached as Schedule 6 to this Item.

February 12, 2018

Agency and Internal Department Circulation – Request for Comments on Updated Documentation (6 amended reports) was circulated to all agencies included in the original circulation as well as internal departments that had provided previous comments.

Public Circulation – A letter was mailed or emailed to all members of the public that had provided written or oral comments to date. The correspondence outlined the updated studies that were received and where to access the studies.

County of Simcoe Solid Waste Management staff also emailed all interested parties that requested information on the project through the siting process.

Availability of Supporting Documentation

Supporting studies, notices, public meeting minutes and comments have been made available through the County's website and at the County Administration Centre. Additional materials on the siting process, project updates, frequently asked questions, and fact sheets were made available through the County's website. The County has strived to provide up-to-date information and correspondence on the project to the public and agencies.

Supporting Studies

Original Studies

1. Locational Plan prepared by GHD Limited dated November 17, 2016
2. Conceptual Site Plan Figure 3.1 prepared by GHD Limited dated November 15, 2016
3. Planning Justification Report prepared by GHD Limited dated November 17, 2016
4. Scoped Environmental Impact Study (includes Hazard Lands Assessment) prepared by GHD Limited dated November 17, 2016
5. Agricultural Impact Assessment Report prepared by AgPlan Limited dated November 17, 2016
6. Facility Characteristic Report (includes Stormwater Management, Noise & Odour, Functional Servicing) prepared by GHD Limited dated November 17, 2016
7. Cultural Heritage Resources: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes, Existing Conditions – Impact Assessment prepared by ASI Archaeological & Cultural Heritage Services dated August 2016 (Revised November 2016)
8. Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment prepared by ASI Archaeological & Cultural Heritage Services dated November 17, 2016
9. Stage 3 Site Specific Archaeological Assessment for Gribbin Site (BdGw-49) prepared by ASI Archaeological & Cultural Heritage Services dated November 11, 2016
10. Stage 3 Site Specific Archaeological Assessment Supplementary Documentation for Gribbin Site (BdGw-49) prepared by ASI Archaeological & Cultural Heritage Services dated November 11, 2016
11. Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports Stage 3
12. Traffic Impact Study prepared by MMM Group dated November 2016
13. Hydrogeological Assessment prepared by GHD Limited dated November 15, 2016

Amended Studies

1. Amended Planning Justification Report prepared by GHD Limited dated February 2018
2. Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study prepared by GHD Limited dated February 1, 2018
3. Amended Facility Characteristic Report prepared by GHD Limited dated February 1, 2018
4. Updated Hydrogeological Assessment prepared by GHD Limited dated February 1, 2018
5. Geotechnical Investigation prepared by GHD Limited dated November 30, 2017
6. Traffic Impact Study Addendum prepared by MMM Group dated October 2017
7. Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes prepared by ASI Archaeological & Cultural Heritage Services revised November 2017
8. Letter from GHD dated November 29, 2017 providing correspondence from Ministry of Tourism, Sport and Culture confirming acceptance of Stage 3 Site Specific Archaeological Assessment dated July 12, 2017

Planning Analysis

Planning Act

Section 2 of the *Planning Act* provides that Council in carrying out their responsibilities under the *Planning Act* shall have regard to matters of Provincial interest. The matters of Provincial interest which should be considered in this proposal include the following:

- a. The protection of ecological systems, including natural areas, features and functions;
- b. The protection of agricultural resources of the Province;
- d. The conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest;
- f. The adequate provision and efficient use of communication, transportation, sewage and water services and waste management systems;
- g. The minimization of waste;
- o. The protection of public health and safety; and
- p. The appropriate location of growth and development.

Section 3(5) of the *Planning Act* states that a decision of Council in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter shall be consistent with the policy statements issued under subsection (1) that are in effect on the date of the decision and shall conform with the provincial plans that are in effect on that date, or shall not conflict with them, as the case may be. Relevant sections of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 are identified below.

Provincial Policy Statement (2014)

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) came into effect in 2014 and provides direction on matters of Provincial interest related to land use planning and development. While the PPS provides limited direction in respect to waste management, the following are policies that are applicable in the development of the proposed ERRC.

1.2.1 Coordination

Policy 1.2.1 (d) states that a coordinated, integrated and comprehensive approach should be used when dealing with planning matters within municipalities, across lower and upper tier municipal boundaries and other government agencies for waste management systems.

Waste management systems is defined in the PPS as “sites and facilities to accommodate solid waste from one or more municipalities and includes recycling facilities, transfer stations, processing and disposal sites.”

The County provides waste collection services including waste, recycling and organics for 16 lower tier municipalities. County Council is comprised of representatives from each local municipality. The municipalities along with the separated Cities of Barrie and Orillia have been involved in the siting and land use planning processes. The proposed location of the ERRC has been strategically sited in the centre of the County for operational purposes.

1.2.6 Land Use Compatibility

Policy 1.2.6 indicates that major facilities and sensitive land uses should be planned to ensure that they are appropriately designed, buffered and separated from each other to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term viability of major facilities. The PPS definition of *major facilities* includes waste management facilities. The PPS definition of *sensitive land uses* means buildings, amenity areas or outdoor spaces where routine or normal activities occurring at reasonably expected times would experience one or more adverse effects from discharges by nearby major facilities such as residences, day care centres, educational and health facilities.

Land use compatibility is a significant consideration when siting waste management facilities. The key component of the siting process was the potential impact on sensitive land uses. In considering potential impacts, means of mitigating potential issues including noise, odour, and visual impact must be examined.

The surrounding land uses are primarily agricultural and woodlands with limited sensitive receptors in the form of residential dwellings. As illustrated on Schedule 2 of this Item, there are 11 rural residential or farm dwellings located within 500 metres of the property boundary. Of these, 3 dwellings are located within 200 metres of the property boundary. The closest sensitive receptor to the facility footprint is 388 metres to the southeast (2928 Horseshoe Valley Road West). Within one kilometre of the site boundary, there are approximately 40 additional residential units. There are two vacant lots of record located near the site boundary. An 800 adult lifestyle condominium development is proposed to be located south of Fox Farm Road, approximately 2 kilometres from the facility footprint.

