Agency Comment and Response Summary
County of Simcoe Official Plan Amendment No. 2 - received between January 3, 2017 and May 15, 2018

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
Agency Comments Addressed by GHD Limited							
2	1	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	In general, the report outlines all applicable site servicing requirements and provides the broad range of site development concepts for initial approval, to set the stage for the eventual detail design of Site Servicing and Grading plans required to secure the Township's Site Plan development approval. The conceptual site plan identifies a 4.5 Ha development site within the centre of an 85 Ha forested area known as the Freele County Forest Tract, with an entrance to be constructed approximately 500 m east of the Gill Road intersection on the north side of Horseshoe Valley Road West, following a portion of the existing multi-use trail.	Details related to site servicing (e.g., electricity, gas, communications, lighting, security), grading, and water management (e.g., surface water, process water, fire protection water, potable water, wastewater) will be determined during the detailed design of the MMF and OPF. These details will be included in the Site Plan application submitted to the Township for approval.	Complete the detailed design for the of MMF, including site servicing and grading plans, and submit the Site Plan application for approval. Complete the detailed design for the OPF and submit an amended Site Plan for approval.
	2	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	The proponent's intent is to initially develop the Material Management Facility (MMF) for consolidation and handling of waste including garbage, recyclables and organics, also known as a Transfer Station. This would include the construction of site access, water, sanitary, stormwater management and utility servicing along with the administration building. A site plan amendment will eventually be required for the future Organic Processing Facility (OPF) to process green bin, yard & leaf waste, etc. within the confines of the same site development.	The MMF will be developed in advance of the OPF, and will include the construction of common elements such as the site access road, scale area, stormwater management facility, water management systems (i.e., fire water, potable water, wastewater), administrative facility, and utilities. The initial design of these components will be undertaken with the design of the MMF in support of the Site Plan Approval and Environmental Compliance Approval. Amendments to the Site Plan and Environmental Compliance Approval will be submitted as required following completion of the detailed design for the OPF.	Complete the detailed design for the of MMF, including site servicing and grading plans, and submit the Site Plan application for approval. Complete the detailed design for the OPF and submit an amended Site Plan for approval.
	3	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Supply of domestic potable water will be provided from a new well to be drilled on site, with realistic demands anticipated to be in the order of up to 10 m^3 per day. Pending detail design of the administration facilities, this may require an underground or above grade water storage facility.	The supply of domestic potable water is proposed to be provided from a new groundwater well installed on-site. The location and supply demands for the groundwater well and any associated storage facility will be determined as part of the detailed design.	Complete the detailed design for the Administrative Facility, including the location, demand, and storage requirements for the supply of potable water.
	4	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Fire protection of the proposed facilities will require on-site water storage amenities to the Building Department and Fire Department's satisfaction. The report suggests a variety of methods for these provisions, however specific servicing details are vague at this stage. We note that materials to be processed on site are considered at a higher risk of combustible energy, and minimum fire protection measures will be established by the Ontario Building Code. This may entail an active (pressurized) sprinkler system, or a passive (cistern) water storage facility. We specifically note the consultant's suggestion to utilize the stormwater management facility for drawing water through a dry hydrant system during fire fighting activities. This may be problematic if the detail design of the facility is unable to demonstrate the reliability of maintaining a constant water level in the wet pond, due to evapo-transpiration and infiltration into underlying sandy soils. A significant level of detail will be required to justify the chosen fire protection facility design.	For the proposed facility, the materials being processed are generally considered to be "higher risk" due to the potential 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 Facility Characteristics Report 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. Additional details have been provided in the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. 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.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF and OPF, including the fire protection system.
	5	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Details of the proposed potable water storage facility and domestic wastewater disposal systems have not been provided and are anticipated to be described in sufficient detail on the site servicing design drawings. We look forward to the submission of these details.	Details of the proposed domestic potable water supply and wastewater disposal systems will be developed as part of the detailed design in support of the Site Plan Approval and Environmental Compliance Approval.	Complete the detailed design for the Administrative Facility, including the potable water and wastewater systems.
	6	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Details of the proposed method of disposal of process wastewater from the site must be clearly detailed. The consultant suggests this aspect would be determined as part of the chosen processing technology, in order to determine the most suitable provisions for managing this waste by-product. A significant level of detail is required to evaluate the proposed management and disposal methods, as the preferred processing technology is selected by the owner.	Details of the proposed process wastewater disposal system will be developed as part of the detailed design for the OPF, and will depend on the selected technology.	Complete the detailed design of the OPF, including the management of process wastewater.
	7	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	This report generally outlines the intended stormwater management aspects of proposed surface water Quantity controls, Quality controls, Low Impact Development features (LID), Sediment & Erosion control measures. Given the available land mass and native infiltrative soils, we anticipate that the consultant will be able to successfully design suitable stormwater management and low impact techniques for this site, promoting infiltration and reducing or eliminating peak discharge flows. We look forward to the submission of a detailed Stormwater Management Report and detail drawings for review and comment. We note the consultant's suggestion to possibly utilize the surface water captured in the stormwater management facility for use as supplemental process water in the plant operation. A significant level of detail will be required from the consultant to verify if this approach would even be feasible, in light of the stormwater management objectives and fire protection schemes noted above.	Details of the proposed stormwater management system, including quality and quantity controls, low impact development features, and sediment & erosion control measures will be developed as part of the detailed design for the MMF in support of the Site Plan Approval and Environmental Compliance Approval. This will also include consideration for using this water to support the proposed fire protection systems. Further consideration will be given to using this water to supplement process water requirements during the development of the detailed design for the OPF. Amendments to the Site Plan and Environmental Compliance Approval will be submitted as required following completion of the detailed design for the OPF.	Complete the detailed design for the of MMF, including the stormwater management system. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including potential modifications to the stormwater management system to allow for the use of water for processing operations.
	8	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Section 5.7 - Operations & Maintenance; describes that the stormwater management facility would not incorporate a sediment forebay. This is contradictory to the proposed treatment train approach noted in Section 5 of this report and should be clarified.	The proposed stormwater management facility will incorporate a sediment forebay. The text in Section 5.7 of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report has been updated to reflect this. The Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority is an agreement with the proposed approach to stormwater management. Further details of the stormwater management system for the ERRC will be determined during the detailed design for the MMF and OPF.	Complete the detailed design for the of MMF, including the stormwater management system. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including potential modifications to the stormwater management system.
	9	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Section 6 - Noise; identifies the need for a comprehensive Noise Assessment to be undertaken once the owner has selected the desired processing technology and a detail design has been advanced. It is noted that the primary noise contributor is anticipated to be inbound and outbound traffic. Further site servicing details will be required in order to advance the required Noise Assessment.	A comprehensive Noise Assessment will be undertaken following the completion of the detailed design for the MMF and the identification of all potential noise sources. A subsequent Noise Assessment will also need to be carried out following the completion of the detailed design for the OPF. Notwithstanding this, it is expected that the results of the assessment will not differ significantly from the current Noise Assessment since the primary noise contributor is still anticipated to be the inbound and outbound vehicle traffic.	Complete the detailed design for the of MMF, including a Noise Assessment. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including an updated Noise Assessment.
	10	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Section 7 - Odour; identifies the need for an Odour and Air Emissions Assessment to be undertaken once the owner has selected the desired processing technology and a detail design has been advanced. It is noted that the primary odour contributor is anticipated to be from receiving, handling and processing of organic materials. Further site servicing details will be required in order to advance the required Odour and Air Emissions impact assessment.	In consultation with the MOECC, a preliminary Air Quality Impact Assessment Report has been completed for the ERRC and included as part of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. A comprehensive Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be undertaken following the completion of the detailed design for the MMF and the identification of all potential odour sources. Since the primary odour contributor is anticipated to be from the receiving, handling, and processing of organic materials, a subsequent Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be carried out following the selection of the organics technology and the completion of the detailed design for the OPF.	Complete the detailed design for the of MMF, including an Odour and Air Emissions Assessment. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including an updated Odour and Air Emissions Assessment.
10	11	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Stormwater Management - The "Facility Characteristics Report" prepared by GHD (dated November 2016) notes that the proposed impervious surfaces within the ERRC footprint will produce peak runoff volumes higher than those produced before the pre-development conditions. The proposed stormwater management facility will mitigate the increase of surface runoff from the impervious areas, manage peak flow and maintain existing water quality and quantity conditions. MOECC staff are satisfied with the proposed stormwater management strategy provided the County identifies a commitment to achieving enhanced level of quality of treatment for the site. An Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) is needed for stormwater works for the proposed project. MOECC staff advise that site specific water controls be proposed at detailed design and ECA application stage to demonstrate the discharge water from the site will not degrade downstream creek health. MOECC approval of the ECA will need to be in place prior to construction of any components of the stormwater management facility.	Site specific water controls will be determined during the detailed design and will demonstrate that water discharged from the Site will not degrade downstream creek health. Construction of any components of the stormwater management facility will not be undertaken prior to MOECC approval of the ECA being in place.	Complete the detailed design for the of MMF, including the stormwater management system, and submit an ECA to the MOECC for approval. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including potential modifications to the stormwater management system, and submit an amended ECA to the MOECC for approval.
