



County of Simcoe
Solid Waste Management
1110 Highway 26,
Midhurst, Ontario L0L 1X0

Main Line (705) 726-9300
Toll Free (866) 893-9300
Fax (705) 727-4276
simcoe.ca



Environmental Resource Recovery Centre
2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Springwater

Neighbouring Landowner Meeting
Thursday, September 8, 2016, 6:00 pm
Final Meeting Notes and Follow-up

General Details

- Facilitator – Sue Cumming, Cumming+Company
- In attendance:
 - from County Council – Warden Marshall, Deputy Warden Dowdall, Councillor Allen (Springwater)
 - from GHD Limited (County's consultant) – Tej Gidda, Brian Dermody
 - from County of Simcoe – Debbie Korolnek, Rob McCullough, Stephanie Mack
- Format – Sue Cumming provided introduction, some comments/questions from neighbours, presentation by GHD Limited on Organics Processing Facility (OPF) project delivery (20 minutes), questions followed
- Time started – 6:20 pm. Note – two residents were in attendance at 6:00 pm. Their agreement was sought to delay the meeting start until the others arrived (which was at 6:15 pm).
- GHD's presentation and the OPF project delivery method survey can be found on-line at www.simcoe.ca/opf

Please note that questions and responses have been organized according to topic. Clarification and follow-up is denoted in red.

Amendment – September 30, 2016

Further to correspondence received by a neighbouring landowner regarding the meeting notes sent on September 19, 2016, clarification has been added to this final version (page 9, second question).

Meeting Format, Feedback, Notes and Timing

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>What is the role of Sue Cumming? Has she ever been involved with a project that doesn't know what will be built?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sue noted that she is a registered professional planner, she has a degree from Ryerson University and teaches at Queen's University. She does not work in the realm of planning projects and development approvals. Her primary role is working with municipalities and community groups to look at community engagement, ways to have conversations and guide them through the process so they have the information, are comfortable to speak their minds, and do so in a manner that is respectful. It is not her role to comment on the development.
<p>Does Sue ensure questions are answered?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes are taken by staff and Sue writes questions down on the flip chart paper. Sue noted she does not have authority to require staff to answer questions. <i>For ease of reference, format of meeting notes will be revised. Table format will now note follow-up, if required, undertaken by County staff.</i>
<p>Will we have an opportunity to ask questions, the meeting agenda looks like we won't.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sue advised that the intent was questions and discussions on each item. Further agenda could better reflect this so that it is understood that the purpose of the meeting is to share information and have discussion. <i>Revise future agendas to ensure that it is clear that questions and discussion are intended as an integral part of the meetings.</i>
<p>When did the last meeting notes go out? Concern was expressed that the County was not getting these out in a timely manner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advised that the notes went out about one week following the March 23 meeting by e-mail to those that had provided an e-mail address. These notes were provided to County Council in a staff report. <i>Meeting notes from the March 23, 2016 meeting can be found in Item CCW 16-191 – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects – Public/Stakeholder Engagement Update (May 24, 2016), Schedule 1.</i> <i>Meeting notes will be e-mailed and mailed to all near neighbours within two weeks of the meeting.</i>
<p>What type of feedback are they expecting from residents that is going to have any impact on the technical data? Noted that they (neighbours) are not technicians.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is currently a survey with questions and request for feedback online until October 4, 2016.

Meeting Format, Feedback, Notes and Timing (*continued*)