The facility footprint has been sited to avoid sensitive receptors, natural features and archaeological resources. The footprint is sited more than 180 metres from the northeast wetland and 85 metres from the 10 metre setback from the known archaeological resource. A row of trees approximately 100 metres wide will buffer the facility from nearby agricultural operations to the west of the site. The nearest livestock facilities are north of Rainbow Valley Road East approximately 750 metres from the facility footprint and are buffered by the remaining woodland.

As noted above, the proposal requires an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) issued by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). Air quality is enforced by the MOECC and was considered in the land use planning comments with further study required during the ECA process when the technology has been determined.

A comprehensive Air Quality Impact Assessment Report (AQIA) was undertaken by the County at the request of the MOECC which is typically reserved for the ECA process. The ERRC has the potential to emit odour and other air emissions from organic materials and transfer of waste. As the technology has not been determined (either anaerobic digestion or composting), the modelling incorporated both technologies based on similar operations within the province. The dispersion modelling of odour

emissions did not identify any points off the property where discharges of odour may result in an adverse effect based on MOECC standards and guidelines.

Modern odour control measures will be incorporated into the design of the facility and an Odour Mitigation and Management Plan will be developed as part of the ECA submission. A detailed air and odour assessment called an Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling (ESDM) Report will be required as part of the ECA.

Noise impacts were modeled using worse case scenarios with sources typically found at such facilities including large fans, blowers, and traffic. The closest residence to the southeast was the most impacted sensitive receptor with inbound and outbound traffic being the primary contributor to noise generated from the site. However, it was concluded that the facility, using typical noise levels, can comply with the MOECC noise limits. It was recommended that during final design, equipment should be selected to ensure that it does not exceed the noise impacts modelled in order to meet the MOECC noise limits.

Lighting impacts will be mitigated by using down-cast, low-wattage and motion-active lights on the site. The proposed hours of operation from 6:00 am to 7:00 pm also mitigate the risks of light pollution.

The ECA will govern how the facility will be operated and monitored with respect to preventing offsite impacts and will require the County to undertake additional public consultation and technical studies based upon the selected technology. Through the careful design, operation and implementation of mitigation measures and best management practices, the facility can be developed with no or limited impacts on sensitive receptors.

1.6.6.7 Stormwater Management Facilities

Policy 1.6.6.7 states that stormwater management shall be planned to minimize, or where possible, prevent increases in contaminant loads; minimize changes in water balance and erosion; not increase risk to human health, safety and property damage; maximize the extent and function of vegetative and pervious surfaces; and, promote best management practices, including attenuation, re-use and low impact development.

A Hydrogeological Study and Facilities Characteristic Report were completed to address stormwater management on the site. A stormwater management facility is planned within the facility footprint and is specifically identified as a secondary use on the site. The 0.6 hectare (1.48 acre) stormwater facility will capture and treat surface runoff from impervious areas such as rooftops and paved roadways. Potential stormwater management controls include a vegetated filter strip, rock check dams, stormwater management pond, infiltration basin, catch basins, manholes, piping, overflow weir and a drainage ditch. Following post development, it is proposed that all runoff from within the footprint of the facility will be contained within its limits and will meet quality and quantity objectives before being discharged. Stormwater management is also discussed in PPS Section 2.2 Water below. Erosion and sediment measures will be implemented during construction to minimize the release of pollutants (e.g. sediments) downstream and will include silt fencing, construction mud mat at entrance, rock check dams and vegetated exposed areas. Stormwater management and erosion/sediment measures will be included as part of site plan approval and will be subject to approval by the Township and Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority.

1.6.10 Waste Management System

Policy 1.6.10.1 states that waste management systems need to be provided that are of an appropriate size and type to accommodate present and future requirements, and facilitate, encourage and promote reduction, reuse and recycling objectives. Waste management systems shall be located and designed in accordance with provincial legislation and standards.

The ERRC is a waste management facility that has been designed to accommodate the transfer of waste and recycling, processing of source separated organics and separation of co-mingled waste for an operational period of 20 years. Based on the design capacity of the facility with growth over a 30 year period, it is estimated that the County will manage approximately 435 tonnes per day of waste for final disposal. The maximum capacity of the facility is approximately 30,000 tonnes per year of source separated organics.

As noted above, the proposal requires Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) issued by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). The ECA will govern how the facility will be operated and monitored based upon provincial legislation and standards.

2.1 Natural Heritage

Policy 2.1.1 states that natural heritage features and areas shall be protected for the long term. Policy 2.1.5 further clarifies that development and site alteration shall not be permitted in Significant Wetlands, Significant Woodlands, Significant Valleylands, and Significant Wildlife Habitat unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

Policy 2.1.7 identifies that development and site alteration shall not be permitted in the Habitat of Endangered Species and Threatened Species except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.

Initial field work was completed in 2016 including wetland boundary delineation, verification of watercourse presence, vegetation inventory, calling amphibian surveys, breeding bird surveys, and incidental wildlife observations. Additional field work was undertaken in the summer of 2017 including a bat survey (acoustic monitoring), snag tree density survey, stick nest survey and vegetation inventory.

The study area is comprised of a 65 year old mixed species planation managed by County foresters and represents 84 hectares of a greater than 475 hectare contiguous woodland (Copeland Forest). Wetlands are present in the northeast and southeast corners of the property. An older-growth hemlock tree stand is located in the southeast portion of the property.

As indicated by the Amended Environmental Impact Study (EIS), the study area meets the criteria for Significant Woodland and is considered Significant Wildlife Habitat for Woodland Area-Sensitive Breeding Birds, Bat Maternity Colonies, Amphibian Breeding (Woodland) and Species of Conservation Concern.

The woodland meets the criteria for definition of a significant woodland under the County Official Plan and the PPS based upon size. While the development of the ERRC will result in the loss of approximately 5.5 hectares (13.5 acres) of woodland, this represents 1 percent loss of the total contiguous woodland feature and 6.5 percent of the study area.

