

Name	Affiliation	Date Received	Address			Method	Follow-up	Feedback Received	Interpretation of Feedback and Project Team Response	Report Reference
Mr. Keith White		June 6, 2014	25th S/R RR #3	Thornton	L0L 2N0	e-mail to Customer Service	e-mail sent June 26, 2014	<p>I have read your recent handout concerning the proposed Organics Processing Facility.</p> <p>I wish to herewith commend you in this endeavour. It shows great foresight and it should reduce the environmental footprint by eliminating truck transporting through the major cities.</p> <p>Hopefully it could serve as an impetus to take some of the surrounding counties materials as well and add jobs to the region.</p> <p>Somewhere down the line I would like to see consideration for a state of the art "Brownfield" recycling centre that could service some of the real estate within Simcoe counties urban areas as an impetus for renewal. For instance the County could take the initiative with the City of Barrie and other municipalities to address some premium real estate that could be fixed and the cost of brownfield recycling being added to the value of a given property. This would be similar to what Toronto did for the Port lands. Canada is an industry leader in this area and it would be great if Simcoe county could position itself as part of future initiatives as a leader in Brownfield research, reclamation and environmental science as part of Georgian College and a perhaps future Laurentian University campus in Barrie.</p> <p>Locating this kind of facility (including an organics Processing Facility) somewhere along the BCRailway line (or accessible to via a short spur) would also add some impetus to this line and create a greener footprint. Whether in Essa or Clearview or even Springwater (on the north edge of hwy 90).</p> <p>If Simcoe county can do this as for instance University of Waterloo has done for its research parks it would attract a very viable, perhaps acceptable industry to the region.</p>	<p>Opportunity for Brownfield Development, Enhanced Use is included as an indicator for the Land Use/Zoning evaluation criteria within the Social component. This indicator will be applied in the Screen 3 evaluation.</p> <p>Both Existing/Required Transportation Infrastructure and Neighbourhood Traffic Impacts are included as indicators for the Transportation evaluation criterion within the Social component. The Existing/Required Transportation Infrastructure indicator will be applied in both Screen 2 and 3 evaluations and the Neighbourhood Traffic Impacts indicator will be applied in the Screen 3 evaluation.</p>	<p>County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 - Planning - Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, February 2015</p>
Ms. Sheila Hunter		June 17, 2014				feedback form submitted at public session		<p>Can we keep it to a small - non glamorous facility that will be primarily for Simcoe County alone? Lets try to pay for stage 1 (aerobic?) before continuing to stage 2 (anaerobic).</p> <p>Lets keep the public aware of the numbers - costs of building.</p> <p>Lets keep municipalities involved. Their input is valuable in where to locate the site! Please keep our water pure!</p>	<p>For the siting study, Capital Costs and Operation and Maintenance Costs are criteria under the Economic component and will be applied in the Screen 3 evaluation, which is the comparative evaluation of the short-listed sites.</p> <p>Groundwater is included as an evaluation criteria within the Environmental component, and the indicator Source Water Protection Areas, will be applied in both the Screen 1 and Screen 3 evaluations.</p>	<p>County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 - Planning - Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, February 2015</p>
Mr. Denis Paccagnella		June 17, 2014				feedback form submitted at public session		<p>Like the idea of having an indoor building facility for odor, leaching and pest control.</p>	<p>Acknowledged.</p>	<p>County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 - Planning - Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, February 2015</p>
Mr. Peter Case		October 18, 2014				feedback form from website	e-mail sent December 11, 2014	<p>Odour issues will be a significant issue. The 250 metre setback required by the MoE is unlikely to be adequate.</p>	<p>MOECC minimum setback distance will be considered in Screen 1 as a minimum requirement for all potential sites. During Screen 3 evaluation, the separation distance for each site will be taken into consideration in order to determine the site rankings (i.e., sites with a greater separation distance will rank higher for this indicator than those with smaller separation distances).</p>	<p>County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 - Planning - Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, February 2015</p>
Ms. Leah Emms	Ontario Federation of Agriculture	December 2, 2014	Highway 26	Midhurst	L0L 1X0	feedback form submitted at public session		<p>Concerned only Class 1 & 2 are listed under ag use. Prime ag lands include 1, 2, & 3.</p>	<p>Class 3 Agricultural Land will be included with Class 1 and Class 2 Agricultural Lands as part of the siting criteria. The indicator has been amended to reflect all confirmed Prime Agricultural Areas, which includes Special Crop Areas, and Class 1, 2, and 3 Agricultural Lands, with noted exemptions outlined in Figure 3.</p>	<p>County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 - Planning - Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, February 2015</p>
Mr. Robert Chapman Mr. Ron Varley	Collingwood East Environmental Action Committee	December 3, 2014				feedback form from website, also e-mail sent to S. Mack	e-mail sent December 4, 2014	<p>I would like to thank you for hosting the Public Information Session on Dec.2, 2014 regarding the Organics Processing Facility Project.</p> <p>The session was very informative and it was satisfying to be able to voice community concerns and thoughts regarding this facility at this very early stage of its development process.</p> <p>Our concern was that the old ethanol plant in Collingwood may be considered as a possible site for the processing facility. This would be unacceptable due to proximity to homes at less than 200 metres. The Ministry of Environment's 250 metre minimum setback from sensitive receptor points such as residential dwellings is not sufficient especially in areas such as Simcoe County which are subject to a variety of atmospheric and weather conditions which can affect the dispersal of odours. It is our hope and recommendation that all possible sites for the Organic Processing Facility will have much greater setback requirements.</p>	<p>MOECC minimum setback distance will be considered in Screen 1 as a minimum requirement for all potential sites. During Screen 3 evaluation, the separation distance length for each site will be taken into consideration in order to determine the site rankings (i.e., sites with a longer separation distance will rank higher for this indicator than those with smaller separation distances).</p>	<p>County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 - Planning - Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, February 2015</p>