	12	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Policy 1.2.6.1 of the PPS directs planning authorities to ensure land use compatibility issues and impacts between major facilities, such as waste management systems, and sensitive land uses be avoided and mitigated to the fullest extent possible. MOECC staff recommend a separation between sensitive incompatible land uses as a preventative means of achieving environmental objectives. Areas of influence around certain facilities or land uses, where exposure to residents and other sensitive uses may be harmful, should be minimized. Necessary environmental control measures, such as buffers between emissions sources and residential or sensitive land uses, should be applied in addition to practical emission controls.	Maximizing the separation distances between the facility and sensitive receptors and incompatible land uses was considered during the siting of the overall Site as well as when determining the location of the ERRC footprint. Supplementary environmental controls, if required, will be identified during the detailed design of the facility.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including buffer distances from potential emission sources and controls. Complete the detailed design for the of OPF, including buffer distances from potential emission sources and controls

Agency Comment and Response Summary
County of Simcoe Official Plan Amendment No. 2 - received between January 3, 2017 and May 15, 2018

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
10	13	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	In order to determine if a proposed undertaking will have a negative impact on air quality, an air quality impact assessment is typically conducted.' This assessment would determine if an undertaking will meet 0. Reg. 419/05 standards including 10-minute odour standards and odour mitigation measures to minimize off-site impacts. Based on Section 7 of the "Facility Characteristics Report" prepared by GHD (dated November 2016), it appears the report only reviewed general odour impacts and did not in fact assess individual contaminants (such as total reduced sulphur compounds) and how these will comply with 0. Reg. 419/05 standards. Further, the Facility Characteristics Report stated that the proposed ERRC facility will meet the MOECC's screening level of 1 odour unit at the sensitive receptors. However, without supporting documentation, such as AERMOD modelling input and output files, MOECC staff are cannot confirm if the conclusion is valid. MOECC staff recommend the air quality impact assessment be updated to assess all contaminants prior to the ECA stage so that the public, particularly any concerned residents are aware of the impacts. Appendix 'A' outlines MOECC's technical comments and concerns that should be addressed in the air quality impact assessment report.	In consultation with the MOECC, a preliminary Air Quality Impact Assessment Report has been completed for the ERRC and included as part of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. Electronic modelling files were provided to MOECC. A comprehensive Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be undertaken following the completion of the detailed design for the MMF and the identification of all potential odour sources. Since the primary odour contributor is anticipated to be from the receiving, handling, and processing of organic materials, a subsequent Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be carried out following the selection of the organics technology and the completion of the detailed design for the OPF. An assessment of applicable compounds of concern, including those with limiting effects other than odour, will be prepared as part of a future ECA application for the facility.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including an Odour and Air Emissions Assessment. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including an updated Odour and Air Emissions Assessment.
	14	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	The odour impact assessment should stipulate which meteorological data set was used for the- analysis. A 5-year meteorological data set is recommended and should be representative of the site, which needs to be clarified in the report. Please note that the odour frequency assessment at the sensitive receptors should have used site specific meteorological data, which includes local and land use characteristics. This is not discussed in the odour assessment. The site specific meteorological data should have been reviewed and approved by the MOECC's Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Branch (EMRB).	In consultation with the MOECC, a preliminary Air Quality Impact Assessment Report using site-specific meteorological data has been completed for the ERRC and included as part of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. A comprehensive Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be undertaken following the completion of the detailed design for the MMF and the identification of all potential odour sources. Since the primary odour contributor is anticipated to be from the receiving, handling, and processing of organic materials, a subsequent Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be carried out following the selection of the organics technology and the completion of the detailed design for the OPF. An odour assessment using site-specific meteorological data in accordance with s. 13(1) of O. Reg. 419/05 will be prepared as part of a future ECA application for the facility.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including an Odour and Air Emissions Assessment. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including an updated Odour and Air Emissions Assessment.
	15	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	The basis of the odour estimates and supplier's supporting documentation was not included in the odour assessment. Therefore, MOECC cannot comments on the quality of emission data used in the model assessment.	In consultation with the MOECC, a preliminary Air Quality Impact Assessment Report, including additional information for the emission rates, has been completed for the ERRC and included as part of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. A comprehensive Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be undertaken following the completion of the detailed design for the MMF and the identification of all potential odour sources. Since the primary odour contributor is anticipated to be from the receiving, handling, and processing of organic materials, a subsequent Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be carried out following the selection of the organics technology and the completion of the detailed design for the OPF. Odour emissions were estimated based on similar facilities with similar technology in Ontario. Once a technology is selected and the detailed design is available, supporting information for odour estimates will be included in a future Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling (ESDM) Report.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including an ESDM report. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including an updated ESDM report.
	16	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	The odour assessment did not discuss which sensitive receptors were assessed. There is a building which is situated approximately 500 meters south east of the proposed facility that does not appear to have been included in the odour assessment.	In consultation with the MOECC, a preliminary Air Quality Impact Assessment Report has been completed for the ERRC and included as part of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. A comprehensive Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be undertaken following the completion of the detailed design for the MMF and the identification of all potential odour sources. Since the primary odour contributor is anticipated to be from the receiving, handling, and processing of organic materials, a subsequent Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be carried out following the selection of the organics technology and the completion of the detailed design for the OPF. A full grid model was run as part of each modelling scenario. Based on this full grid, the most-impacted sensitive receptors were assessed in subsequent analysis. The most-impacted sensitive receptors were considered in the odour assessment. The modelling results presented in the report reflect worst-case sensitive receptor impacts.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including an ESDM report. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including an updated ESDM report.
	17	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	The odour assessment does not discuss background odour sources in the area. The additional odours from the proposed facility may potentially result in higher odour impacts at the nearest sensitive receptors when considering background.	In consultation with the MOECC, a preliminary Air Quality Impact Assessment Report has been completed for the ERRC and included as part of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. A comprehensive Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be undertaken following the completion of the detailed design for the MMF and the identification of all potential odour sources. Since the primary odour contributor is anticipated to be from the receiving, handling, and processing of organic materials, a subsequent Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be carried out following the selection of the organics technology and the completion of the detailed design for the OPF. The site has no industrial operations within one kilometer, with agricultural land to the west and forested areas to the east. It should be noted that agricultural operations, which can have odour far higher than 1 OU, may be exempted from odour-based standards. The perceived odour threshold of a mixture of two compounds may, in theory, be as strong as the sum of the two compounds, may be more intense, or may be less intense. Typically, the perceived odour level is not directly correlated to the concentration of individual odorous compounds. Odour is generally accepted to be a logarithmic function of the concentration of the chemical species. Since the modelled ground level odour concentration at the sensitive receptors will be less than 1 OU (99.5% of the time), any significant background odour concentration would likely be the dominant perceived odour. Therefore, background odour concentrations were not taken into account in the preliminary odour impact assessment An odour assessment using site-specific meteorological data in accordance with s. 13(1) of O. Reg. 419/05 will be prepared as part of a future ECA application for the facility.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including an ESDM report. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including an updated ESDM report.
10	18	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	Total reduced sulphur compounds (H2S, etc.) and ammonia are contaminants of concern from organics processing operations (anaerobic digestion) which should have been addressed in this project. MOECC typically recommends doing this assessment prior to the ECA stage to ensure the contaminants released meet 0. Reg. 419/05 standards.	In consultation with the MOECC, a preliminary Air Quality Impact Assessment Report has been completed for the ERRC and included as part of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. A comprehensive Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be undertaken following the completion of the detailed design for the MMF and the identification of all potential odour sources. Since the primary odour contributor is anticipated to be from the receiving, handling, and processing of organic materials, a subsequent Odour and Air Emissions Assessment will be carried out following the selection of the organics technology and the completion of the detailed design for the OPF. An assessment of applicable compounds of concern, including those with limiting effects other than odour, will be prepared as part of a future ECA application for the facility. The facility will be designed to ensure that TRS and ammonia concentrations meet both health and odour limits.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including an ESDM report. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including an updated ESDM report.

Agency Comment and Response Summary
County of Simcoe Official Plan Amendment No. 2 - received between January 3, 2017 and May 15, 2018

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
10	19	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	A minor typo was noted in Section 7.3 of the Facility Characteristics Report which should be corrected. The reports notes that a series of models were performed to determine the odour compliance as per the April 2008 technical bulletin. This would be corrected that a series of modelling scenarios and not models were performed.	Section 7.3 of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report has been updated to reflect that a series of modelling scenarios were performed.	No further action required.
