



---

To: **Committee of the Whole**

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

Item Number: CCW - 17-174

Meeting Date: June 13, 2017

Subject: Environmental Resource Recovery Centre – Project Update

---

## Recommendation

**That Item CCW 17-174, dated June 13, 2017, regarding the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre – Project Update, be received.**

## Executive Summary

Development of the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre (ERRC) at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Springwater, continues as is directed by County Council. The process and facility concepts remain very positive initiatives for the County, however many of the analysis and approval stages are now at a critical juncture. This purpose of this item is to provide Council with some updates on the project with specific emphasis on some recent developments such as:

- implications of two recent pieces of legislation that could potentially impact project timelines for development – *Growth Plan 2017 / Bill 151 – the Waste-Free Ontario Act (WFOA)*;
- an update on preliminary business case developments for both the Organics Processing Facility (OPF) and Materials Management Facility (MMF); and
- the Planning approvals process currently being furthered for the preferred site.

### *Growth Plan 2017*

- new provincial planning policies were recently released on May 18, 2017. Planning decisions made after July 1, 2017 will be required to conform with the new policies;
- it is anticipated that there could be further requirements on the Planning approvals process for the proposed site in consideration of:
  - strengthened natural heritage/environmental protection policies, including a Natural Heritage System map to be issued by the province;
  - restriction on developments in key groundwater recharge areas; and
  - Provincial mapping of an Agricultural System.
- the new Planning policies may require further work to justify how the ERRC meets the new policy requirements.

*Bill 151 – Waste-Free Ontario Act*

- proclaimed on November 30, 2016 – however, key enacting legislation and policy statements such as the *Food and Organic Waste Action Plan* are still forthcoming;
- anticipated to encourage and increase organics diversion (details are yet to come on how this will be accomplished) - this may effectively exert more pressure on the already constrained organic processing capacity in the province which could support capacity building; and
- brand owners and first importers of blue box recycling (the Producers) are anticipated to fund this program 100% – with the program transitioning to their control by 2023. At this time, what this may mean is unclear, but there may be no guarantee that this material would come to municipal MMF's in the long-term and sizing of our facility should take this into consideration.

*OPF Preliminary Business Case / MMF Site-specific Financial Analysis/Update*

- anticipate to present both reports to County Council later this summer. These reports will address not only the anticipated costs of various options but associated risks and resulting business and operational impacts of each;
- these reports have been delayed somewhat due to additional site-specific costing and research related to agency recommendations and comments as the Planning approvals process is furthered. In addition, MMF costing is reflective of new information on timing of the blue box transition as noted above;
- the financial model for the MMF has changed since the initial 2014 assessment. Uncertainty regarding long-term transfer of blue box recycling from this facility, potential loss of funding, anticipated increased legal and consulting costs related to furthering the Planning approvals process, and higher site-specific development costs could have a negative impact on the long term analysis and extend the payback for the MMF.

*Planning-related Matters*

- through the circulation of the proposed County Official Plan Amendment (OPA) and supporting information, the County has received comments from various agencies, public bodies, one First Nation community, and from the public. Comments generally pertain to concerns about noise, odour, traffic, natural heritage, loss of forests, and forest fire hazard;
- comprehensive comments have been received from the province as the approval authority for County OPAs. These included technical comments from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). These comments may be challenging for the County to navigate at this stage as they appear to require a level of detail normally reserved for the Environmental Compliance Approvals (ECA) stage (or license to operate issued by the MOECC) which is not only technology-specific but considers the vendor's application of that technology. Staff and consultants continue to meet with the MOECC to try to outline a more constructive and achievable path forward;
- natural heritage/environmental comments received from both the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA) and the Ministry of Natural Resources & Forestry (MNR) require further clarification of data/information that has been collected, as well as some additional field work that will occur during the summer of 2017; and
- in consideration of local municipal informal comments on this project and input received from some members of the public, an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) is likely regardless of outcomes. This could significantly impact the project's timelines, potentially resulting in a lengthy delay in project development. It should also be noted that the Province has very recently released an outline of proposed changes to the land use planning appeals system in Ontario. It is not possible to confirm how these proposed changes could impact the project until the associated legislation is published and reviewed by the County's legal counsel.