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The following response was provided in the presentation and online survey:</i> <i>Why consult on procurement arrangements for the OPF?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The County has committed to consulting with the public and stakeholders at various stages in project development.</i> • <i>Feedback on the OPF project delivery method is being sought before procurement begins.</i>
<p>What outreach methods is the County utilizing to let residents know they have the opportunity to give feedback. There is less than 30 days between today and the feedback deadline, when did the request for feedback go out and is that typical of County deadlines, or is there justification for this timeline?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newspaper ads run County wide in newspapers starting today (September 8, 2016), a media advisory will be issued, and we will utilize social media (Facebook, Twitter). Timing was based on this meeting, felt we should come to neighbours first with presentation which has been put online today (September 8, 2016). We do not utilize a specific length of time for notifications. The County felt it was reasonable to talk to this group first, have time for the feedback and be able to report back to Council this fall. • <i>A summary of the consultation undertaken (including advertising dates, etc.) will be provided to County Council with feedback.</i>
<p>Sue Cumming indicated that she has learned that near neighbours felt that two weeks' notice was insufficient for the meeting that the time of month (with school starting) was of concern. Through further discussion, it was noted that near neighbours feel that a request of 3 weeks' notice should be given for future meetings,</p> <p>A longer meeting and/or later start time was also requested with a potential venue change if the times couldn't be accommodated at the Museum.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>County staff will commit to providing notification 3 weeks in advance going forward unless circumstances prevent this. In those instances, explanation will be provided to neighbours regarding the shorter notice.</i> • <i>County staff will commit to providing less than one hour of presentation/information at a meeting leaving the balance for questions and discussion. County staff will also commit to promptly beginning the meetings at the noted start time.</i> • <i>Feedback from neighbours will be sought on preference for timing:</i> <p><i>6:00 to 8:00 pm</i> <i>6:30 to 8:30 pm</i> <i>7:00 to 9:00 pm</i></p>

Anaerobic Digestion

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>If anaerobic digestion option is chosen will gas be stored or processed on site?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas is produced through the process of anaerobic digestion, mostly methane which is natural gas. It would not typically be stored. Commonly it is put into an engine to produce electricity which can then be used for the facilities on site, however it often produces more than what can be used therefore it would be exported out to the grid. • <i>The following response will be included in updated FAQs:</i> <p><i>What is anaerobic digestion? How is the biogas used?</i> <i>Anaerobic digestion is a series of biological processes in which microorganisms break down biodegradable material in the absence of oxygen. One of the end products is biogas, which is used to generate electricity and heat, or can be processed into renewable natural gas and transportation fuels.</i></p>
<p>Comment that anaerobic digestion or using methane gas was not brought up before.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anaerobic digestion was discussed before. Question from last meeting whether anaerobic digestion had less odours. When organics are processed in absence of oxygen, gas is a byproduct. • <i>The following response will be included in updated FAQs:</i> <p><i>Will anaerobic digestion be considered for the OPF?</i> <i>Yes. In June 2016, County Council provided direction that procurement of organics processing technology would be “technology neutral” and open the process to consider both aerobic composting and anaerobic digestion.</i></p>
<p>If producing the gas is there different zoning or fire regulations that would have to be adhered to?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a code regulated in Canada by the Technical Standards and Safety Association (TSSA) called the Digester Gas Code, it is publicly available online if anyone wants to look at it. It is not part of the zoning by-laws, it is the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), TSSA, and a number of other bodies that would look at the factors around the facilities.

Anaerobic Digestion (*continued*)

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The following response will be included in updated FAQs:</i> <p><i>What permits would be required for anaerobic digestion or recovery of biogas?</i> <i>Planning applications would be unchanged as studies currently being undertaken for these applications will consider various technologies. Should biogas be converted to electricity as part of the selected technology, the County would be required to apply to the MOECC for a Renewable Energy Approval (REA).</i></p>
<p>Is a full description on what is going on at the site included in the planning application to the Township? Is the zoning for this process part of the Planning submissions to Springwater Council?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The anaerobic digestion process fits under the Organics Processing Facility which is part of the zoning. • <i>The following response will be included in updated FAQs:</i> <p><i>How will the Planning submission move forward without knowing technology?</i> <i>Applications for Official Plan and zoning amendments, which will include numerous studies related to site conditions and facility operations, will provide details on the intended use of this facility – organics processing and the transfer of garbage and recycling. Studies, although technology neutral, will consider impacts of various known technologies to allow for either aerobic composting or anaerobic digestion technologies.</i></p>
<p>Comment that a waste-to-energy facility would require specific zoning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not a waste-to-energy facility. • <i>The anaerobic digestion process produces energy (in the form of biogas) from source-separated organics (commonly referred to as green bin material). This is different, however, from incineration or other methods of thermally treating garbage. In Ontario, a waste-to-energy facility is most often considered a location for incineration (such as the Durham York Energy Centre).</i>