2	20	Terraprobe Inc. (Ainley Group)	January 24, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	In general the Hydrogeological Assessment conducted by GHD has used generally accepted professional practices during their assessment, review and interpretation of the hydrogeological conditions at the site.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	21	Terraprobe Inc. (Ainley Group)	January 24, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	Terraprobe agrees with the GHD conclusion that a PTTW or an EASR posting from the MOECC will not be required for water takings relating to construction activities at the site.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	22	Terraprobe Inc. (Ainley Group)	January 24, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment Facility Characteristics Report	Terraprobe agrees with the GHD conclusion that the deep water table and sandy soils have the potential to facilitate the infiltration of all collected storm water post development. Implementation of infiltration measures for the post development condition will be required.	Details of the proposed stormwater management system, including potential infiltration measures will be developed as part of the detailed design for the MMF in support of the Site Plan Approval and Environmental Compliance Approval. This will also include consideration for using stormwater to support the proposed fire protection systems. Further consideration will be given to using this water to supplement process water requirements during the development of the detailed design for the OPF. Amendments to the Site Plan and Environmental Compliance Approval will be submitted as required following completion of the detailed design for the OPF.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including the stormwater management system. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including potential modifications to the stormwater management system to allow for the use of water for processing operations or fire protection.
	23	Terraprobe Inc. (Ainley Group)	January 24, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment Facility Characteristics Report	The water demand of ERRC facility, and therefore the water taking of the proposed supply well, should be further evaluated to demine an estimated daily flow volume. If the water requirement does exceed 50,000 L/day, then a Category 3 PTTW for long term water takings will be required for the facility.	Details of the required water demand of the ERRC will be developed as part of the detailed design for the MMF and the OPF in support of the Site Plan Approval and Environmental Compliance Approval. If it is determined that more than 50,000 litres of water will be required per day, then a Permit to Take Water (PTTW) application will be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.	Complete the detailed design for the Administrative Facility, MMF, and OPF, including the potable water requirements. Apply for a PTTW if required.
	24	Terraprobe Inc. (Ainley Group)	January 24, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	Seasonal groundwater level monitoring has not been undertaken to confirm the seasonal ground water levels and flow direction. If the new ground water levels and flow direction are substantially different then what has been found to date (i.e. the water table is much shallower then has been observed to date), the conclusions and recommendations of the report may have to be revaluated. GHD has indicated that this will be undertaken, but was not included as part of the report reviewed.	Additional groundwater level monitoring was undertaken in 2017 to confirm the seasonal groundwater levels and flow direction. The Amended Hydrogeological Assessment Report has been revised to reflect the additional monitoring. Groundwater monitoring is currently being carried out at the Site, and will continue on a quarterly basis until the Site is developed. Formal groundwater and surface water monitoring programs will be developed in consultation with the MOECC and will form part of the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for the ERRC.	Continue quarterly groundwater monitoring at the Site. Develop groundwater and surface water monitoring programs as part of the ECA.
	25	Terraprobe Inc. (Ainley Group)	January 24, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment Facility Characteristics Report	The unevaluated wetland near the northeast portion of the Site will constrain storm water management options in that vicinity. Additional evaluation of the wetland area should be undertaken to ensure that drainage patterns are maintained to provide similar hydrologic contributions to this feature.	Monitoring undertaken from August 2016 to November 2017 included the collection of groundwater levels from mini-piezometers installed in the wetland area. The groundwater level monitoring for the mini-piezometers is summarized in the Updated Hydrogeological Assessment Report. Groundwater monitoring is currently being carried out at the Site, and will continue on a quarterly basis until the Site is developed. Formal groundwater and surface water monitoring programs will be developed in consultation with the MOECC and will form part of the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for the ERRC. The wetland provides recharge to the deeper underlying sand aquifer during the spring freshet, based on the observed mini-piezometer and surface water levels within the wetland area. Additional evaluation of the wetland will be undertaken during the development of the stormwater management system design to ensure that drainage patterns are maintained to provide similar hydrologic contributions to this feature.	Continue quarterly groundwater monitoring at the Site. Develop groundwater and surface water monitoring programs as part of the ECA. Consider potential impacts to hydrologic contributions to the wetland feature during development of the detailed design for the stormwater management system.
9	26	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	The site is located within a significant groundwater recharge area. Please include this classification within the report. Further advise on how the proposed development may impact groundwater quality and the associated risk management measures required to manage and/or prevent potential groundwater contamination from the ERRC.	The classification of the Site as a low to medium vulnerability significant groundwater recharge area (SGRA) will be added to the Hydrogeological Assessment Report. The MOECC has indicated that they are satisfied that the activities associated with the proposed land use are not subject to threat policies in the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan. In addition, the County met with the Risk Management Official for the City of Barrie who confirmed that the proposed ERRC adequately addressed Source Protection. The risk management measures required to manage and/or prevent potential groundwater contamination from the ERRC will be developed as part of the detailed design for the MMF in support of the Site Plan Approval and ECA.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including risk management measures for the protection of groundwater. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including risk management measures for the protection of groundwater.
	27	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	The report indicates in Section 4.4 that chromium and lead were present in the water sample from monitoring well MW2-16. Please advise on the source of chromium and lead.	The concentration of chromium and lead from Monitoring Well MW-16 are only slightly above the ODWS maximum acceptable concentration and the sample collected was slightly turbid. Based on a confirmatory sample taken at Monitoring Well MW-16 on June 9, 2017, the chromium (total) concentration was not detected above the reportable detection limit of 0.005 mg/L, and the lead (total) concentration was not detected above the reportable detection limit of 0.0005 mg/L. The sample had a total suspended solid (TSS) concentration of 170 mg/L indicating a relatively low amount of sediment was contained in the sample. Based on the results, the elevated concentrations of chromium and lead obtained from the sample collected on August 22, 2016 are considered to be anomalous, due to sediment contained within the sample.	No further action required.
	28	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	Although outside of the scope of the report, nitrate loading calculations will be required for the septic system(s) to service the site. This comment can be addressed to the satisfaction of the appropriate approval authority at the site plan stage of the planning process.	GHD confirms that the nitrate loading calculations are outside the scope of the current study, but will be completed as part of the detailed design and site servicing. The nitrate loading will be addressed to the satisfaction of the appropriate approval authority at the site plan stage of the planning process.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including the wastewater system, and submit the Site Plan application for approval. Complete the detailed design for the OPF and submit an amended Site Plan for approval.
	29	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	Ongoing groundwater level monitoring is strongly encouraged to capture high water table elevations. Upon receipt of data, confirm the sites flow direction as being in a westerly direction. This comment can be addressed at the site plan stage of the planning process.	Additional groundwater level monitoring was undertaken in 2017 to confirm the seasonal groundwater levels and flow direction. The Amended Hydrogeological Assessment Report has been revised to reflect the additional monitoring. Groundwater monitoring is currently being carried out at the Site, and will continue on a quarterly basis until the Site is developed. Formal groundwater and surface water monitoring programs will be developed in consultation with the MOECC and will form part of the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for the ERRC.	Continue quarterly groundwater monitoring at the Site. Develop groundwater and surface water monitoring programs as part of the ECA.

Agency Comment and Response Summary
County of Simcoe Official Plan Amendment No. 2 - received between January 3, 2017 and May 15, 2018

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
10	30	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	Source Protection Plan - MOECC staff are satisfied that the activities associated with the proposed land use are not subject to threat policies in the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan. In addition, it appears that the amendment to permit the ERRC is consistent with the adopted Simcoe County OPA No. 1 - Source Protection Conformity. Surface Water/Groundwater Protection - MOECC staff are satisfied that neither wetland nor downstream surface water tributaries will be impaired, provided that erosion and sediment control measures identified in the mitigation plan are implemented during the construction stage and for long-term site management. The "Hydrological Assessment" prepared by GHD (dated November 2016) notes that construction activities will be limited to slab on grade construction with trenching for utilities installation. Considering the depth of the water table and the length of the utilities trenches, a registration via the Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) for construction dewatering or Permit to Take Water (PTTW) may be required.	The depths of the building slabs and utility trenches relative to the water table, as well as the potential need for registration via the Environmental Activity and Sector Registry (EASR) for construction dewatering or Permit to Take Water (PTTW), will be determined during the detailed design.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including the potential need for registration via the EASR or a PTTW application. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including updates to the EASR or PTTW.