It should be noted that the County owns approximately 33,000 acres of forest with Simcoe County Forests being one of the largest municipally owned forest in Canada. Springwater Township has 37 County forest tracts and has the largest forested area at 4,056.2 hectares (10,037 acres) or 32% in the County forest system. From 2007 to 2016, approximately 580 hectares (1,433 acres) of land were added to the Simcoe County Forests in the Township of Springwater.

The planting of trees on a vacant parcel (afforestation) has been recommended to compensate for the removal of 5.5 hectares of woodland for the facility. Afforestation at a 2:1 ratio (11 hectares or 27 acres) to expand and/or enhance the contiguous woodland feature within the study area (5 kilometres) was recommended and supported by the MNRF and NVCA comments. The requirement for afforestation

has been included as a policy in the proposed official plan amendment along with a Compensation Planting Plan that will be developed in consultation with, and to satisfaction of, the MNRF and NVCA.

In field surveys, seven regionally rare vegetation species were observed. No federally or provincially vascular plants were observed during the surveys. 49 species of birds were observed within the vicinity of the study area with three bird SAR (Special Concern) species noted in the study area including eastern wood-pewee, wood thrush and red-shouldered hawk. Vernal pools were found within the wetland portions of the study area which are outside of the proposed development footprint. Suitable habitat was not present for whip-poor-will or Hine's emerald dragon-fly which are threatened species.

The bat survey conducted in 2017 identified species including the Big Brown Bats (most common), Little Brown Myotis, Small Footed Myotis and Myotis unknown. It was found that relatively low densities of SAR bats are using the study area for maternity roosting, feeding and commuting as they were inferred to be using the area via acoustic monitoring. Snag tree density was highest in the hemlock hardwood mixed forest with nine snag trees located in areas proposed for development. It was noted that it was unlikely that a permit under the Endangered Species Act will be required due to the size of the facility footprint but consultation with MNRF will continue in advance of development.

The vegetation and wildlife mitigation measures detailed in the Amended EIS include vegetation replanting, a 30 metre buffer from the old growth forest, containment of all activities indoors (avoidance of invasive species), erosion and sediment controls, restriction of vegetation and tree removal from September to December to avoid breeding bird, bat maternity and fauna disturbance, establishment of a terrestrial buffer zone of 160 metres from the wetland to the north, amphibian tunnels north and south of the site, and wildlife crossing signage along the access road.

Even though the wetlands and old growth hemlock stand will be undisturbed by the development of the ERRC and mitigation measures will be followed to avoid impacts on species and vegetation, a Wildlife Management Plan and Environmental Management Plan will be completed to the satisfaction of, and in consultation with, the MNRF and NVCA. This requirement has been included in the proposed official plan amendment.

In considering the recommended mitigation measures, history of the site as a plantation, and location of the facility footprint, it is anticipated that the proposal will not result in a negative impact on natural heritage features or their ecological functions as defined under the PPS.

2.2 Water

Policy 2.2.1 (e) states that planning authorities shall protect, improve or restore vulnerable surface and ground water, sensitive surface water and sensitive ground water features and their hydrologic functions and protect the quality and quantity of water by implementing necessary restrictions on development and site alteration to protect all municipal drinking water supplies and designated vulnerable areas.

A Hydrological Assessment Report and Facility Characteristics Report were completed to address ground water and surface water including stormwater management. The hydrological assessment analyzed the current groundwater conditions including potential impacts to the quality and quantity, identified hydrologically sensitive features for recharge/discharge protection (i.e. wetlands, stream courses), developed a water balance to estimate ground water recharge potential (pre-to-post conditions), and determined the options for groundwater control during construction and required approvals. Stormwater management controls will consist of a treatment train including erosion and sediment controls, enhanced vegetative swales, vegetated filter strips, sediment forebay, setting pond, infiltration basin and access road drainage ditch. The stormwater pond will be sized to capture, store and infiltrate rainfall events up to and including the 100 year storm event and will be designed in accordance with the MOECC guidelines.

The reports were amended based upon comments received from the review agencies. The amended reports concluded that the development of the site is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on ground water or surface water including wetlands or downstream surface water tributaries subject to appropriate mitigation measures being applied. Existing drainage conditions will be maintained beyond the facility footprint with the majority of the detailed water balance, nitrate loading calculations, and potential mitigation measures will be prepared as part of detailed design. Quarterly ground water monitoring will continue at the site.

The South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan (2015) has been developed to protect existing and future municipal drinking water supplies. In the Source Protection Plan, vulnerable areas include Wellhead Protection Areas (WHPA), Surface Intake Protection Zones (IPZ), Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas (SGRA), and Highly Vulnerable Aquifers (HVA). The subject lands are located in a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) and the facility footprint is located within an area of low vulnerability. The site does not include a WHPA, IPZ or HVA.

The Risk Management Official (RMO) for the Township of Springwater provided a letter dated March 7, 2018 stating that the facility would not be a significant drinking water threat according to Ontario's Clean Water Act (CWA). The letter also identified measures that the County has planned that will contribute to the protection of groundwater including all waste processing activities occurring indoors with limited potential runoff, all waste processing activities will be conducted on impermeable surfaces (concrete floors and clay liners, outdoor areas to be paved), all main functions are to occur above ground, and process water will be contained, collected and treated on-site or trucked off-site for treatment. While not required by the CWA or Source Protection Plan policies, these measures will be incorporated into the final design of the facility and site.

2.3 Agricultural

Policy 2.3.1 notes that prime agricultural areas shall be protected for long-term use for agriculture. *Prime agricultural areas* are where prime agricultural lands predominate. The property is comprised of Canada Land Inventory Class 1 - 3 Soils and Class 5 – 7 Soils. Class 1 – 3 Soils are located in the northeast, southeast and southwest portions of the site with Class 5 – 7 Soils in the central eastern, western and southern portions of the site. The facility footprint is located primarily in Class 5 – 7 Soils.

The subject lands are not identified as agricultural lands in the County Official Plan, Township Official Plan or Provincial Agricultural System mapping. The subject lands are not located in a prime agricultural area.