Environmental Resource Recovery Centre

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>How does an Environmental Resource Recovery Centre compare with an organics processing centre? It was felt that they are portraying rotting food and diapers as an environmental resource and not organic waste. Felt that none of the actual words that describe what happens at the site are being used and if you call it what it is we will have more honest conversation about it.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organics waste processing is part of the plan, it has not changed by relabelling it. We are giving the whole site a moniker to try to describe in a short number of words what is happening on the site, Materials Management Facility, Organics Processing Facility, Solid Waste Management truck servicing, potential public education centre and potential expansion in the future to recycling sorting. • <i>The following response is included in the updated FAQs, page 2:</i> <p><i>What is the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre?</i> <i>There are two main facilities to be co-located at the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre – a Materials Management Facility (MMF) and an Organics Processing Facility (OPF).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Materials Management Facility (MMF) – a location for consolidation and transfer of waste (garbage, blue box recycling, and organics) from multiple collection vehicles for more economical shipment to other disposal or processing locations.</i> • <i>Organics Processing Facility (OPF) – a location where green bin material (kitchen waste, soiled paper products, etc.) and potentially materials such as leaf and yard waste, pet waste, diapers, and sanitary products are processed under controlled conditions and converted into other valuable products, such as compost or fertilizer.</i> • <i>Other – additional developments at the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre include a Solid Waste Management truck servicing area, a public education area, and the potential for future expansion to a recycling sorting facility.</i>

County Forests

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>Have staff read the County's 20-year Forestry Plan?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Debbie Korolnek provided clarification that her role is the General Manager of Engineering, Planning & Environment – this includes Forestry. • The 20-year Forestry Plan has been read and Graeme Davis, County Forester, has been involved in this process, no red flags have been raised by the County Forester.
<p>Residents believe the County fixed the selection of the forested tract by allowing 48% of the long list to include Simcoe county forest assets. The process to evaluate the sites showed a clear bias in favour of returning Simcoe County Forest to wasteland instead of selecting an industrial site which would be a more appropriate location to dump waste.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no requirement to declare a property surplus to change its use. We have been through the siting process, the County started with the premise that we did not want to expropriate land for this site, all County owned properties were looked at. We are past the siting process and now at the stage of proving the site is viable by the studies done.

County Forests (*continued*)

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>The resident stated that he has an outstanding letter to Mr. Davis pointing out that in the County's 20-year Forestry Management Plan there is no mention of turning any of our forests and converting them into industrial sites, in the five year renewal of that plan there is no mention of it, in the last annual report sent around there was a question if any of the forest was considered surplus and the answer was no.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The County Forester has responded to various inquires and the outstanding letter noted by the resident.</i>
<p>What was the purpose of the purchase of 4 forest properties in a recent report to Council?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Details were provided to County Council in Item CCW 16-238 – Simcoe County Forest – 2015 Annual Report (June 14, 2016), Schedule 1.</i>
<p>By opting to avoid expropriation then a truly viable industrial site may have been overlooked. Much of the conflict is because this site is a County forest. Requested comment with the importance of not expropriating land even if there is a strong belief that there are other lands available.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County Council supported the process of not considering expropriation, the County did seek willing vendor sites through ads in the paper, looked at the realty sites and engaged a realtor on our behalf to include those sites. Roughly half of the properties came from those lists. • <i>The following response will be included in updated FAQs:</i> <p><i>Was expropriation considered during the siting process?</i> <i>No. All County-owned properties were evaluated and, in addition, willing-vendor sites were sought through a Request for Expression of Interest (RFEI) process and a search of the Multiple Listing Service (MLS).</i></p>
<p>The name of an individual and telephone number was given to the Warden of an industrial site close to Highway 400, noted that the County's Economic Development officer was also aware of the site, suggested it as an alternative, and felt might be economically more viable. Noted it was sent to Mr. McCullough who stated the County was not able to pursue it. Questioned if he has the authority to block the flow of information to County Council.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was noted that many communications have gone on Council agendas, unsure if the communication with respect to the industrial site on Highway 400 was one of those. • <i>Correspondence from Mr. Wagner providing an alternative site was sent directly to Warden Gerry Marshall, County Council, local Councillors, and various provincial and federal elected officials. The correspondence and County response can be found in Item CCW 16-301 – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects – Project Update (September 13, 2016), Schedule 2 (pages 10 to 15).</i>