2	31	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	We note that a portion of the site is regulated under the Conservation Authorities Act, however the proposed site location is not anticipated to impact the regulated lands. Given the forest coverage area, the characteristics of the site also comply with the County's Official Plan - Greenlands definition. The EIS suggests that the proposed development clearing of approximately 4.5 Ha equates to less than 1 % of the total contiguous woodland area and would therefore have a negligible impact on the overall County Greenlands area. However, the Planning Justification Report recommends an area equivalent to the area being cleared for this site development to be planted elsewhere as replacement, in order to maintain the net quantity of woodlands throughout the County forests (County OP - Resource Conservation). This is somewhat contradictory and the applicant's intent should be clarified by the owner.	Impacts of vegetation removal will be mitigated through afforestation at a 2:1 ratio within the County that will increase available contiguous woodland vegetation by a minimum of 11 ha. Afforestation sites will be chosen as close as possible to the Study Area (within 5 km) and in a location that serves to enhance or increase the available interior forest habitat within the Copeland Forest by infilling existing gaps in the forest unit. One element of this may include the restoration and afforestation of the existing Study Area access road/parking area off of Horseshoe Valley Road West. Afforestation measures will be detailed in a Compensation Planting Plan (CPP) developed in consultation with the NVCA and other stakeholders (e.g., Township, County Forestry Department). The CPP will identify planting details including location(s), species, stock size, and spacing. The CPP will be developed prior to site development, with compensation plantings initiated in advance of tree removal. The CPP will ultimately be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan for the ERRC.	Develop a Compensation Planting Plan as part of the detailed design for the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings prior to tree removal.
	32	Ainley Group	January 24, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	The EIS identifies initial perimeter works and tree clearing timing restrictions to limit impacts to breeding birds, terrestrial fauna, etc. Further timing and restriction details in the form of an Environmental Management plan should be provided at the detail site servicing stage.	The removal of any vegetation required for the development of the ERRC will take place in the fall (September – December) to avoid the breeding bird timing window, the bat maternity roost timeframe, and limit disturbance to terrestrial fauna. Vegetation removal will not occur between April 1 to September 1. The Compensation Planting Plan (CPP), Wildlife Management Plan (WMP), and mitigation and monitoring programs will incorporate this timing restriction, and will include alternate protection and mitigation measures should the clearing works not be conducted in the recommended fall season. Ecologists, arborists, and the County forester will be involved in the development and implementation of these plans to provide wholesome mitigation of the potential impacts to habitats and wildlife in the vicinity. Impacts of vegetation removal will be mitigated through afforestation at a 2:1 ratio within the County that will increase available contiguous woodland vegetation by a minimum of 11 ha. Afforestation sites will be chosen as close as possible to the Study Area (within 5 km) and in a location that serves to enhance or increase the available interior forest habitat within the Copeland Forest by infilling existing gaps in the forest unit. One element of this may include the restoration and afforestation of the existing Study Area access road/parking area off of Horseshoe Valley Road West. Afforestation measures will be detailed in a Compensation Planting Plan (CPP) developed in consultation with the NVCA and other stakeholders (e.g., Township, County Forestry Department). The CPP will identify planting details including location(s), species, stock size, and spacing. The CPP will be developed prior to site development, with compensation plantings initiated in advance of tree removal. The CPP and WMP will ultimately be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan for the ERRC.	Develop a Compensation Planting Plan and Wildlife Management Plan as part of the detailed design for the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings and wildlife protection measures prior to tree removal.
9	33	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	The submission has successfully demonstrated that the proposed development is outside any area of natural hazards (flooding and erosion) and there are no hazardous soils that would impact the development.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	34	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	The stormwater management proposal is to use a treatment train approach to provide water quality and water quantity control for all stormwater prior to discharging onto Horseshoe Valley Road. This approach is reasonable for this site.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	35	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Section 2.2.3 - SWMM2-1 also supports thicket swamp inclusions. Ground cover notes should include sensitive fern, marsh fern, dwarf raspberry, wetland sedges. Ground cover indicated in report is more typical of ground cover in adjacent (non-wetland) fresh-moist white pine hardwood mixed forest (FOMM9-2). Please add this information to the report.	The ground cover notes have been updated in the Amended Scoped EIS to include sensitive fern, marsh fern, dwarf raspberry and wetland sedges. It has also been noted that SWMM2-1 community supports thicket swamp inclusions.	No further action required.
	36	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	NVCA staff concurs with Section 2.2.4 and 2.2.5 of the EIS. Wetlands mapping undertaken by GHD is accurate and the unevaluated MNRF wetland just west of the property is not wetland but in fact a dry-fresh sugar maple forest. It is also agreed that the previously mapped drainage feature is not present in the field as noted in the EIS (Section 4.3).	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	37	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Section 2.2.6.1 of the EIS notes timing of Amphibian breeding surveys, however further details on species activity (including call code as per Marsh Monitoring Protocol) by station and by survey date should be provided.	Amphibian breeding survey detail including species per station, species per survey and calling code for each species has been updated in the Amphibian Survey Results table (Table 2.4). The additional information requested has also been detailed within the Amphibian Survey section (2.2.6.1) of the Amended Scoped EIS.	No further action required.
	38	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Section 2.2.6.2 of the EIS regarding breeding bird surveys should include further details on species activity by station.	An additional table (Table 2.5) has been created for inclusion in the Amended Scoped EIS to detail species detected at each bird survey station. Further detail on woodland area-sensitive species has also been included in the additional table and within the text of the Amended Scoped EIS (Section 4.5.2).	No further action required.
	39	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Section 2.2.6.3 of the EIS should include observance of spotted salamander egg masses in the SWCM2-1 vernal pools on May 31, 2016. Large numbers of dead/dying tadpoles (species unknown) observed in the MASM1-2/SWCM2-1 wetland in the northeast corner of the property on July 4, 2016. Additionally, please note the drought conditions in spring/summer 2016.	The additional observance of spotted salamander egg masses have been added to the Wildlife and Habitat Feature figure (Figure 5). The spotted salamander egg masses, tadpoles and drought conditions of 2016 have been noted within the Wildlife Habitat Features (Section 2.2.6.3) section of the Amended Scoped EIS.	No further action required.
	40	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Vegetation community inventory is incomplete and additional sedges and other wetland flora identified during site visits should be included.	The vegetation inventory (Appendix B) has been updated to include the additional species noted by NVCA. Two additional field visits were completed in 2017 to provide a more complete vegetation inventory within the proposed facility footprint and wetland areas within the Study Area. The results of the additional field visits are included in an updated vegetation inventory and documented within the text of the Amended Scoped EIS.	No further action required.
	41	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Potential habitat for Hine's Emerald Dragon Fly has been appropriately shown to not be present on the property. Confirmation of Ministry of Natural Resource and Forestry (MNRF) review of bat survey protocols and proposed mitigation should be provided for bat Species at Risk considerations.	GHD consulted with MNRF on the bat survey protocols. As per MNRF recommendations, a systematic snag survey and acoustic survey was completed in 2017 to further characterize any potential bat habitat. The results of the additional surveys are detailed in Section 2.2.7 and Appendix D of the Amended Scoped EIS.	No further action required.
	42	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Vegetation species of interest also identified ox eye sunflower and running strawberry bush noted as being regionally rare in the area. Mitigation should be considered for these two species should they be potentially impacted by proposed site development. Mapping showing the location(s) of these two species should be provided.	Regionally rare species were further delineated during 2017 field activities and results are documented in section 2.2.7 and Figure 5. Section 5.2.2. 'Mitigation' has been updated to identify that regionally rare species will be transplanted. A species-appropriate transplantation plan will be developed as part of the Compensation Planting Plan.	Develop a species-appropriate transplantation plan as part of the Compensation Planting Plan during the detailed design of the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings prior to tree removal.

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
9	43	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Section 4.1 of the EIS should include a note that the forests (and contiguous areas) on the property meet the size criterion for "woodlots" as outlined under Section 16.2.1.4.2 in the Township of Springwater Official Plan. In addition, identified wetlands are considered Category 1 Lands as per Section 16.2.1.4.1 of the Springwater Official Plan and should be noted as such within the EIS report.	Section 4.1 of the Amended Scoped EIS has been updated to clearly identify woodlots and Category 1 Lands.	No further action required.
	44	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Section 4.5 of the EIS regarding significant wildlife habitat should include an assessment of potential Amphibian Breeding Habitat (Woodland) as per MNRF Significant Wildlife Habitat Criteria Schedules for Ecoregion 6E. As per comments on Section 2.2.6.1, insufficient documentation is provided in the report to determine either the presence or absence of this significant wildlife habitat component on the property.	Upon review of the detailed amphibian surveys and MNRF Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) Criteria Schedules for Ecoregion 6E, the Amended Scoped EIS identifies that amphibian SWH is present on the property.	No further action required.