## Background/Analysis/Options

The purpose of this item is to provide a detailed update for County Council on the development of the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre (ERRC) including:

- updates on potential project timeline / development impacting provincial legislation – *Growth Plan 2017* and *Bill 151 – Waste-Free Ontario Act (WFOA)*;
- information on long-term organics management options to be presented in a forthcoming preliminary business case for the Organics Processing Facility (OPF) and considerations as staff undertake an updated financial analysis for the Materials Management Facility (MMF); and
- details regarding the Planning approvals process for 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Springwater.

Previous staff reports regarding development of these facilities, consultants' technical reports, communication material from public information and consultation sessions, and minutes of Community Engagement Committee meetings can be found at [www.simcoe.ca/errc](http://www.simcoe.ca/errc).

### Growth Plan 2017

On May 18, 2017, the Province released *Growth Plan 2017*. This policy document outlines how municipalities in the Greater Golden Horseshoe should plan for and manage growth and development. Beginning July 1, 2017, all decisions regarding planning matters are required to conform with the new Growth Plan, subject to any legislative or regulations that provide otherwise. County and local municipal planning staff are scheduled to receive more in-depth training from provincial planning representatives later in June. Following this training, County staff anticipate providing County Council with a more fulsome review of the new provincial policies and their potential impacts on overall planning and processes within Simcoe County.

However, County staff have conducted a high-level review of the entire *Growth Plan 2017* to assess any potential implications the new policies could have on the planning approvals process for development of the ERRC at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West. This initial review revealed the following notable policy updates with regard to the new Growth Plan and the ERRC:

- strengthened natural heritage/environmental protection policies, including a Natural Heritage System map to be issued by the province which may be applied to the proposed site. This could result in further work being required to confirm how the proposed ERRC meets the new policies;
- development in key hydrologic areas (i.e. groundwater recharge areas) will be limited and may be subject to higher standards. Further confirmation may be required from the Province to determine whether the proposed site is in their opinion now within a key hydrologic area; and
- provincial mapping of the Agricultural System is also expected. While the proposed site is not currently designated Agricultural in the OMB approved County Official Plan, it is unclear what impact the new Agricultural mapping may have on the proposed ERRC site at this time.

Based on the above, County staff are of the opinion that the planning approvals for the ERRC on the preferred site will be very likely subject to the policies of *Growth Plan 2017*. While unknown at this time until further clarification is received from the Province, the new policies may require further work by the County to justify how the ERRC addresses the new policy requirements.

### Bill 151 – Waste-Free Ontario Act

The timing of business case developments for the OPF and MMF is important given the Province's advancement of the WFOA. This legislation could have direct impacts on both the County's organics and blue box recycling programs – and thus development of supporting infrastructure.

In regard to organics, a key component of Bill 151 is development of a *Food and Organic Waste Action Plan* (commonly referred to as the *Organics Action Plan*). It is anticipated that this plan – which is yet to be released – will focus on actions to address food waste prevention and recovery of food and organic wastes from the waste stream. The Province has recently launched a stakeholder working group to provide advice on development of the *Organics Action Plan* and work is on-going. It is anticipated that the plan could include consideration of the entire supply chain (including pre-consumer and post-consumer organic wastes), a desire to increase recovery in high-rise and multi-residential dwellings, and potential regulatory actions such as disposal bans. This may have obvious implications on the availability and long-term pricing of processing capacity, making new capacity development critical.

In light of this, the County is not alone in pursuing organics processing infrastructure at this time – other jurisdictions such as the Region of Durham, Region of Peel, and York Region are also in the process of assessing various options for the design, build, operation and maintenance of new facilities. With new regulations on cap-and-trade coming into effect on January 1, 2017 (falling under *Bill 172 – Climate Change Mitigation and Low-Carbon Economy Act*), there is a desire to pursue processing technologies that have the added benefit of utilizing biogas produced during anaerobic digestion processing. Staff have met recently with representatives from both the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) and Association of Municipalities Ontario (AMO) to discuss the potential recovery and utilization of biogas at a County OPF. This will be an important consideration in technology and both the preliminary and final business cases.

The WFOA also outlines major changes to the blue box recycling program. Development of the MMF must consider that in the near future, brand owners and first importers (referred to as the Producers) will take full responsibility for the management and incurred costs of blue box recycling. There is recent indication that the transition could be sooner than expected – noting that it could likely come by 2023 or earlier should agreements be reached with the municipalities and Producers. This is good news for municipalities. Currently, the County's blue box program is only about 46% funded – leaving the County to pay approximately \$3.4M annually for the remaining collection, transfer, haulage, and processing costs.