Even though the subject lands are not located in a prime agricultural area, an Agricultural Impact Assessment Report (AIA) was still undertaken in support of the proposal. The AIA concluded the site and surrounding area are not a specialty crop area as defined by the PPS, the site has very limited potential for specialty crop production, the average productivity index for soil capability is Class 6 for the facility footprint, agricultural land in active production is only present west of the site, and Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) is not applicable. Impacts to agriculture have been minimized by avoiding land designated for agriculture, locating the facility on lower quality soils, and siting the facility with a vegetative buffer from the agricultural uses to the west of the subject lands.

It should be noted that the agricultural community may benefit from the development of the OPF as compost will be available locally to be used as fertilizer to supplement existing soil conditions.

2.6. Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Policies 2.6.1 and 2.6.2 state that significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved and development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.

Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments were prepared in support of the proposal. The Stage 1 assessment identified only one previously registered archaeological site within one kilometre of the study area along with a historic cemetery (Apto – St. Patrick Catholic Church) on adjacent lands to the southwest of the site. The Stage 2 assessment identified a Euro-Canadian archaeological site that met the criteria for sufficient cultural heritage value or interest.

The Stage 3 report included one metre test unit excavations with historical artifacts recovered. The resource is referred to as the Gribbin Site and identified as BdGw-49. The protection of the area in-situ and relocation of the original footprint was considered over excavation. The facility footprint was relocated 85 metres south of the Gribbin Site with a 10 metre setback applied from the archaeological find.

Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment was submitted to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) for review. The assessment was deemed compliant and subsequently entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports on July 12, 2017. The letter is included in the agency comments attached as Schedule 8 to this Item. The letter issued by the Ministry identifies conditions of approval including a 10 metre buffer or “no-go” zone for any construction activity, adherence to a Stage 4 Avoidance and Protection Strategy until all construction is complete, and inclusion of site plan conditions to support the long-term protection of the site.

A Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes was completed in August 2016 and revised in November 2016 and 2017. A total of one built heritage resource and three cultural heritage landscapes were identified within or adjacent to the study area. The built heritage resource consists of a stone foundation which is adjacent to the inactive Apto Cemetery. It is likely that the foundation was either the church (built in 1855) or the residence for the priest (built between 1865 and 1875). Even though the foundation is located a substantial distance from the facility footprint, the Ministry requested that the County further evaluate the foundation to determine if the resource is of cultural heritage value or interest and work with the Township to conserve the resource if it is of value or interest. This requirement has been added to the proposed official plan amendment. Based on the location of the proposed facility footprint and access roads, no impacts to identified cultural heritage resources are expected.

Policy 2.6.3 restricts development on lands adjacent to protected heritage property unless it is demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected property will be conserved. There are no protected heritage properties as defined by the PPS adjacent to the subject lands.

Policy 2.6.5 notes that planning authorities shall consider the interest of Aboriginal communities in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources. Eleven (11) Indigenous communities were circulated on the Stage 1, 2 and 3 Archaeological Assessments which included measures to conserve the Euro-Canadian built heritage resources. As detailed in Schedule 4, the siting process involved extensive consultation with Indigenous communities including circulation, exchange of correspondence, in person meetings with First Nations and the Métis Nation of Ontario, and a site visit with Beausoleil First Nation on June 1, 2016.

Policy 3.1.8 Wildland Fire

Policy 3.1.8 states 'development shall generally be directed to areas outside of lands that are unsafe for development due to the presence of hazardous forest types for wildland fire. Development may however be permitted in lands with hazardous forest types for wildland fire where the risk is mitigated in accordance with wildland fire assessment and mitigation standards.'

The definition of 'hazardous forest types for wildland fire' means 'forest types assessed as being associated with the risk of high to extreme wildland fire using risk assessment tools established by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources [and Forestry] as amended from time to time'.

In the MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018, the Ministry notes that the 65 year old managed forest is a plantation consisting of naturalized coniferous, sugar-maple and hemlock-hardwood species. Based upon the characterization of the forest composition and the MNRF's mapping, the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire and therefore policy 3.1.8 does not apply.

MNRF staff recommended that the County include a Wildland Fire Assessment as part of the site hazard assessment for the Fire Prevention Plan. These requirements have been included in the official plan amendment.

Even though the Ministry has indicated that this policy does not apply, the Amended Facility Characteristic Report (FCR) addresses wildland fire risks for the proposed facility. Section 4.4.1 of the FCR outlines the two basic approaches to be addressed with fire protection: protect life and minimize property loss.

For the proposed facility, the materials being processed are generally considered to be "higher risk" due to the potential for combustible energy content in the materials (paper/fibre, wood/organics, plastics, etc.). As such, most facilities of this nature are classified as a medium hazard industrial occupancy (Group F, Division 2) under the Ontario Building Code. The FCR noted that the most common type of fire protection system for these types of facilities is an active system (e.g., pressurized sprinklers), but notes that a passive protection system (e.g., standpipe) may also be feasible. On-site water storage and pressurized pumping is recommended in the facility design. The supply rate, volume, and provision of fire protection water will be developed as part of the detailed design in accordance with the requirements of the Ontario Building Code.

A Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared for the ERRC which will outline guidelines and procedures for material and vegetation/fuel management, staff responsibilities, fire safety training requirements and maintenance of the fire equipment and systems. The Plan will be developed with input from the Township of Springwater's Fire and Emergency Services and will include a site hazard assessment and relevant documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual.

Additionally, an Emergency Response Plan will be prepared to address potential emergency circumstances including fire, power failures, chemical spill and weather conditions and will be developed in accordance with provincial and municipal standards. An emergency access route is proposed along the existing trail north of the facility fronting onto Rainbow Valley Road East. Township Fire and Emergency Services will be provided keys/access codes to any gates to the facility along with involvement in escape route planning.

Additional details have been provided in the FCR in regards to fire protection and the complete design requirements will be outlined as part of the ECA process.

Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017)

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 (Growth Plan) was approved by the Province in May 2017 and took effect on July 1, 2017. The 2017 Growth Plan replaces the previous 2006 version. Additionally, the Province released mapping of the Natural Heritage System and Agricultural System in early 2018 as it relates to Section 4.2.2 and 4.2.6. Generally, the Growth Plan encourages the development of healthy, liveable and safe communities through accommodating an appropriate mix of residential, employment and other uses to meet long-term needs. The sections applicable to this proposal include Section 3 'Infrastructure to Support Growth' and Section 4 'Protecting What is Valuable.'

Section 3.2.1 Integrated Planning

Policy 3.2.1 provides direction on planning for new or expanded infrastructure in an integrated manner including evaluations of long-range scenario based land use planning and financial planning to direct growth and development, identify full life cycle costs for infrastructure and consider the impacts of a changing climate.

The County's Solid Waste Management Strategy is a long-term vision for the delivery of waste management services to the County's 16 municipal partners. The Strategy identified the need for the ERRC to address existing and planned population growth in the County as directed by the Growth Plan. As noted in the business cases for the OPF and MMF, the development of County-owned transfer capacity and organics was the recommended approach in preparation for long-term, secure management of waste. It is anticipated that the ERRC will result in a positive impact on climate change by eliminating transportation of organics to Hamilton for processing and increasing the volume of recycling and waste separated and compacted reducing materials transferred to landfills.

Section 4.2.2 Natural Heritage Areas

Policy 4.2.2.1 notes that the Province will map a Natural Heritage System (NHS) for the Greater Golden Horseshoe to support a comprehensive, integrated, and long-term approach to planning for the protection of the region's natural heritage and biodiversity. The Province released the mapping of the Natural Heritage System in early 2018.

Policy 4.2.2.3(a) states that new development or site alteration will demonstrate that there will be no negative impacts on key natural heritage features or key hydrologic feature or their functions; connectivity along the system and between key natural heritage features located within 240 metres of each other will be maintained, or where possible, enhanced; the removal of other natural features not identified as key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features is avoided, where possible; the disturbed area including any buildings and structures, will not exceed 25% of the total developable area and the impervious surface will not exceed 10% of the total developable area; and, at least 30% of the total developable area will remain or be returned to natural self-sustaining vegetation.

As discussed above in PPS policy 2.1 and 2.2, the EIS and Hydrological Assessment Report have concluded that there will be no negative impacts on key natural heritage features and key hydrological functions which have been accepted by the review agencies. The facility footprint is on the western edge of the woodland feature and will not result in a loss of connectivity as the remaining 78.5 hectares will remain undisturbed. The woodland feature will be enhanced at a 2:1 ratio with approximately 11 hectares to be reforested in or near the existing feature. Due to the overall size of the subject lands, the percentages of impervious surfaces and disturbed area noted in the policy 4.2.2.3(a) can be met.

Section 4.2.3 Key Hydrologic Features, Key Hydrologic Areas and Key Natural Heritage Features

Policy 4.2.3.1 states that outside of settlement areas, development or site alteration is not permitted in key natural heritage features that are part of the Natural Heritage System or in key hydrologic features with limited exceptions.

The subject lands are located in the NHS as mapped by the Province. Subsection (c) of this policy identifies 'activities that create or maintain infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process' as an exception. Infrastructure is defined in the Growth Plan as "physical structures (facilities or corridors) that form the foundation for development. Infrastructure includes: sewage and water systems, septage treatment systems, stormwater management systems, waste management systems, electricity generation facilities, electricity transmission and distribution systems, communications /telecommunications, transit and transportation corridors and facilities, oil and gas pipelines and associated facilities."

The Ministry of Municipal Affairs responded to a memorandum prepared by the County's consultants in late 2017 seeking clarification on this policy. The Ministry's letter dated November 15, 2017 states that the MOECC has clear EA requirements for waste division and disposal facilities through O. Reg. 101/07 under the EA Act and in 2007 the province passed this regulation to exempt certain types of projects from the requirements of the EA Act. The letter further states that "as the County's ERRC is exempt from the requirements of the EA Act through this regulation, it may be considered as infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process for the purposed of 2017 Growth Plan policy 4.2.3.1(c)." The Ministry further acknowledge that the ERRC would be subject to the approval requirements under other environmental legislation such as the Environmental Protection Act. The Ministry letter is attached as part of the agency comments in Schedule 8. Therefore, the ERRC is exempt from policy 4.2.3.1.

Section 4.2.6 Agricultural System

The Province has mapped an Agricultural System for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH) which was released in early 2018. The subject lands are not identified in the Agricultural System mapping.

Section 4.7 Cultural Heritage Resources

Policy 4.2.7.1 notes that cultural heritage resources will be conserved in order to foster a sense of place and benefit communities particularly in strategic growth areas. This is addressed as per the response for PPS policy 2.6.

Section 4.9 Culture of Conservation

Policy 4.9.1 (d) notes that municipalities will development and implement conservation strategies including integrated waste management through enhanced source reduction, reuse, and diversion; comprehensive plan with integrated approaches to waste management; promotion of building conservation and adaptive reuse; and consideration of waste management initiatives within the context of long-term regional planning, and in collaboration with neighbouring municipalities.

The development of the ERRC appears to embody policy 4.9.1(d) of the Growth Plan. As stated previously, the County's Solid Waste Management Strategy is a comprehensive plan with integrated approaches to waste management including reduction, reuse and diversion. With the processing of sole-sourced organics, the development of increased transfer capacity and separation of co-mingled materials, the facility will enhance waste reduction, promote diversion programs and recycling for the County's sixteen local municipalities. The facility will enable the County to continue to develop diversion strategies to address expected population growth and anticipated changes affecting waste management in the province.

Greenbelt Plan, 2017

The Greenbelt Plan, 2017 does not apply to the subject lands. Public comments noted that the subject lands are located in the draft study area for the potential expansion of the Greenbelt Plan which was released by the Province in early 2018. As this is only a draft study area and no policies have been drafted or approved, the Greenbelt Plan is not applicable to this application.