	45	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Additional justification is required for statement in the EIS that much of the property should not be considered as area-sensitive breeding bird habitat on the basis that it is not comprised of "large, natural blocks of mature woodland". While the property is a managed plantation, natural regeneration has occurred in many of the stands (through management) as indicated by non-plantation Ecological Land Classification (ELC) coding. Based on NVCA staff observations, a number of area-sensitive bird species are present in the forest which attests to the presence of forest interior conditions conducive to a significant wildlife habitat function. This potential function should be re-evaluated based on the appropriate ELC communities present on the property.	The evaluation of Area-Sensitive Breeding Bird Habitat (ASBBH) has been revisited specifically addressing SWH function. GHD found that although natural blocks of mature woodland within the Study Area are limited to the northeast and southeast corners, the presence of area-sensitive birds across the Study Area warrants consideration of the Study Area as candidate SWH function for Woodland ASBBH. Table 2.5 has been prepared to reflect point count results and likelihood of breeding (possible, probable or confirmed). While the results of the 2016 breeding bird surveys (2 surveys completed within the breeding bird season) do not strictly satisfy defining criteria for SWH of ASBBH, it is prudent to assume that the Study Area provides SWH function for ASBBH based on the abundance of area-sensitive birds observed within the Study Area. The Amended Scoped EIS has been updated to reflect this.	No further action required.
	46	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Rationale should be provided in the EIS in support of the proposed facility footprint, clarifying why it is proposed for the current location instead of in a potentially less sensitive natural heritage areas (i.e. forest edge/near road).	Rationale for the siting of the proposed ERRC footprint is provided in Section 3.4 of the Facility Characteristics Report. The siting considered multiple factors, such as wetlands, previously disturbed areas of the Site (i.e., access road, trails), archaeologically significant areas, sensitive receptors, separation distances, and topography. The footprint location identified provided the best balance of all factors considered.	No further action required.
	47	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	The existing Ontario Federation of Snowmobile Clubs (OFSC) Trail is proposed to be relocated. Identification of new trail locations should be proposed and consideration given to avoiding any impacts to the natural features identified in the EIS.	The Amended Scoped EIS identifies sensitive natural heritage features that should be avoided for trail relocation (e.g., hemlock forest stand, wetlands) in Section 5.2.2. The County considered this information when consulting with the OFSC regarding the relocation of the trail.	No further action required.
	48	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	NVCA staff agrees with the report's findings outlined in Section 5.2 that the proposed facility/primary access route is sufficiently removed from the wetlands to protect their functions (including upland dispersal of amphibians) Details of proposed mitigation along the emergency access route (i.e. crossing tunnels/culverts, drift fences), should be considered at the site plan stage of the process.	The details of the mitigation along the emergency access route will be considered as part of the detailed design stage.	Complete the detailed design for the of MMF and OPF, including potential mitigation measures along emergency access route.
	49	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Afforestation/offsetting is recommended to offset the 4.5 Ha loss of forest cover associated with the proposed facility footprint. NVCA staff recommends that the proposed afforestation/offsetting be undertaken in a location that will contribute to forest interior function as well as forest cover to offset the loss of forest interior habitat on this property. Typically, offsetting is undertaken on a 2 to 1 basis, which represents 9 Ha of reforestation for this project.	Impacts of vegetation removal will be mitigated through afforestation at a 2:1 ratio within the County that will increase available contiguous woodland vegetation by a minimum of 11 ha. Afforestation sites will be chosen as close as possible to the Study Area (within 5 km) and in a location that serves to enhance or increase the available interior forest habitat within the Copeland Forest by infilling existing gaps in the forest unit. One element of this may include the restoration and afforestation of the existing Study Area access road/parking area off of Horseshoe Valley Road West. Afforestation measures will be detailed in a Compensation Planting Plan (CPP) developed in consultation with the NVCA and other stakeholders (e.g., Township, County Forestry Department). The CPP will identify planting details including location(s), species, stock size, and spacing. The CPP will be developed prior to site development, with compensation plantings initiated in advance of tree removal. The CPP will ultimately be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan for the ERRC.	Develop a Compensation Planting Plan as part of the detailed design for the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings prior to tree removal.
	50	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Further afforestation should be considered to offset the loss of forest cover associated with the proposed expansion of the primary access route and emergency access road. Afforestation of the historical and now abandoned portion of the primary access route may partially offset this loss of forest; however additional afforestation should be included to offset the net loss of forest to roadworks.	Impacts of vegetation removal will be mitigated through afforestation at a 2:1 ratio within the County that will increase available contiguous woodland vegetation by a minimum of 11 ha. Afforestation sites will be chosen as close as possible to the Study Area (within 5 km) and in a location that serves to enhance or increase the available interior forest habitat within the Copeland Forest by infilling existing gaps in the forest unit. One element of this may include the restoration and afforestation of the existing Study Area access road/parking area off of Horseshoe Valley Road West. Afforestation measures will be detailed in a Compensation Planting Plan (CPP) developed in consultation with the NVCA and other stakeholders (e.g., Township, County Forestry Department). The CPP will identify planting details including location(s), species, stock size, and spacing. The CPP will be developed prior to site development, with compensation plantings initiated in advance of tree removal. The CPP will ultimately be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan for the ERRC.	Develop a Compensation Planting Plan as part of the detailed design for the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings prior to tree removal.
	51	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	NVCA staff agrees that the planned continued management of the plantation areas on the remainder of the property toward mature native forest form will also serve as a portion of mitigation.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	52	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Further mitigation techniques will need to be detailed at the site plan stage of the planning process and should include directional lighting to minimize intrusion into natural areas or fencing of the ERRC footprint to minimize inadvertent encroachment into natural areas.	Further mitigation measures surrounding lighting and fencing will be considered at the detailed design stage.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF, including details of lighting and fencing. Complete the detailed design for the OPF, including updated lighting requirements.
	53	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	March 2, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	A salvage and transplant plan should be generated for regionally rare species that may be impacted by the facility footprint and access routes.	Section 5.2.2. 'Mitigation' has been updated to identify that regionally rare species will be transplanted. A species-appropriate transplantation plan will be developed as part of the Compensation Planting Plan.	Develop a species-appropriate transplantation plan as part of the Compensation Planting Plan during the detailed design of the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings prior to tree removal.
10	54	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	MNRF staff request clarification with respect to the surveys conducted in support of the conclusions made in the Scoped EIS. Additional surveys and/or mitigation may be required (as outlined in the technical comments in Appendix 'A') to ensure the Scoped EIS demonstrates that there will be no negative impacts from the proposed development on the natural features or their ecological functions with respect to significant wildlife habitat in a manner consistent with the PPS.	Further clarification with respect to the surveys conducted in support of the conclusions made in the Amended Scoped EIS is provided below in the responses to Comments 57 - 61.	No further action required.
	55	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	The 'Planning Justification Report' prepared by GHD (dated November 2016) states that targeted surveys for Species at Risk were carried out. Although the Scoped EIS noted incidental sightings of two bats within the study area on two separate visits, MNRF is concerned that the Scoped EIS does not identify the survey protocol that was used to identify potential roost habitat for endangered bats within the study area. This information is required in order to support the proposed mitigation measures for endangered bats. Please see Appendix 'A' for technical comments.	GHD consulted with MNRF on the bat survey protocols. As per MNRF recommendations, a systematic snag survey and acoustic survey was completed in 2017 to further characterize any potential bat habitat. The results of the additional surveys are detailed in Section 2.2.7 and Appendix D and E of the Amended Scoped EIS.	No further action required.
	56	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Hydrogeological Assessment	Source Protection Plan - MOECC staff are satisfied that the activities associated with the proposed land use are not subject to threat policies in the South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Plan. In addition, it appears that the amendment to permit the ERRC is consistent with the adopted Simcoe County OPA No. 1 - Source Protection Conformity.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.

Agency Comment and Response Summary
County of Simcoe Official Plan Amendment No. 2 - received between January 3, 2017 and May 15, 2018

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
10	57	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	There were two bird species discovered within the study area that have a special concern status. These are the eastern wood-pewee and the wood thrush. The habitat of a species with special concern status under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is considered significant wildlife habitat and should be protected. The location of these birds is not identified in the Scoped EIS, nor are there mitigation measures to protect these species from potential impacts.	The locations of these species, along with all birds observed during Site surveys, have been included in an additional table (Table 2.5) by each bird survey station. Further detail on area-sensitive species has also been included in the additional table and within the text of the Amended Scoped EIS (Section 4.5.2), along with the impact and mitigation sections.	No further action required.
	58	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	There was a red-shouldered hawk identified within the study area. The habitat of this species, known as woodland raptor nesting habitat, is considered significant wildlife habitat. The location of this hawk is not identified in the Scoped EIS, nor are there mitigation measures to protect this species from potential impacts.	The location of the red-shouldered hawk has been included as part of new Table 2.5 of the Amended Scoped EIS. A stick nest survey was conducted in spring 2017 prior to leaf out to identify any raptor nest present within the Study Area, the results and implications of are included in Section 4.5.2 of the Amended Scoped EIS.	No further action required.