The blue box transition has however complicated costing for the MMF portion of the project, and thus delayed the forthcoming business cases as consideration is being given on how best – and prudently – to size the facility. The MMF will be required for long-term transfer of garbage – whereas long-term capacity for blue box recycling is uncertain as control shifts to the Producers. In the short-term, MMF design must consider enough space for blue box recycling to ensure receipt of the \$2M funding committed by the Continuous Improvement Fund (CIF).

## OPF Preliminary Business Case

Work continues on assessing the viability of advancing the Organics Processing Facility (OPF). Information obtained from the *Request for Information (RFI 2016-127) – Organics Management Options* is currently being assessed by Ernst & Young Orenda Corporate Finance Inc. (EY) in a three-part preliminary business case. The purpose of this report will be to examine alternatives for securing long-term processing for source-separated organics – including the development of an OPF at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Springwater.

### *Preliminary Business Case*

A total of eight (8) separate submissions were received in response to the organics management RFI. The respondents included a variety of constructors, operators, and technology providers and the submissions varied in terms of the proposed technology and agreement structure, with some respondents providing multiple options under the same submission.

In summary, Ernst & Young Orenda Corporate Finance Inc. (EY) is assessing the following alternatives for organics processing:

- Option 1 – status quo – continue to export to existing processor;
- Option 2 – export to alternate processor;
- Option 3 – in-vessel composting delivered via design-build-operate-maintain (DBO) model;
- Option 4 – dry anaerobic digestion (dry AD) delivered via DBO model; and
- Option 5 – wet anaerobic digestion (wet AD) delivered via DBO model.

The three-part report will evaluate each of the above alternatives as follows:

#### Business and operational impacts

- including alignment with policy (both County and provincial), ease of development/permitting, availability and applicability of technology, and potential feedstocks and end products

#### Risk assessment

- including legislation changes, process and technical risks, and long-term viability

#### Cost/benefit analysis

- a discounted cash flow analysis – including direct and indirect costs, capital and operating costs, and equipment maintenance and replacement costs

EY has provided some preliminary key findings that will be presented in their report:

- while the option to transport waste 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 WFOA) could lead to market capacity and availability issues. Potential impacts related to market capacity may include increasing gate fees at privately-owned or partner facilities/sites, inability to accept new materials such as pet waste and diapers, and expensive transport to facilities/operators in distant jurisdictions; and
- based on the County's long-term waste strategy, pending legislation, and trends of increasing diversion from landfill, the County should consider options that allow for long-term control over organic waste processing and diversion, including the development of a County-owned facility,

or ensure that contracts with partner facilities are structured to “freeze” gate fees for long term arrangements.

EY will present their findings to County Council later this summer for further consideration and directions.

MMF Site-specific Financial Analysis/Update

As project development continues and the Planning approvals processes advance, greater site specific detail has allowed for updating costing for the Materials Management Facility (MMF). A financial analysis for a County transfer facility was presented to County Council in *Item CS 14-253 – Transfer Station Analysis* (August 12, 2014). Completed prior to the siting process, it outlined future contract costs, estimated land purchase and site development costs (based on development at an industrial location), and preliminary capital costs for the building. This initial assessment outlined that a County MMF could save approximately \$13 million over the next 20 years compared to the current system, with a payback of 5.5 years. This savings is reflective of increased costs for transfer of garbage with the closure of County landfills – noting that even without this increased material, over \$800,000 (net) is spent annually on transfer.

The Project Team (including County Finance) has been working to finalize an updated business case for the MMF which will now incorporate consideration of site conditions and required improvements outlined in the technical studies (such as the Facility Characteristics Report and Traffic Impact Study). This site-specific information is critical in order to complete a more detailed analysis. Utilizing the County’s business case template, various alternatives will be assessed – including continued contracting this service.