County of Simcoe Official Plan, 2016

The County of Simcoe Official Plan was adopted by County Council in 2012 and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in a series of decisions over a three year period with final approval received in December 29, 2016.

The subject lands are designated 'Greenlands' in Schedule 5.1 Land Use in the County Official Plan.

The amendment is proposed to modify Schedule 5.6.1 of the County Official Plan by renaming the schedule from 'County Waste Disposal Sites' to 'County Waste Management System', adding 'Environmental Resource Recovery Centre' to the map legend and adding a symbol for 'Environmental Resource Recovery Centre' to the Schedule on a portion of the subject lands. The proposed amendment will also add a new site specific section of text after Section 4.9.17 detailing the permitted uses and associated development parameters on the site.

Section 3.8 Greenlands

The objectives of the Greenlands designation are to preserve, maintain or enhance the natural environment. Policy 3.8.19 states *infrastructure* authorized under an environmental assessment process may be permitted within the Greenlands designation or on adjacent lands and *infrastructure* not subject to the environmental assessment process may be permitted within the Greenlands designation or adjacent lands in accordance with Section 3.3.15 (Natural Heritage). The definition of *infrastructure* in the County Official Plan is consistent with the PPS and Growth Plan definitions.

The ERRC is considered infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process with additional approvals required under the Environmental Protection Act. Nonetheless, an EIS was completed to address Section 3.3.15 to demonstrate no negative impacts on natural features or their ecological functions including significant woodlands, significant wildlife habitat, habitat of endangered and threatened species and wetlands. This is addressed in PPS Section 2.1.

Section 3.15 Source Protection

The County's Source Protection policies were approved as OPA No. 1 by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs in June 13, 2017. The subject lands are located in a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area (SGRA) in Schedule 5.2.6 of the County Official Plan. The facility footprint is located within an area of low vulnerability and avoids areas of medium vulnerability located in the northeast and southeast.

Policy 3.15.19 identifies that SGRAs may be considered when evaluating major development applications and that best management practices to maintain pre-development recharge rates will be assessed. Through the siting process to the development of the technical studies, the SGRA has been considered, assessed and demonstrated that pre-development recharge rates can be met. Comments from the Township of Springwater's Risk Management Official are noted above under PPS 2.2 Water that identify groundwater protections that will be incorporated, at a minimum, as part of detailed design.

Section 4.5 Resource Conservation

Policies within Section 4.5 focus on water resources, landforms, woodlands and air quality. Policies 4.5.1, 4.5.2 and 4.5.7 in regards to ground water features, surface water features and stormwater management have been addressed in PPS Section 1.6 and 2.2. Policies 4.5.34 to 4.5.38 and 4.5.42 address woodlands in terms of conservation, management, and forest cover. As discussed in PPS Section 2.1, no negative impacts are anticipated for the woodland feature and the forest cover will be increased by 4.5 hectares with the proposed afforestation.

Section 4.6 Cultural Heritage Conservation

Policies 4.6.1, 4.6.5 and 4.6.6 of the County Official Plan mirror PPS policies 2.6.1 and 2.6.2 in terms of conserving significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes and restricting development and site alteration on lands containing archaeological resources unless the resources have been conserved. As outlined in the PPS Section 2.6, the archaeological resources on the site have been conserved in-situ and further evaluation will occur on the built heritage resource that is present beyond the facility footprint.

Section 4.8 Transportation

Policy 4.8.26 states that where development applications will impact on existing or planned County Road corridors, traffic impact analyses, land dedications, noise attenuation and other measures will be required. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was prepared in support of the proposal. Horseshoe Valley Road West is identified as a primary arterial road on Schedule 5.5.1 'County Transportation Systems' and referred to as County Road 22.

The TIS has been reviewed by County Transportation and Engineering staff in relation to County Road 22 and County Road 27 which is approximately 5 kilometers to the west. Township of Springwater engineers have reviewed the TIS in relation to potential impacts on Rainbow Valley Road East, Gill Road, and Old Second South Road. The Ministry of Transportation was also circulated in relation to the Highway 400 corridor located to the east of the property.

The OPF and MMF are expected to generate external traffic. Curbside collection vehicles are contracted from Progressive Waste Solutions who have a service yard located in the south end of Barrie. These vehicles will deposit the collected materials at the ERRC and return to their respective yard for fueling at the end of each day. The County's fleet of ten waste management vehicles may be based out of the facility with associated service bays.

The TIS concluded that site-generated traffic will not adversely impact the surrounding road network for the 2021, 2026 or 2031 time horizons. The site is expected to generate between 89 and 148 trips per day during the studied peak hours for the design capacity of the facility which will occur at the 30 year horizon (2049). It is expected that the future road network will become increasingly busy beyond the 2026 horizon as a result of the significant increase in background traffic in the vicinity of the ERRC. It is recommended that the County monitor traffic conditions within the study area, particularly in the County Road 22/27 intersection, through traffic studies for any future development applications.

The TIS concluded that an eastbound left turn lane and a westbound climbing lane are warranted on Horseshoe Valley Road West (County Road 22). These will be constructed prior to opening of the site. The TIS recommended that in addition to improved site access, the County will need to monitor traffic conditions and specify any necessary road improvements.

The intersection of the access road and Horseshoe Valley Road West does not warrant signalization based on the traffic generation data. However, it is recommended that provisions be made to signalize

the intersection during construction including necessary underground ducts. The intersection can be monitored periodically to confirm if the warrants are satisfied.

The proposed access road will follow the alignment of the existing trail with the entrance relocated further south for safety purposes. The access road will be approximately 10 to 15 metres wide comprised of two to three lanes and 1 metre paved shoulders. Approximately 15 to 20 metres of clearing will be completed to accommodate the road, drainage ditch and utility corridor. Trees will be maintained along either side of the access road. A turning lane will be installed at the entrance onto Horseshoe Valley Road West. Both entrances to the facility will be gated with keys or access codes providing access during non-operational hours.

Comments from the Township's consulting engineer and County Transportation and Engineering staff on the TIS Addendum indicated the County's responses were acceptable and no further concerns were noted.