	59	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Area sensitive breeding bird habitat exists where three or more of the following birds are breeding in a woodlot: sapsucker, red-breasted nuthatch, very, blue-headed vireo, northern parula, black-throated green warbler, blackburnian warbler, black-throated blue warbler, ovenbird, scarlet tanager and winter wren. Ten of the eleven birds indicative of ASBBH were recorded in the study area during the breeding bird season according to the protocol of the Ontario Breeding Bird Atlas. The Scoped EIS mentions that evidence was recorded to determine if the observed species were possible, probable or confirmed breeders, however these records are not contained within the study report. Detailed information with respect to the locations and observed breeding status (possible, probably or confirmed breeder) of these birds should be provided in the Scoped EIS. Without this information, it is difficult to support the conclusion that this significant wildlife habitat feature is not present in the study area.	The evaluation of Area-Sensitive Breeding Bird Habitat (ASBBH) has been revisited specifically addressing SWH function. GHD found that although natural blocks of mature woodland within the Study Area are limited to the northeast and southeast corners, the presence of area-sensitive birds across the Study Area warrants consideration of the Study Area as candidate SWH function for Woodland ASBBH. Table 2.5 has prepared to reflect point count results and likelihood of breeding (possible, probable or confirmed). While the results of the 2016 breeding bird surveys (2 surveys completed within the breeding bird season; only 2 pairs of qualifying species were reported as confirmed breeding) do not strictly satisfy defining criteria for SWH of ASBBH, it is prudent to assume that the Study Area provides SWH function for ASBBH based on the abundance of area-sensitive birds observed within the Study Area. The Amended Scoped EIS has been updated to reflect this.	No further action required.
	60	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	The Scoped EIS doesn't describe the weather conditions on the three nights when surveys were carried out for amphibian breeding habitat. Survey protocol requires that these surveys be performed during conditions when there is little wind and minimum air temperatures of 5C, 10C and 17C on each of the three respective nights of surveys. A further requirement of the amphibian surveys requires call level codes. These codes are not described in the Scoped EIS. Insufficient information is provided in the Scoped EIS to determine if this significant wildlife habitat feature is present in the study area.	As stated in the Scoped EIS, the calling amphibian survey protocols were followed for the on-Site surveys. These surveys satisfied the wind and temperatures, as noted. Amphibian breeding survey detail including species per station, species per survey and calling code for each species has been updated in the Amphibian Survey Results table (Table 2.4). The additional information requested has also been detailed within the Amphibian Survey section (2.2.6.1) of the Amended Scoped EIS.	No further action required.
	61	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	The Planning Justification Report states that the targeted surveys for Species at Risk were carried out. The Scoped EIS noted that there were incidental sitings of two bats within the Study Area on two separate visits and the GHD documented any snags that were encountered (Figure 5). Snags were considered potential roosts and documented if they exhibited cavities or crevices and possessed greater than or equal to 25 centimetre (cm) diameter at breast height (dbh). Our concern is that the Scoped EIS does not identify the survey protocol that was used to identify potential roost habitat for endangered bats within the study area. This information is required in order to corroborate the assertions made and support the proposed mitigation measures for endangered bats.	Based on the presence of bats within the Study Area (as per the two incidental sitings), the approach used was to assume that maternal roosts may be present on Site within the Study Area. As such, it is the incidental snags observed within the Study Area that were identified in the Scoped EIS. GHD has since consulted with MNRF and as per MNRF recommendations, systematic snag surveys and acoustic surveys were completed in 2017 to further characterize any potential bat habitat within the Study Area. The results of the additional surveys are documented within Section 2.2.7 and Appendix D and E of the Amended Scoped EIS.	Continued consultation with MNRF has confirmed that an ESA permit will not be required for the development based on the information provided to MNRF if a condition of tree removal timing can be adhered to, namely removal of potential snag trees outside of April 1 - September 1. Assuming this condition can be met, no further action is required.
	62	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment	MTCS staff note that the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment has been reviewed and entered into the register as compliant. At this time, a Project Information Form (PIF) number for the Stage 3 assessment has been issued, but the Stage 3 report included in this-circulation has not been submitted for review. It is not recommended that a planning application be approved until the Archeological Program Unit has issued a letter indicating that all associated Archeological Assessment Reports have been deemed compliant and entered into the register.	The Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment report was submitted to MTCS for review, deemed compliant, and subsequently entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.	No further action required.
	63	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	The criteria listed in Section 2.3 of the CHRA for identifying cultural heritage resources are heavily based on the criteria found in 0. Reg. 9/06, but includes revisions and additions to them. No explanation is given as to why the revised or additional criteria were included, or what their basis is. Criteria taken from 0. Reg. 9/06, which are the standard criteria to use in identifying cultural heritage resources, should be identified as such, and if the criteria used are to differ from 0. Reg. 9/06, the case for these variation should be clearly outlined.	This is intended as a summary of heritage evaluation criteria such as those found in O. Reg. 9/06 and O. Reg 10/06 that are used to guide the identification of potential resources of cultural heritage value or interest within the study area.	No further action required.
	64	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	The criteria discussed above are introduced with the statement that "a built structure or landscape is identified as a cultural heritage resource if it is considered to be 40 years or older, and if the resource satisfies at least one of the following criteria". It is not clear whether this definition is intended to include resources that either exceed 40 years of age and meet one of the listed criteria. However, either of these would be an incorrect use of the 40-year age threshold. This age threshold is often used as a screening mechanism to identify potential cultural heritage resources for evaluation. During evaluation, however, the 40-year age threshold is not a criterion for determining a cultural heritage resource. As the CHRA acknowledges in Section 2.1, not all structures over 40 years old have cultural heritage value or interest, and some cultural resources may be younger than 40 years old	ASI recognizes the inconsistent use of the 40-year age threshold in Sections 2.1 and 2.3. Section 2.3 was revised to acknowledge that not all structures over 40 years old have cultural heritage value or interest, and some cultural heritage resources may be younger than 40 years old.	No further action required.
	65	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	No evaluation is provided for structures and properties that were not found to constitute cultural heritage resources. It is unclear if any potential resources other than built heritage resource 1 and cultural heritage landscapes 1 through 3 were assessed for cultural heritage value or interest, how they were selected for evaluation, and how they were determined not to be cultural heritage resources.	All of the properties within the study area were screened for potential cultural heritage value or interest based on background historical research, field review, and application of heritage evaluation criteria listed in Section 2.3 of the CHRA. The inventory includes built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes that were determined to retain potential cultural heritage value or interest.	No further action required.
	66	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	April 7, 2017	Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	For the identified cultural heritage resource, the evaluation offered in Table 4 gives only general comments about the building based on the broad themes into which the 0. Reg. 9/06 criteria are grouped. An evaluation of a potential cultural heritage resource should go through each individual criterion and clearly explain whether the resource meets it.	The scope of the Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) was to provide cultural heritage screening of the study area which identified resources of potential cultural heritage value or interest that may be impacted by the proposed undertaking. If an identified cultural heritage resource were to be impacted by the proposed undertaking, a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) would have been recommended as part of the CHRA. An in-depth evaluation of a resource based on O.Reg. 9/06 criteria would occur as part of this recommended resource-specific CHER.	No further action required.
17	67	Ainley Group	February 22, 2018	Facility Characteristics Report	Based on our review of the amended report and the summary table of responses to our previous review comments, we generally concur with the consultants' conclusions and recommendations for servicing this site. We further note the additional description of Air Quality Impact Assessment, as well as the conceptual fire protection approach. We have no further concerns at this time and look forward to the consultants' detail design submissions to thoroughly evaluate the site servicing for the proposed facility.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	68	Ainley Group	February 22, 2018	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	We have reviewed the amended report and have no further concerns at this time. We look forward to the consultants' preparation of an Environmental Management Plan as part of the detail design submissions.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	69	Ainley Group	February 22, 2018	Hydrogeological Assessment	We once again referred the review of the Updated Hydrogeological Assessment report to Terraprobe Ltd. The sub-consultant's review comments are appended to this letter for your information. In Summary, we look forward to the consultants' detail design submissions to address the hydrogeological aspects of site servicing.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	70	Ainley Group	February 22, 2018	Geotechnical Investigation Report	The report provides extensive geotechnical data that will provide valuable information to the designer. We note that boreholes advanced within the proposed Stormwater Management facility area identify layers of silts and clays. The report made reference to utilizing these fine grained native materials as an impervious quality control layer, however, the author does not provide any input on free draining soils in this area that would accommodate Low Impact Development features, promote infiltration and reduce peak runoff flows. The detail design should be cognizant of the native soils' capacity to infiltrate all rainfall events in this area, as previously identified in the Site Characteristics Report - Proposed Stormwater Management Controls.	In addition to geotechnical considerations related to the subsurface soils, the detailed design of the ERRC will assess the drainage potential of the existing soils to determine their ability to accommodate Low Impact Development features.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF and OPF, including Low Impact Development features for the stormwater management system.