Outlined below are some key considerations that are impacting analysis of MMF costs:

- changes to the blue box recycling program under WFOA (as discussed above). Consideration has been given to prudently size the facility to manage garbage and organics but having contingency for transfer capacity should the Producers ultimately wish to utilize the County facility as a regional transfer centre for blue box recycling on a cost recovery basis;
- should Planning approvals delay commissioning of the MMF (discussed further below), there is the risk that funding from the Continuous Improvement Fund (CIF) (over \$2M) could be lost. The funding agreement with CIF outlines the following milestones – noting that given the anticipated transition of the blue box recycling program by 2023, there may be limited room to negotiate extensions in the timelines and any missed deadlines could impact the agreement;

**Table 1 – Milestones for CIF Funding**

Milestone	Timing	Status
1 – Monitoring & Measurement Plan	January 2016	complete
2 – Siting and Site-specific Studies, Planning Approvals	September 2017	report to be submitted requesting payment for studies undertaken to date
3 – Engineering and Site Prep	December 2018	dependent on Planning approvals – some risk

4 – Building Construction	September 2019	dependent on Planning and Environmental approvals – some risk
5 – Final Report	September 2020	dependent on Planning and Environmental approvals – some risk

- incorporation of costs associated with recommendations and comments from various agencies reviewing the Planning applications (including the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change and Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority). This is an evolving project and as additional details are confirmed in regard to required mitigation measures, design features, forest compensation, etc., specific capital costs are being determined. It is noted that consideration for these Planning-related comments will delay presentation of the updated costing for the MMF as outlined;
- increased legal and consulting costs as the Planning approvals process is furthered;
- unknown final directions on the OPF project as the preliminary business case is developed for that portion of the ERRC. Consideration for co-locating both facilities will have a positive impact for both projects as site improvement and development costs can be shared;
- County Road 22 (CR22) improvements other than the recommended intersection improvements will not be costed into either business case as they are warranted by the future background traffic not the ERRC project (as outlined in the Traffic Impact Study);
- development timing is critical from a waste system perspective as the County prepares to export all facilities’ garbage in 2024 with closure of Site 2 – Collingwood and all curbside garbage in 2029 with the anticipated closure of the last County landfill capacity.

Although current contracted transfer costs are expected to increase with the closure of County landfills, it is anticipated that many of the financial benefits of this facility could be lessened with any delayed development. Uncertainty regarding long-term transfer of blue box recycling from this facility, potential loss of funding, and increased legal and consulting costs from an extended Planning approvals process would have obvious negative impacts on the overall analysis and extend the payback for this infrastructure. It is noted that initial estimates related to the major site development costs for 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West (these will be shared with the OPF and incorporated into both business cases) are approximately \$1M for access road paving, \$1.1M for CR22 improvements specifically related to the ERRC facility, \$775,000 for site servicing, and \$820,000 for storm water management. Staff are working with our consulting team (both GHD Limited and MMM Group) on refining costing for site works, building costs, and recommended improvements to CR22 for the final report.

The updated financial analysis for the MMF will be presented to County Council later this summer for consideration and direction.

Planning Updates

Applications have been submitted to the Township of Springwater to further the required local Official Plan (OP) and Zoning By-law (ZB) amendments for the ERRC at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Springwater. These applications and a County-initiated County Official Plan Amendment (OPA) are now following the processes outlined in the Planning Act. Required information has been provided to the appropriate ministries, agencies, and Aboriginal communities

for their respective review and comment. Consultation with the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority, and Township of Springwater and County Planning staff continues as they have now provided written comments in regard to submitted technical studies.

In addition, County Council held a statutory Public Meeting on May 9, 2017 to hear comments from the public on the proposed amendment to the County of Simcoe Official Plan. It is noted that the Township of Springwater will be holding a similar Public Meeting in relation to this matter on June 19, 2017.

The following is a brief summary of comments received to date from public agencies and the public in regard to the applications.

#### *Synopsis of Public Agency Comments:*

County staff have circulated information related to the ERRC to a wide variety of public agencies, First Nations and Metis communities, as well as other authorities and organizations that are required by the Planning Act. The information that was provided was pertinent to each recipient's anticipated interest in the proposed County OPA and the ERRC development. Comments received through this process have been posted on the County Planning webpage. As the approval authority for County OPAs, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs' (MMA) comments are notable.

As part of the MMA review, Provincial planning staff pursue a one-window approach to ensure all Provincial interests are considered. As such, the Ministry circulated the ERRC County OPA (COPA) to partner ministries resulting in a comprehensive set of the province's comments on the ERRC. Through the provincial review, staff have identified a number of issues including the protection of natural heritage and water features, cultural heritage and archaeological resources, and air quality. The comments are summarized, by each applicable Ministry, as follows (noting there was no objections from the Ministry of Transportation (MTO) and OMAFRA).

