

# Solid Waste Management – Infrastructure Projects Community Engagement Committee

MINUTES

SEPTEMBER 6, 2016 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM

MIDLAND PENETANGUISHENE  
BOARDROOM

MEETING CALLED BY	County of Simcoe – Project Team
TYPE OF MEETING	Community Engagement Committee
NOTE TAKER	Stephanie Mack
ATTENDEES	Debbie Korolnek (County – Chair), Rob McCullough (County), James Nightingale (County), Robert Brindley (Springwater), David Barber (First Nations), Ray Millar (Public Member),  By teleconference – Christopher Baines (Public Member)  Regrets – Andy Campbell (Innisfil), Susan Antler (Public Member)

## Agenda topics

### VARIOUS ADMINISTRATION ITEMS

DK

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>welcome</b></li> <li>• <b>“housekeeping” items</b></li> <li>• <b>introduction of Robert Brindley, Township of Springwater</b></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• introduction of the agenda, DK welcomed committee</li> <li>• introduction of Robert Brindley – CAO Township of Springwater, new municipal staff representative on CEC</li> </ul>

### PROJECT UPDATE

RM

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>general update – project development (last CEC meeting May 2016)</b></li> <li>• <b>update on studies</b></li> <li>• <b>discussion of Item CCW 16-266 – OPF project delivery method</b></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• committee last met on May 31, 2016 to debrief on the neighbouring landowner meeting held March 23 and Public Information Sessions held on April 19</li> <li>• RM provided update on work currently being undertaken, studies on-going for Planning approvals</li> <li>• shifted discussion to procurement and how the two facilities – the OPF and MMF – will be developed separately</li> <li>• MMF and OPF differences – MMF – Design-Bid-Spec</li> <li>• no technology, simple delivery method, similar to other County infrastructure projects</li> <li>• OPF memo from GHD – County’s consultant on different methods for procuring the organics processing technology – more complicated process for procurement</li> <li>• not a simple thing to describe</li> <li>• options are limited on the arrangements for project delivery but County has committed to get public feedback at all stages of development</li> <li>• Item 16-266 – provided GHD recommendation for a Design-Build-Operate delivery method to County Council, want to get back to Council with further feedback, Council will then make a decision prior to the RFI being issued in November</li> <li>• to obtain feedback – presentation/survey to be put on OPF webpage</li> <li>• near neighbours – 500 m from property boundary (outside limit of the property boundary) – invited to a neighbouring landowner meeting on September 8</li> <li>• GHD to be there and present information, answer questions</li> <li>• September 20 – drop-in sessions</li> <li>• provided an update of information in Item CCW 16-301 (will be on agenda today for CCW September 13) – name of facility will be Environmental Resource Recovery Centre, report includes County response to correspondence</li> <li>• correspondence received by the Warden provided in a schedule along with updated FAQs which provide responses to questions received</li> </ul>

**FALL CONSULTATION**

**RM**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>overview of upcoming consultation – format of sessions</b></li> <li>• <b>neighbouring landowner meeting – September 8, 2016</b></li> <li>• <b>drop-in sessions – September 20, 2016</b></li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• neighbouring landowner meeting this week – Thursday, September 8</li> <li>• GHD have prepared the presentation and will be there to answer questions and respond to near neighbours</li> <li>• presentation and survey will be on the website September 8, drop-in sessions to discuss the presentation if they have any questions</li> <li>• discussed the format of the meetings</li> <li>• invited to near neighbours meeting – Mayor, Deputy Mayor, local Councillor from Springwater</li> <li>• Warden, Deputy Warden, Debbie Korolnek, Rob McCullough, Stephanie Mack will attend</li> <li>• neighbours invited – two guests/household</li> <li>• drop-in sessions – more informal, to be held at Simcoe County Museum</li> </ul>	

**DRAFT PRESENTATION AND SURVEY**

**RM**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>review and comment on draft presentation</b></li> <li>• <b>review and comment on draft survey</b></li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RM reviewed presentation with committee – discussed the OPF delivery method, more complicated than MMF</li> <li>• timing of the business case (preliminary and final)</li> <li>• comment – timing of October 4, 2016 deadline, how many residents will respond?</li> <li>• County Council to weigh feedback, provide direction on the OPF project delivery model (DBO recommended by GHD)</li> <li>• address attached to the survey to ensure that responses are from County residents</li> <li>• comment – is there relevant feedback to be gained?</li> <li>• RM – County committed to getting feedback at all stages, chance for neighbours to provide input on ownership/operation of the OPF (although it is not common to consult on this)</li> <li>• RMi – technically too heavy, long, and average person will not understand</li> <li>• CB – almost too perplexing for average person, don't want to think about it, needs to be more generic rather than so specific</li> <li>• JN – does not like space for general comments, seeking direction on specific information related to procurement</li> <li>• RMi – unsure if survey should ask if agree with recommendation (is there a benefit in this?)</li> <li>• RB – want to engage people, a lot of information on the first page of the survey – clarify with many pages up front, too much detail on the first page with small font, reader might not want to go move forward with the survey</li> <li>• RB – very focused, too technical – lead them into the survey – it is confusing, looks busy – want someone to keep going</li> <li>• consensus – needs to be more genuine, own the presentation, County logo, need to place "owner" with "County" – presentation is too technical and lengthy</li> <li>• in the presentation, consider a summary table of delivery methods with simplified terms – need to modify the description of each method and provide and simplify</li> <li>• presentation too long – consider editing and making more succinct</li> </ul>		
<b>ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• revise presentation and survey accordingly for September consultation</li> </ul>	Project Team	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• send updated FAQs document, final presentation, and survey to the committee</li> </ul>	SLM	

**TIMING FOR NEXT CEC MEETING**

**DK/RM**

<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>upcoming milestones</b></li> <li>• <b>potential fall neighbouring landowner meeting, submission of Planning application</b></li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• near neighbours – potential meeting with submission of Planning approvals, will wrap up technical studies</li> <li>• would provide notification of the process ahead, upcoming milestones</li> <li>• OPF RFI to be released in November – procurement will begin</li> <li>• need to discuss with Planning staff the engagement process once application for Planning approvals is submitted</li> </ul>		
<b>ACTION ITEMNS</b>	<b>PERSON RESPONSIBLE</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• send doodle.com poll and make arrangements for next meeting</li> </ul>	SLM	

**CLOSING REMARKS**

**DK**

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>opportunity for closing comments, etc.</b></li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• no other items for discussion, meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm</li></ul>	