	71	Ainley Group	February 22, 2018	Traffic Impact Study	We have reviewed the TIS Addendum and generally concur with the consultants' conclusions. We have no further concerns at this time.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
20	72	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	May 3, 2018	Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	Given that the CHRA has identified a built heritage resource on the subject property with the potential to be significant as defined in the PPS, any Planning Act matter affecting this property requires an evaluation of this resource under the Ontario Regulation ("O. Reg.") 9/06 criteria. If this evaluation confirms that this resource is of cultural heritage value or interest, the County will need to take on measures to ensure that it is conserved pursuant to the definition in the PPS and the in-effect County Official Plan. As such, MTCS staff recommend the following addition to the proposed COPA: "The County shall evaluate the stone foundations at 2976 Horseshoe Valley Road West according to the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06. If this resource is found to be of cultural heritage value or interest according to these criteria, the County shall work with the Township of Springwater to ensure that this resource is conserved." MTCS staff further note, as the three cultural heritage landscapes identified in the CHRA are on an adjacent property that is not a protected heritage property under the PPS definition, PPS 2.6.3 does not apply to this draft COPA.	The Built Heritage Resource (i.e., stone foundations) identified during the CHRA will be further assessed for cultural heritage value in accordance with O. Reg. 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act. Pending the outcome of this assessment, the resource may need to be registered with MTCS and the Township, and incorporated into the County Official Plan Amendment. Mitigation measures may need to be put in place to prevent any potential impacts during the development and operation of the ERRC.	Prepare a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report.
	73	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	May 3, 2018	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	MNRF staff reviewed the information in the amended scoped Environmental Impact Study ("EIS") prepared by GHD dated February 1, 2018 that was provided with this draft COPA, along with additional information subsequently provided to MNRF including the amended Snag and Acoustic Bat Survey Results based on a snag density survey completed on March 29, 2018. Based on this review, it is the opinion of MNRF staff that the development of the proposed ERRC is not likely to adversely impact endangered bat species and their habitat provided that no tree removal occurs between April 1 and September 1. Accordingly, this timing restriction for vegetation removal must be incorporated into the Environmental Management Plan and Wildlife Management Plan along with all mitigation and monitoring programs described in the amended scoped EIS. Should any of the project details change or if it is not possible to comply with the above timing condition, MNRF staff should be notified immediately to obtain advice on whether the changes would require authorization under the Endangered Species Act, 2007. MNRF staff maintain that afforestation at a 2:1 ratio is appropriate to mitigate negative impacts to significant woodland and significant wildlife habitat features and recommend that this afforestation ratio also be incorporated into both the Environmental Management Plan and the Wildlife Management Plan once prepared. MNRF staff also recommend the amended EIS be updated to clarify that these corresponding mitigation measures will occur (see Appendix 'A' for technical comments).	The removal of any vegetation required for the development of the ERRC will take place in the fall (September – December) to avoid the breeding bird timing window, the bat maternity roost timeframe, and limit disturbance to terrestrial fauna. Vegetation removal will not occur between April 1 to September 1. The Compensation Planting Plan (CPP), Wildlife Management Plan (WMP), and mitigation and monitoring programs will incorporate this timing restriction, and will include alternate protection and mitigation measures should the clearing works not be conducted in the recommended fall season. Ecologists, arborists, and the County forester will be involved in the development and implementation of these plans to provide wholesome mitigation of the potential impacts to habitats and wildlife in the vicinity. Impacts of vegetation removal will be mitigated through afforestation at a 2:1 ratio within the County that will increase available contiguous woodland vegetation by a minimum of 11 ha. Afforestation sites will be chosen as close as possible to the Study Area (within 5 km) and in a location that serves to enhance or increase the available interior forest habitat within the Copeland Forest by infilling existing gaps in the forest unit. One element of this may include the restoration and afforestation of the existing Study Area access road/parking area off of Horseshoe Valley Road West. Afforestation measures will be detailed in a Compensation Planting Plan (CPP) developed in consultation with the NVCA and other stakeholders (e.g., Township, County Forestry Department). The CPP will identify planting details including location(s), species, stock size, and spacing. The CPP will be developed prior to site development, with compensation plantings initiated in advance of tree removal. The CPP and WMP will ultimately be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan for the ERRC.	Develop a Compensation Planting Plan and Wildlife Management Plan as part of the detailed design for the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings and wildlife protection measures prior to tree removal.
	74	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	May 3, 2018	Facility Characteristics Report	To assist municipalities and other stakeholders in the implementation of PPS policies related to wildland fires, the province has generalized wildland fire hazards mapping that provides a coarse scale assessment of areas with the greatest potential for risks associated with high to extreme wildland fire. However, this mapping alone does not represent a complete assessment of risk. Determination of mitigation measures can be done with confidence only on a site-specific basis. MNRF's Wildland Fire Risk Assessment and Mitigation Reference Manual advises that if an assessment determines that hazardous forest types for wildland fire are not present on or in the vicinity of proposed development (i.e., generally within 100 metres), PPS policy 3.1.8 does not apply. Accordingly, MNRF staff reviewed the amended Facilities Characteristic Report ("FCR") prepared by GHD dated February 1, 2018 which recognizes that one of the highest priorities for a facility of this nature is property protection (fire risk). The FCR describes the ERRC site as being part of the Freele County Forest tract, an approximately 65 year old mixed species plantation managed by County foresters. Site assessment carried out by the County's consultation in the preparation of the EIS characterizes the vegetation communities surrounding the proposed ERRC structures as naturalized coniferous plantation, sugar-maple naturalized deciduous plantation and hemlock-hardwood mixed forest. This characterization, which confirms MNRF's mapping, indicates that the forested areas surrounding the ERRC structures are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire and, therefore, PPS policy 3.1.8 does not apply. The FCR provides further details on the proposed approach to fire protection for the ERRC in Section 4.4, including the preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan ("FPP") that will be developed in consideration of a site hazard assessment and relevant documents such as the Ontario's FireSmart Manual. It is also noted that the conceptual layout in Figure 3.1 of the FCR shows 15 to 25 metres of driveway/parking lot between the ERRC facility and the chain link fence. MNRF staff recommend that the County include a wildland fire assessment as part of the site hazard assessment for the FPP, and that a vegetation plan or strategy be incorporated into this plan to create an appropriate separation between buildings and the surrounding forested lands. The County is encouraged to incorporate vegetation/fuel management mitigation techniques beyond the ERRC footprint within the surrounding forested lands as part of the FPP. MNRF's Wildland Fire Risk Assessment and Mitigation Reference Manual provides recommended standards on vegetation management and development considerations that are based on the principles of the FireSmart Manual.	A wildland fire assessment will be carried out as part of the site hazard assessment for the preparation of the Fire Prevention Plan (FPP), which will be developed in consideration of the MNRF's Wildland Fire Risk Assessment and Mitigation Reference Manual and other relevant documents such as Ontario's FireSmart Manual. A vegetation plan or strategy will also be incorporated into the FPP to ensure appropriate separation between buildings and the surrounding forested lands. Vegetation/fuel management mitigation techniques beyond the ERRC footprint within the surrounding forested lands will also be included as part of the FPP.	Undertake a wildland fire risk assessment and prepare a Fire Prevention Plan.

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
20	75	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	May 3, 2018	Facility Characteristics Report	MOECC staff have confirmed receipt of updated dispersion modelling files with respect to the proposed ERRC facility from the County's consultant on April 5, 2018 and acknowledge that these files will be reviewed at the ECA stage. Prior to receiving these updated files, MOECC staff provided MMA with the following technical comments on the AQIA report to be addressed through the ECA process: • The AQIA report uses a processing capacity of 30,000 tonnes per year to estimate its air emissions. It is not clear whether this is the initial processing capacity, or the anticipated maximum capacity. It is recommended the latter be used for assessing compliance. • When using source test results from other facilities, it is expected that the source test reports are made available. These reports were not done as part of the AQIA and should be included in the application package for the ECA application. • There was no mention of particulate matter emissions in the AQIA report. These are common to waste processing facilities and, at a minimum, a Best Management Practice plan for particulate matter should be developed and included in the ECA submission. • Both composting and anaerobic digestion technologies are known to have fugitive odour emissions. The AQIA report should have included a discussion on potential fugitive odours from the proposed operations and how these would be mitigated to minimize off-site impacts. It has been MOECC's experience that such organics processing facilities do result in odour complaints from process fugitives as well as the trucking of waste into the facility. This potential odour source should be addressed during the facility's design stage and discussed in the ECA submission. • The development of an odour mitigation and management plan is expected for a waste organics processing facility and should be included in the ECA submission. A proposed plan to demonstrate how negative pressure in the building will be monitored and maintained, and how the proponent will mitigate other fugitive sources such as the trucking of materials to the proposed ERRC site should be developed. In addition, a procedure for recording and responding to complaints, and also a protocol for managing process upsets and equipment malfunction should be part of the plan. • The AQIA report should have discussed the facility impact at the proposed future sensitive receptor (receptor no. 7) and this should be addressed through the ECA application. • The facility's design and operation will ultimately lead to the success of odour mitigation methods. The MOECC notes that studies have been carried out for the composting process, which highlights the need to maintain the proper level of moisture and oxygen content, and the correct temperature during the curing stage, as well as a sufficiently long curing time to produce mature compost. Inspections at existing facilities have shown that the finished product is often not mature, leading to odours. Complete enclosure of all the process activities, from receipt of raw material to the finished product, together with odour treatment of the building air prior to exhaust to the environment is expected for waste organics processing facilities.	Preliminary responses are summarized below. However, it should be noted that these details will be refined and finalized as part of the detailed design and addressed through the ECA process. • 30,000 tonnes per year of source separated organics is the anticipated maximum processing capacity of the facility. • Source test results from other facilities were not provided as part of the AQIA due to confidentiality reasons. Permission from the relevant facility owners will be requested so that this information can be provided as part of the ECA submission. • Best Management Practices for particulate matter will be reviewed and included as part of the ECA submission. • Fugitive odour emissions from facility operations will be addressed during the detailed design stage and will be included as part of the ECA submission. • An Odour Mitigation and Management Plan will be developed to address fugitive emissions from facility operations and included as part of the ECA submission. • Potential impacts at all existing and proposed future sensitive receptors surrounding the facility will be assessed and included as part of the ECA submission. • Odour mitigation measures will be developed as part of the detailed design and enforced as part of facility operations. This will encompass all aspects, from receipt of raw material to the finished product, together with odour treatment of the building air prior to exhaust to the environment.	Develop the detailed design and prepare updated emissions modeling to be submitted as part of the ECA.