#### Ministry of Natural Resources & Forestry

- clarification is required regarding identification of specific wildlife habitat
- further information and summer field work is required to ensure Species At Risk habitat has been appropriately considered

#### Ministry of Environment & Climate Change

- satisfied that the proposed ERRC land use are not subject to threat policies on the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan
- satisfied that neither wetland nor downstream surface water tributaries will be impaired, provided appropriate control measures are completed
- satisfied with the proposed stormwater management strategy
- further facility details and air quality/odour modelling is required to ensure land use compatibility issues and impacts have been considered to the Ministry's satisfaction

#### Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport

- recommended that the COPA not be approved until the Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment Report has been deemed compliant



It should be noted that provincial planning staff have confirmed that the provincial comments will need to be addressed to ensure the COPA complies with all applicable provincial legislation, regulations and policies.

While many of the comments received from the Province do not appear to be insurmountable obstacles to the Planning process, they will require further work and financial investment to address. Specifically, the MOECC request for further information regarding air quality and odour is particularly challenging at this stage in the project's development as a technology has not been selected yet. The information the MOECC is seeking is typically accomplished when facility technology and operational details are known and an application to operate (an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) application) has been submitted. However, the ERRC project has proceeded upon the County consultant's recommendation that the County defer procuring technology until land use approvals are obtained. The MOECC has suggested that a potential solution that could be considered would be to model the air quality and odour impacts of each of several different technology options. This could be expensive and time consuming without the needed certainty that it would be sufficient to the MOECC. This requirement may have an impact on the ERRC project timeline and the Planning approvals process.

With regard to comments from other public agencies and First Nations, similar comments regarding the MNR's natural heritage comments were received from the Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority (NVCA). County staff and the consulting team have met with NVCA staff to discuss their comments. Additional work related to the EIS, spring groundwater sampling, and a bat survey are required. Work can continue this summer as these studies are seasonal. Also, the NVCA has recommended that the forest cover lost through the development of the ERRC be replaced at another location at a 2:1 area ratio. This results in a requirement for the County to explore opportunities where this forest compensation can be achieved elsewhere. The Township of Springwater and its peer review consultants (Ainley Group) provided comprehensive technical comments. The County's consultants have indicated that many of these comments may be addressed through the site plan approval stage of the process, or by addressing other comments that have been received by other agencies (i.e. MOECC, etc.). Township Council also provided a resolution requesting that the County provide further financial and business case information related to the ERRC facilities, which again is not normally part of a planning process.

The Township of Oro-Medonte provided comments generally related to suggested Planning policy edits for the proposed COPA, financial considerations related to the ERRC, traffic management and enforcement, and a request for further information regarding organics processing technologies being considered and associated odour impacts. Additional responses or comments were received from the City of Orillia, Chippewas of Rama First Nation, Canada Post, Enbridge Gas, and the Simcoe County District School Board.

### *Synopsis of Public Comments*

Leading up to, and as a result of the COPA Public Meeting on May 9, 2017, the County has received over 100 written comments from members of the public. Oral submissions were also made at the County's Public Meeting. Written comments from members of the public are posted on the County Planning webpage along with a transcript of the COPA public meeting. With respect to the comments received, the common themes are generally summarized as follows:

- The proposed ERRC site represents an inappropriate use of forested lands; an industrial site should be selected instead.
- The proposed ERRC site represents a missed opportunity to improve the local economy and lacks a sound business case.

- Locating the ERRC within a forested area presents a potential forest fire hazard.
- The ERRC will have a negative impact on surrounding properties and residents.
- Traffic impact concerns.
- Impact on the natural environment.

As with agency comments, County staff will continue to review comments received from members of the public and determine the most appropriate approach to addressing them. Any new comments/submissions that are received in the future will be posted on the County Planning webpage from time to time. A more fulsome summary of all comments, agency and public, and how they are addressed will be provided in the future.

### *Next Steps and Timing*

Although there is an underlying desire from all parties to encourage better solid waste management processes and greater diversion from landfill in Ontario, the planning and site selection process for supporting waste management infrastructure is a difficult task for any municipality. The County's efforts to pursue the ERRC has been further complicated by the lack of a clear process outlined by the Province for facilities outside of an Environmental Assessment (EA). In siting waste management facilities, numerous factors and criteria must be balanced, which often results in a need to address some potential impacts and the concerns of neighbouring landowners – wherever a site may be proposed.