County Forests (*continued*)

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="894 305 2011 358">• <i>Specifically, Mr. McCullough responded to pursuing alternatives sites in correspondence to Mr. Wagner dated June 28, 2016:</i> <p data-bbox="1024 396 1919 717"><i>In regard to your suggested alternative location, this property was not submitted as a willing vendor privately-owned site and therefore was not evaluated as a potential location for the OPF (noting that it falls outside of the search area for the MMF). We will not speculate on the theoretical and as such will provide no comment on what process the County might follow should we be approached now by landowners offering their property for sale over one year later from the closing of the Request for Expression of Interest for property. Determining the preferred location encompassed a detailed, comprehensive process which went well beyond what would be required for siting these facilities. The development process will now go forward as directed.</i></p>

On-Site Storage

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p data-bbox="107 870 842 927">Would oil and petroleum products be recycled or stored on the property?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="894 870 2039 1021">• The County fleet of Solid Waste Management trucks would start from this site, it has not been decided if a fuelling station will be put in there. We are close to existing fuelling stations at transportation garages however we may decide to put a fuelling station on-site. Commercial oil or petroleum will not be processed or recycled at the site however grease from food may be recycled depending on the organics processing technology chosen.
<p data-bbox="107 1032 842 1151">What is the County going to do when the markets are depressed and we do not get rid of metal or plastic, are we going to stockpile material on the property if we cannot get rid of it? How big does this facility need to be to do this?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="894 1032 2039 1248">• What we are initially constructing is a transfer facility, unsorted material comes in and unsorted material goes out. At this point we do not believe we have the tonnage to sort our own material economically. In the future if tonnages and economics makes sense then we may look into building a sorting facility and at that point there would need to be decisions as to how to do it. We are reserving capacity at the site to sort materials into different streams, plastics, glass, metal, aluminum etc. With those sort of processes there would be some on site storage until you at least have a truckload to go.
<p data-bbox="107 1260 842 1313">Trucks going out of the site will they be going directly to the smelters?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="894 1260 1997 1313">• Trucks going out of the site will be going to sorting facilities like we currently utilize, City of Guelph for sorting of containers and Canada Fibres for sorting of paper fibres.

On-Site Storage (*continued*)

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The following response will be included in updated FAQs:</i> <p><i>Where does curbside material currently go now? What happens to this material?</i> <i>Garbage is currently landfilled at County sites, with the majority of curbside garbage exported to an energy-from-waste facility in Brampton. Organics are hauled to Hamilton for processing. Recycling containers (blue box) are hauled to Guelph, recycling paper (grey box) to Toronto for sorting. Leaf and yard waste and Christmas trees are processed at County facilities.</i></p>
<p>Why are we not continuing to use a service provider, why change?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will be doing the same thing that is happening at our current transfer station, there is a significant cost benefit to do it ourselves and we believe we can do it more economically. • <i>Responses to the following questions are included in the updated FAQs:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → <i>Why is this facility being developed? (page 2)</i> <p><i>Financial Considerations (page 8, 9)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → <i>What are the anticipated costs for the facility?</i> → <i>Was a business case completed for the MMF?</i> → <i>How were the savings calculated for the MMF?</i> → <i>Will costs of the MMF be updated now that the siting is complete?</i> → <i>When will the business case be developed for the OPF? Why has it not been undertaken?</i> → <i>What will the OPF business case consider?</i>