Section 4.9 Waste Management

Policy 4.9.1 states that an objective of the Plan is to provide waste management systems that are of appropriate size and type to accommodate present and future requirements and to facilitate, encourage, and promote reduction, reuse, and recycling objectives. Policy 4.9.3 states that the County will strive to maximize waste diversion from disposal where viable markets are available and waste disposal solution in which the County takes responsibility for its own waste are preferred where practical. As indicated above, the proposed ERRC is intended to address this objective by developing a County-owned and operated facility to process sole-sourced organics and manage waste and recycling in an effort to reduce the overall impact of waste generated by local municipalities.

Schedule 5.6.1 County Waste Disposal Sites

Amending the title of this schedule to 'County Waste Management System' along with the associated changes to the legend appropriately reflects the changing nature of managing waste in the County and Province.

Comments Received

Written and oral comments were received from the public and agencies during the planning consultation process.

Written comments were received from numerous agencies including the Township of Springwater, Township of Oro-Medonte, City of Orillia, Simcoe County District School Board, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority, Enbridge, Canada Post, Chippewas of Rama, Ainley & Associates (Township of Springwater consulting engineers), County of Simcoe Forestry Department, County of Simcoe Transportation and Engineering Department, and Ministry of Municipal Affairs and their partner ministries including the Ministry of Transportation, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Sport, Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs, Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, and Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry. These comments are attached as Schedule 8 to this Item.

A significant number of public comments were received from early 2017 to date. Approximately 240 written comments have been received from the public with approximately 180 in the form of a standard letter. The bulk of the detailed comments have been received from the nearby landowners noting a variety of concerns which are summarized below. These comments are attached as Schedule 7 to this report.

Oral submissions were provided at the statutory public meeting from 10 parties on May 9, 2017. The submissions were comprehensive and are fully captured in the meeting minutes and transcript that are attached as Schedule 6 to this Item.

Summary of Public Comments and Responses

The public comments received can be consolidated into the following common themes:

1. Land Use Planning
2. Traffic and Road Conditions
3. Environmental Impacts
4. Odour and Noise Impacts
5. Wildland Fire Hazards
6. Decision-Making Process (Siting)
7. Snowmobile Trail

The form letter noted five areas of concern including the inclusion of County forests in the site selection process with 50% of the candidate sites being in woodlands, 82% of the County-owned sites were woodland areas, County Forests should have been excluded from the site selection process based on natural heritage, social and cultural impacts, the siting process was not consistent with the PPS, and the EIS has not demonstrated no negative impact on areas of provincial interest.

Planning staff have reviewed the public comments and have summarized these comments in a table which is attached as Schedule 9 to this Item. Staff have provided responses to the comments and consulted with the technical experts to address specific concerns. Of note, neighbouring landowners retained a planning and natural heritage consultant to peer review the original and amended studies. These comments are located at the end of the table due to the number of comments and length of the County's response.

Issues with the siting process are a common theme throughout the public comments. It is noted that the siting process is not subject to the requirements of the *Planning Act* or the PPS. It is acknowledged that the evaluation criteria included avoidance of features contained in the PPS such as wetlands and source protection.

Snowmobile Trail

While not governed by the planning process, a number of public comments cited the relocation of the existing snowmobile trail. The trail currently traverses through the property from Horseshoe Valley Road West to Rainbow Valley Road East following what is proposed to be the access road for the facility.

Section 5.2.2 of the Amended Scoped EIS identified sensitive natural heritage features that should be avoided for trail relocation including the wetland and hemlock forest stand in the southern portion of the property. To minimize the removal of habitat, the EIS recommended that the trail be relocated to the western edge of the study area, that installation be done outside of the breeding bird window, and that tree removal be limited. The County Forestry Department will consider this information when consulting with the OFSC regarding the relocation of the trail and will confirm the exact location of the trail with the consulting biologists prior to installation.

County planning staff are satisfied that the oral and written submissions received from the public were considered and/or addressed prior to the approval of OPA No. 2.

Summary of Agency Comments and Responses

The agency comments received were generally technical in nature and focused on air quality (noise/odour), stormwater management, natural heritage, archaeological and cultural heritage, transportation, fire protection, and site servicing. These comments were provided to GHD, the County's consultants, to review and respond as required. As a result of the comments received and recent changes to the Growth Plan, seven of the studies were updated and a comment/response table was included in each document. All of the agency and First Nation comments with the associated responses in a chart which is attached as Schedule 10.

There are no outstanding comments from the review agencies that cannot be addressed at the detail design stage. In particular, Provincial ministries, NVCA and Township engineering have no further objections to the approval of the amendment.

As a result of the comments received, County planning staff have revised the draft official plan amendment by including policies related to forest compensation at a 2:1 ratio and the completion of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan, Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, Fire Prevention Plan and Emergency Response Plan.

County planning staff are satisfied that the oral and written submissions received from the agencies were considered and/or addressed prior to the approval of OPA No. 2.

Approvals Process

If adopted, the proposed amendment will be sent to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs (MMA) for approval as the Ministry is the approval authority for all County Official Plan Amendments. Given that the County has worked closely with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and its partner ministries, no significant modifications are expected.

Summary

With the County of Simcoe adoption of a Solid Waste Management Strategy in 2010 and following further recommendations by County Council, a siting process was initiated in 2014 to identify a site for the development of an Organics Processing Facility (OPF) and was subsequently expanded to also identify a site for the development of a Materials Management Facility (MMF), a future potential Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) and ancillary uses including a stormwater management facility, waste vehicle servicing facility, and administrative facility. Collectively referred to as the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre (ERRC), 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road in the Township of Springwater was selected as the preferred site.

Following the selection of the preferred site, a substantial number of studies were undertaken to evaluate the site and location for the proposed facility footprint. The rationale for siting of the ERRC footprint included multiple factors such as distance from wetlands, archaeologically significant areas, sensitive receptors, topography and previously disturbed areas on the site. The footprint location identified provided the best balance of all the factors considered.