Moving forward with the Planning approvals process for the ERRC includes consideration of all comments. As both MMA and the Township of Springwater are also involved in the Planning approvals process, public and agency comments will be considered by them as well as County staff, potentially with other interpretation. It will very likely take additional time and resources to address the various comments received. While some comments are straight forward, some will be more challenging, costly and time consuming to address than others, which could make the Planning approvals process more challenging to navigate. This is further complicated by changes to Provincial Acts, other required Planning approvals from the Township of Springwater and the potential implications of the new 2017 Growth Plan. The County's legal counsel has indicated that the process may be long and slow, with opposition and land use planning appeals being a distinct possibility which will only further increase costs and timelines. If appealed, project timing – and the certainty of getting approvals – are at risk from initial timelines.

### **Summary**

Given the approved siting methodology and comprehensive evaluation criteria, 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Springwater, remains the preferred location for the ERRC facility. This site has numerous advantages in regard to environmental conditions, transportation, size, and distance to sensitive receptors. Technical studies have indicated that this site is viable to host the ERRC.

That being said, the ERRC project is still at a critical juncture and faces a number of new challenges. As outlined in this item and based on the comments and submissions received to date, indications from County Planning and legal counsel is that the process to further approvals may be more arduous and more lengthy than anticipated – further complicated by the new provincial *Growth Plan 2017* and potential challenges with the host municipal processes and stated perspectives. Project development could be delayed as outlined in this report as the County seeks to satisfy the various agencies and work with the Township of Springwater on local Planning approvals. It is estimated that, if appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board under current legislation, delays related to the Planning approvals could extend project development by as much as 2 years – pushing commissioning of the MMF and OPF to 2021 and 2023, respectively. Changes to the

land use planning appeal system are also being undertaken, however, and detailed implications will not be known until County legal counsel reviews legislation that is expected in the near future.

These delays will likely result in increased legal and consulting costs and potentially risk the loss of funding for the blue box recycling portion of the facility (over \$2M) as outlined. It is further noted that the delay in development of the MMF may also extend the payback period for this infrastructure as the County can no longer forecast long term blue box recycling to be managed at this facility after 2023 as the program transitions under the WFOA.

While this important waste management initiative continues to be the prudent, long term strategic direction for the County's solid waste management path at this time, it appears that overall challenges relating to siting and approvals may create some further delays and utilization of County resources as we work toward facility and waste management system development.

### **Financial and Resource Implications**

To date, approximately \$570,000 and \$420,000 has been spent on development of the Organics Processing Facility (OPF) and the Materials Management Facility (MMF) projects, respectively (to May 2017). A breakdown of these costs is as follows:

Siting process and consultation	\$260,000
Site-specific technical studies and consultation	\$585,000
OPF procurement and business case	\$130,000
MMF functional design and costing	\$15,000

It is anticipated that additional 2017 costs will include:

On-site, additional seasonal studies (response to agency comments)	\$35,000
OPF preliminary business case	\$82,000
Consulting services related to furthering Planning approvals process	\$25,000

### **Relationship to Corporate Strategic Plan**

In regard to long-term processing of organics, the Solid Waste Management Strategy (Strategy) recommended development of a centralized composting facility within the County. Public input indicated support for in-County processing as well as for the addition of pet waste and diapers to the program. This item also supports the Strategy recommendation to develop transfer capacity infrastructure to manage garbage and recyclables generated within the County.

### **Reference Documents**

Item CCW 17-038 (January 24, 2017) Environmental Resource Recovery Centre – Project Update

**Attachments**

There are no attachments to this Item.

**Prepared By:** Nathan Westendorp, Manager of Development  
Stephanie Mack, P.Eng., Special Projects Supervisor

**Approvals:**

David Parks, Director of Planning, Development and Tourism	May 31, 2017
Rob McCullough, Director, Solid Waste Management	May 31, 2017
Debbie Korolnek, P.Eng., General Manager, EPE	May 31, 2017
Trevor Wilcox, General Manager, Corporate Performance	June 4, 2017
Mark Aitken, Chief Administrative Officer	June 5, 2017