Buffer

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>Felt that the facility is using private property as buffer because the facility is close to the property line. Why is the 11 acres butted up against the property line? Questioned if the adjacent property wanted to build a home could they do so?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There will be a buffer between the facility footprint and the property line. Noted that adjacent property owners are welcome to come and meet with County Planning staff to discuss how the facility would impact plans to build a home on adjacent property. • <i>As follow-up, Township and County staff are available to discuss specific Planning matters with individual landowners.</i> • <i>The following response will be included in updated FAQs:</i> <p><i>How will the final location of the facility footprint be determined?</i> <i>Many factors will determine the final facility location and site plan. The location of buildings within the facility clustered on the 207 acre property will consider constraints such as setbacks from the property line and wetland areas, groundwater and soil conditions, and other findings from the studies currently being undertaken. Setbacks from property lines and environmental features such as wetlands will comply with all municipal and provincial legislation. In addition, distances from sensitive receptors and buffer distances will be an important consideration.</i></p>
<p>What other 11 acres are suitable within that parcel of land or is every other environmental concern holding it back to that specific location.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted that what we looked at was from existing conditions, groundwater, wet areas, and distance from existing buildings and that was the area that was best identified to house the facility. The location could be moved on the site however that would mean that we would be closer to existing buildings and we would have to re-initiate many of the studies already taking place.
<p>What width is an appropriate buffer and would that consist of trees? As per provincial regulations is there a prescribed minimum buffer for facilities like this? With respect to other properties that are similar to this, do you have a sense of what the norm is and will you follow it?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The width of the buffer is dependent on which element you are looking at and which regulation you are following. There is no specific number published by the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change for a minimum buffer from a property line because it is not the same for every situation. This is why we do studies with respect to (for example) people nearby, we may need more buffer for noise, odour or dust, we have to work through every single one of these parameters. Noted that 11 acres is not all building, not planning on putting the building to the edge of the 11 acres or to the property line, we must take into account all the other factors. There is no real norm as variables for each property are very different.

Buffer (*continued*)

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>The minimum acreage required was a 50 acre parcel, how did they get down to 11 acres for this site?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looking at all of the technologies out there they had a conservative estimate of 4.5 hectares for the footprint of the facility however there is a possibility that when the technology is chosen the footprint could decrease. The rest of the land around that was to be a buffer and not necessarily developed, felt that when they looked at the siting it was to be a minimum of 17 hectares. • <i>The following response is included in the updated FAQs, page 4:</i> <p><i>Why did candidate sites have to be so large? Will the facility take up this much space?</i> <i>Site size was considered as part of the technical siting criteria. For a co-located facility, the minimum site size was 17 ha (42 acres) – although the actual footprint would be a portion of this, approximately 4.5 ha (11 acres). The difference between the two provides what is known as a buffer – the distance between the facility and surrounding land uses. It is common practice when siting this type of facility to provide a buffer area. It is used in combination with good design and operational practices to mitigate potential impacts such as odour and noise. Generally, the greater the distance to sensitive receptors, the greater potential to reduce conflicts between the site and neighbours.</i></p> <p><i>Minimum property size, including buffer distances, was recommended by the County’s consultant, utilizing their expertise and applying best practices. This was exclusionary criteria and did not change during the evaluation or with surrounding land use.</i></p>

Studies

- Note on the Archaeological Assessment – the County relayed information to neighbours on a verbal update from their consultant undertaking the work. There was a find of an early pioneer homestead from the 1830s to 1850s in the footprint of the 11 acres. County is expecting to receive the written report by Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) at the end of October.

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>If it goes to a Stage 3 and 4 Archaeological Assessment, will they go with ASI, the same archaeological company?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As of this evening, no final decision has been reached as to which consultant will do the Stage 3 and 4 Archaeological Assessment. But due to ASI’s site knowledge, it may make sense to continue with them. • <i>Details on the archeological find were provided to County Council in Item CCW 16-301 – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects – Project Update (September 13, 2016).</i>

Studies (*continued*)