It is noted that the siting process is not subject to the requirements of the *Planning Act* or the PPS. It is acknowledged that the evaluation criteria included avoidance of features contained in the PPS such as wetlands and source protection.

Numerous comments were received from the public and agencies. These comments are detailed in schedules to this report. Through additional studies, the County has demonstrated that the development of the facility will result in no negative impact on natural heritage features or their ecological functions,

archaeological and cultural features, agricultural resources, key hydrologic features, vulnerable areas under Source Protection, wildland fire risks, transportation systems, and land use compatibility.

Additional studies that will be required as part of site plan approval include a Compensation Planting Plan, Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, Environmental Management Plan, Wildlife Management Plan, Fire Prevention Plan, and Emergency Response Plan. The additional required studies have been incorporated into the official plan amendment and will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction, of the applicable agencies. The review agency had no further objections to the proposed official plan amendment. With these and the mitigation measures documented in the supporting reports, it is the opinion of planning staff that any issues have been adequately addressed.

County planning staff recommend adoption of Official Plan Amendment No. 2 to the County of Simcoe Official Plan as per Schedule 11 to this report, given the reasons outlined in Item CCW 2018-320 which includes:

- Consistency with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014);
- Conformity with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017); and
- Conformity with the goals, objectives and general intent of the County of Simcoe Official Plan.

Financial and Resource Implications

Planning

If the County's decision is appealed to the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal (LPAT) there may be legal costs associated with that process. In the event of an appeal, staff will report back seeking authority to proceed with involvement in related LPAT proceedings.

Corporation

Business cases for the OPF and MMF were provided to County Council on September 26, 2017 and are detailed in Reference Items CCW 17-222 and 17-223. Funding for this capital project has been included in the Long Term Financial Plan and it is anticipated that funds would be provided from the Solid Waste Management reserve, development charge reserve and other sources which will be detailed in future reports.

Relationship to Corporate Strategic Plan

A. Growth Related Service Delivery: Create and strengthen partnerships with key stakeholders to support communities through the delivery of sustainable services.

D. Environmental Sustainability: To preserve, conserve, and safeguard our environment and natural resources, while recognizing opportunity, innovation, and the needs of our community.

Solid Waste Management Strategy 2010 and 2016 Update recommended the development of a centralized composting facility and transfer facility within the County.

Reference Documents

- a) Supporting Studies can be located on the County website by following the link: www.simcoe.ca/Planning/Pages/Simcoe-County-Environmental-Resource-Recovery-Centre.aspx
- b) Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria Part 1, Part 2 and Part 3 can be located on the County website by following the link:

www.simcoe.ca/SolidWasteManagement/Pages/ERRC/About%20Environmental%20Resource%20Recovery%20Centre.aspx

- c) **Item CS-095** (June 13, 2012) – Central Composting Facility Viability Assessment Report and Next Steps
- d) **Item CCW 14-025** (January 28, 2014) – Central Composting Facility Update
- e) **Item CCW 14-246** (May 27, 2014) – RFP 2014-021 – Consulting Services: Central Composting Facility
- f) **Item CCW 14-253** (August 12, 2014) – Transfer Facility Assessment
- g) **Item CCW 14-299** (August 12, 2014) – Organics Processing Facility Update
- h) **Item CCW 14-344** (August 26, 2014) – Transfer Facility Funding Update
- i) **Item CCW 14-407** (October 30, 2014) – Community Engagement Committee
- j) **Item CCW 15-020** (January 13, 2015) – Infrastructure Projects: Update
- k) **Item CCW 15-055** (February 26, 2015) – Organics Processing Facility: Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria
- l) **Item CCW 15-078** (February 26, 2015) – Materials Management Facility: Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria
- m) **Item 15-229** (June 23, 2015) – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects: Siting Process Update
- n) **Item CCW 15-240** (August 11, 2015) – Organics Processing Facility and Material Management Facility: Short List of Sites
- o) **Item CCW 15-397** (November 24, 2015) – Infrastructure Projects: Consultation Update
- p) **Item CCW 16-054** (March 8, 2016) – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects: Final Siting Report
- q) **Item CCW 16-165** (May 24, 2016) – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects: Development Strategy
- r) **Item CCW 16-191** (May 24, 2016) – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects: Public Stakeholder Engagement Update
- s) **Item CCW 16-266** (August 9, 2016) – Organics Processing Facility: Project Delivery Method
- t) **Item CCW 16-301** (September 13, 2016) – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects: Project Update
- u) **Item CCW 16-357** (October 25, 2016) – Organics Processing Facility: Recommendation for Project Delivery Method

- v) **Item CCW 16-376** (November 8, 2016) – Environmental Resource Recovery Centre: Project Update
- w) **Item CCW 17-038** (January 24, 2017) – Environmental Resource Recovery Centre: Project Update
- x) **Item CCW 17-174** (June 13, 2017) – Environmental Resource Recovery Centre: Project Update
- y) **Item CCW 17-222** (September 26, 2017) – Business Case: Organics Processing Facility
- z) **Item CCW 17-223** (September 26, 2017) – Business Case: Material Management Facility

Attachments

Schedule 1 – Location Map
 Schedule 2 – Site Features and Surrounding Area
 Schedule 3 – Conceptual Site Plan
 Schedule 4 – Consultation Report: Project Initiation and Siting
 Schedule 5 – Circulation and Notices
 Schedule 6 – Public Minutes and Transcript from May 9, 2017
 Schedule 7 – Public Comments Received
 Schedule 8 – Agency Comments Received
 Schedule 9 – Public Comment and Response Chart
 Schedule 10 – Agency Comment and Response Chart
 Schedule 11 – Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 2 to the County Official Plan

Prepared By: Tiffany Thompson, MCIP RPP, Planner III

Approvals:

	Date
David Parks, Director of Planning, Development and Tourism	June 1, 2018
Debbie Korolnek, General Manager, Environment, Planning and Environment	June 1, 2018
Trevor Wilcox, General Manager, Corporate Performance	June 4, 2018
Mark Aitken, Chief Administrative Officer	June 5, 2018