Mr. Brett Gratrix		December 4, 2014				e-mail to Customer Service	e-mail sent December 19, 2014	<p>This site should be located in existing industrial areas away from pristine rural/natural areas and should fit in with adjacent land use.</p> <p>I would like to see a detailed cost analysis of constructing/operating and maintaining an organics processing facility compared to trucking the waste to another existing facility.</p>	<p>Sites within County Greenlands, the Niagara Escarpment, and Oak Ridges Moraine will be considered during the Screen 1 evaluation, with noted exemptions outlined in Figure 3. Adjacent land use considerations will be evaluated in Screen 2.</p> <p>Both Capital Costs and Operation and Maintenance Costs are criteria under the Economic component and will be applied in the Screen 3 evaluation, which is the comparative evaluation of the short-listed sites.</p>	<p>County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 - Planning - Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, February 2015</p>
Ms. Barbara Hunt Mr. Harry Hunt	Aware Simcoe	December 5, 2014	Mertz Corner Road	Tiny	L0L 2T0	feedback form by mail	letter sent by mail December 12, 2014	<p>There aren't many sites in Simcoe County, that would meet Screen 3 criteria - "Environmental, Social, Cultural, Technical, Economic, Legal" ("Proposed Siting Criteria").</p> <p>Add under Economic: Capital Costs, Legal, Environmental - add compensation to nearby property owners/IMPAC - reduced property values/tax? reduction Legal - zoning/surrounding sites, protection property owners Environment - Terrestrial - eg. Oro Moraine, Oak Ridge Moraine</p> <p>MOE - new COA certificates - ECA - need more info</p> <p>Siting Criteria - Screen 1, 2, 3 - how was the criteria arrived at?</p> <p>Separated cities Barrie/Orrilla - how do cities fit into this plan?</p> <p>Are "Conestoga Association" consultants still involved with OPF, MMF - June 14 workshop</p>	<p>Capital Cost is a criteria under the Economic component and will be considered in the Screen 3 evaluation.</p> <p>Land Use and Zoning are criteria under the Social component and will be considered in the Screen 2 evaluation.</p> <p>The Oak Ridges Moraine will be considered under the Terrestrial criteria and will be considered in the Screen 1 evaluation.</p> <p>The Oro Moraine will be considered with the Land Use/Zoning criteria under the Social component and will be considered in the Screen 2 evaluation.</p>	<p>County of Simcoe Organics Processing Facility Part 1 - Planning - Siting Methodology and Evaluation Criteria</p> <p>Conestoga-Rovers & Associates, February 2015</p>
Mr. Mark Coughlin		December 30, 2014						<p>The technology exists for farmers to Compost green bin waste on farm. This would provide another source of income to our agriculture sector and in addition provide farms with organic matter that may be deficient in land without livestock. Has this or any other private sector solution been explored?</p>	<p>Acknowledged. Consideration of the benefits of end products such as compost or fertilizer will be part of the procurement process for organics processing technology.</p>	-

Name	Affiliation	Date Received	Address			Method	Follow-up	Feedback Received	Interpretation of Feedback and Project Team Response	Report Reference
Ms. Barbara Hunt	Aware Simcoe	Received January 12, 2015	Mertz Corner Road	Tiny	L0L 2T0	feedback form by mail	letter sent by mail January 23, 2015	Was there an open house in South Simcoe? Was the same format used? Questions still not answered. How is pet waste, diapers, dead animals (farm animals, vet, humane society) handled at CCF or MMF? Pathogens; human, animal	2014 open houses were held at the Simcoe County Museum - located centrally within the County. Currently, pet waste and diapers are collected in the garbage stream. Direction on inclusion of this material in the organics program will be determined as the project is developed further. It is noted that modern organics processing technology can manage this material.	-
Ms. Barbara Hunt	Aware Simcoe	Received February 23, 2015	Mertz Corner Road	Tiny	L0L 2T0	feedback form by mail	letter sent by mail March 17, 2015	"How will we site the facilities?" (white board) "prevention of impacts/protection of the existing environment" multi-staged will occur next 9 mos. Dec. 2, 2014 What are those stages Jan - Sept 2015? Additional criteria: Cost??? Why not partner with Brampton \$300M new facility being built presently Siting Considerations OPF & MMF Ec./Social/Cultural/Tech./Legal/Surface Water/Ground Water I don't know where you will find site/meets criteria Thank you, for your info 15.01.23 I'm still concerned with (a) cost \$\$\$ (b) partnership with Brampton (why not) (c) diapers, pet waste, dead animals (d) pharmaceuticals, pathogens	Acknowledged. Under the "Economic" component, capital and operation and maintenance costs will be considered. Also, business case development will occur when additional information on the site and organics processing technology is known.	-
Ms. Sandra French		June 14, 2015				e-mail sent from website	e-mail sent June 17, 2015	Why would the County not include a septage handling facility as part of this organics processing? The individual townships and municipalities within the County do not appear to be able to get their act together, so why not show some real leadership in regards to this problem?	The County is not responsible for water or wastewater. It is noted that inclusion of septage with feedstock for the OPF was, however, considered further in a 2015 study.	Item CCW - 17-095 - Septage and Landfill Leachate Disposal Feasibility Study - Final Report March 14, 2017