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
Are all independent companies doing the studies, who does them?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response & Follow-up • GHD is doing the majority of the studies in house but subcontracting some of them including the Archaeological Assessment (to ASI) and Agricultural, etc. • MMM Group Limited is undertaking the Traffic Impact Study. • <i>List of studies was provided to County Council in Item CCW 16-301 – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects – Project Update (September 13, 2016).</i>
Has a full legal boundary and topographic study been done on the site?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The topographic survey is ongoing and the legal boundary has not been done however the County possibly already has one and in order to file a site plan it will be required.
When will the studies be completed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The County will likely receive the studies by the end of September however we have not received any as of yet.
For the Environmental Impact Study (EIS), the documents say that the work was undertaken in January by GHD's ecologist, who is the ecologist? Why did they do it in January?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHD has several in house ecologists. The reason for various times of year is that we are looking at different habitats and species. We have consulted with the Conservation Authority throughout the process and mapped some of the features with them so they have been involved every step of the way. • <i>An on-site reconnaissance to confirm site conditions and to preliminary assess natural heritage features on the preferred site was undertaken in January 2016 following the comparative evaluation of the short-listed sites. Information on this study and why it was undertaken was outlined for Council in Item CCW 16-054 – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects – Final Siting Report (March 8, 2016), Schedule 5.</i> • <i>Further work continues on the EIS – including spring and summer field work.</i>
Environmental Impact Study (EIS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The following response is included in the updated FAQs, page 9:</i> <p><i>What will an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) include?</i> <i>The EIS will examine natural features of the property (including soils, vegetation, wildlife, topography, watercourses/ bodies) and the ecological functions they provide. It will include a description of potential impacts of the development and how the environmental characteristics and features will be maintained. This work will be done in consultation with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), Nottawasaga Conservation Authority (NVCA), and the Township of Springwater. This study will guide where development can occur on the site and inform the land use planning applications.</i></p>

Studies (*continued*)

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>In January 2016, GHD ecologists walked the site, question on timing, they walked Horseshoe Valley Site in January but it was decided in March 2016 what the preferred site was. Requested the timing of all the other ecology reviews.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHD staff walked each short-listed site to gain an understanding of site characteristics that were used in the comparative evaluation. GHD noted it was a site walk, not in depth analysis. • <i>Following GHD's comparative evaluation undertaken in late 2015, their ecologist visited the preferred location to confirm site conditions as due diligence prior to public release of the preferred site. Following direction from County Council to further studies at this location, an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is currently being undertaken.</i> • <i>From Item CCW 16-054 noted above:</i> <p style="margin-left: 40px;"><i>In addition to the above and as due diligence, GHD's work was extended to conduct an on-site reconnaissance to confirm site conditions and preliminary assess natural heritage features on the preferred site – work that will form the basis of an EIS. The work was undertaken in January by GHD's ecologist who walked the site to verify the approximate location of surface water features and condition of the woodlot. This initial assessment did not identify any conditions that may preclude development of the facilities, as outlined in their additional technical memorandum, provided as Schedule 5. However, additional site investigation(s) will be required as part of the preparation of an EIS to confirm the natural features of the site.</i></p> • <i>Details of field work undertaken at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Springwater – including timing of field work associated with the EIS – will be provided to the County in forthcoming reports. These reports will be submitted as part of the Planning applications and become public at that time.</i>
<p>Questioned how fair a process it was when the ecologists are all from GHD employees, questioned expertise in ecological, biological, species identification, and environmental functions. Questioned if a third party would review their work?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecologists on staff are certified, accredited, experienced people who work on multiple files. The review activity is done by the regulators – Township of Springwater for Planning, MOECC for the environmental approvals.

Timeline

Questions & Comments	Response & Follow-up
<p>Felt aggressive timeline due to the expiration of several contracts. Questioned what will happen if there are delays including zoning, if preferred vendors do not put forth a proposal, if suitable systems do not come forward, or if it gets delayed in litigation, what is the plan for that?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The procurement process, Request for Information (RFI) is a good first step, it helps to gage interest in what systems are available, who has a system that can economically work at this scale. The Request for Prequalification (RFPQ) creates a shortlist where they have to pass a threshold for the ability to do the job the way the County needs it to be done and they are the only ones that can submit an Request for Proposal (RFP). There is technical scoring in the RFP and if they do not meet the minimum score then the RFP would not be fulfilled. • We have constructed a timeline, it is the best approximation. If there are changes in the timeline, we will do extensions or short term contracts to deal with all of the materials. When we review the submissions we will be doing a business case for Council to determine if the submissions make sense with the technologies available. It was noted that a recent staff report has different timelines for the four different paths, note that the RFPQ and RFP will go out following Planning approvals. • <i>Details on the Development Strategy provided to County Council in Item CCW 16-165 – Solid Waste Management Infrastructure Projects – Development Strategy (May 24, 2016).</i>