	76	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	May 3, 2018	Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment	The November 29, 2017 letter from the County's consultant, GHD, to Brent Spagnol, Director of Planning Services and By-law Enforcement for the Township of Springwater notes a meeting was held on May 5, 2017 between County, Township, MMA and GHD staff to discuss the CHRA comments in MMA's April 7, 2017 letter. According to MMA staff records, the May 5, 2017 meeting (via teleconference) involved MOECC staff to exclusively discuss the provincial One-Window comments articulated in the April 7, 2017 letter regarding air quality.	Following a review of the meeting records it is agreed that comments on the CHRA were not discussed with MMA during the May 5, 2017 teleconference meeting. Notwithstanding this, all other aspects of the November 29, 2017 letter remain unchanged.	No further action required.
	77	Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Partner Ministries (MNRF, MOECC, MTCS, MTO, OMAFRA)	May 3, 2018	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	MNRF recommends the amended scoped EIS be updated to clarify that tree removal will not occur between April 1 and September 1 as the wording in some sections of the EIS suggest this mitigation is discretionary. For instance, Section 5.3.2 (p.30) of the EIS report states that, "vegetation removal should take place in the fall (September - December) to avoid the breeding bird timing window, the bat maternity roost timeframe, and limit the disturbance to terrestrial fauna." While there is flexibility within this timing window, it is important to note that for endangered bat species, tree removal must not occur between April 1 and September 1. Section 10.2 of the Amended Planning Justification Report prepared by GHD dated February 2018 refers to the EIS and certain implementation measures that are recommended therein to mitigate negative impacts to significant woodland and significant wildlife habitat features. The amended Planning Justification Report describes the replacement of plantation forest area with afforestation of at least an equivalent area of native natural forest. The EIS, however, describes a preferred afforestation at a 2:1 ratio (e.g. 11 ha). For example, in Section 6 (p.31), the EIS states that "a commitment to afforestation at a 2:1 ratio (e.g. 11 ha) to expand and/or enhance the contiguous woodland feature within the vicinity of the Study Area will, along with the detailed site design and operation considerations, serve to mitigate the loss." This statement suggests that afforestation at a 2:1 ratio is not definite. MNRF recommends the amended EIS be clarified that afforestation will occur at a 2:1 ratio as a significant measure that will mitigate for the loss of interior forest function in the study area.	The removal of any vegetation required for the development of the ERRC will take place in the fall (September – December) to avoid the breeding bird timing window, the bat maternity roost timeframe, and limit disturbance to terrestrial fauna. Vegetation removal will not occur between April 1 to September 1. The Compensation Planting Plan (CPP), Wildlife Management Plan (WMP), and mitigation and monitoring programs will incorporate this timing restriction, and will include alternate protection and mitigation measures should the clearing works not be conducted in the recommended fall season. Ecologists, arborists, and the County forester will be involved in the development and implementation of these plans to provide wholesome mitigation of the potential impacts to habitats and wildlife in the vicinity. Impacts of vegetation removal will be mitigated through afforestation at a 2:1 ratio within the County that will increase available contiguous woodland vegetation by a minimum of 11 ha. Afforestation sites will be chosen as close as possible to the Study Area (within 5 km) and in a location that serves to enhance or increase the available interior forest habitat within the Copeland Forest by infilling existing gaps in the forest unit. One element of this may include the restoration and afforestation of the existing Study Area access road/parking area off of Horseshoe Valley Road West. Afforestation measures will be detailed in a Compensation Planting Plan (CPP) developed in consultation with the NVCA and other stakeholders (e.g., Township, County Forestry Department). The CPP will identify planting details including location(s), species, stock size, and spacing. The CPP will be developed prior to site development, with compensation plantings initiated in advance of tree removal. The CPP and WMP will ultimately be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan for the ERRC.	Develop a Compensation Planting Plan and Wildlife Management Plan as part of the detailed design for the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings and wildlife protection measures prior to tree removal.
21	78	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Facility Characteristics Report	We advise the property is partially within the regulatory jurisdiction of the NVCA where a permit is required under Ontario Regulation 172/06 prior to development. The lands are partially regulated due to mapped drainage features and wetlands associated with erosion and flooding concerns. The initial review of site mapping identified a watercourse present which has since been ground-truthed by NVCA staff to not exist.	We understand that portions of the property are within the regulatory jurisdiction of the NVCA. Permits will be obtained under Ontario Regulation 172/06 as required prior to any development that impacts these areas.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF and OPF, and secure permits from the NVCA under Ontario Regulation 172/06 as required prior to development.
	79	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Facility Characteristics Report	We note that the supporting documentation provided to date is sufficient to address all hazard and stormwater concerns at the County Official Plan Amendment stage of the planning process.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	80	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Facility Characteristics Report	The submission has successfully demonstrated that the proposed development is outside any are of natural hazards (flooding and erosion) and there are not hazardous soils that would impact the development.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	81	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Facility Characteristics Report	The stormwater management proposal to use a treatment trail approach to provide water quality and water quantity control for all stormwater prior to discharging onto Horseshoe Valley Road and ultimately Matheson Creek is reasonable for this site.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
	82	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Facility Characteristics Report	The NVCA requires the matching of post-development phosphorus loads to pre-development levels.	Post-development phosphorus loading will be consistent with pre-development levels. This requirement will be considered during the development of the detailed design.	Complete the detailed design for the MMF and OPF, maintaining phosphorus loading to pre-development levels.
	83	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	From a natural heritage perspective, the NVCA is satisfied that the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) addresses concerns with respect to significant forests, significant wetlands, and significant wildlife habitat through setbacks, avoidance and mitigation.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
21	84	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	All mitigations listed in the EIS should be implemented including the dedication of 5.5 ha of mitigation afforestation to infilling forest gaps.	Impacts of vegetation removal will be mitigated through afforestation at a 2:1 ratio within the County that will increase available contiguous woodland vegetation by a minimum of 11 ha. Afforestation sites will be chosen as close as possible to the Study Area (within 5 km) and in a location that serves to enhance or increase the available interior forest habitat within the Copeland Forest by infilling existing gaps in the forest unit. One element of this may include the restoration and afforestation of the existing Study Area access road/parking area off of Horseshoe Valley Road West. Afforestation measures will be detailed in a Compensation Planting Plan (CPP) developed in consultation with the NVCA and other stakeholders (e.g., Township, County Forestry Department). The CPP will identify planting details including location(s), species, stock size, and spacing. The CPP will be developed prior to site development, with compensation plantings initiated in advance of tree removal. The CPP will ultimately be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan for the ERRC.	Develop a Compensation Planting Plan as part of the detailed design for the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings prior to tree removal.
	85	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Scoped Environmental Impact Study	Staff recommends that the afforestation plan should be presented concurrently to the development of detailed site design to the satisfaction of the County of Simcoe, the Township of Springwater, the MNRF and the NVCA.	Impacts of vegetation removal will be mitigated through afforestation at a 2:1 ratio within the County that will increase available contiguous woodland vegetation by a minimum of 11 ha. Afforestation sites will be chosen as close as possible to the Study Area (within 5 km) and in a location that serves to enhance or increase the available interior forest habitat within the Copeland Forest by infilling existing gaps in the forest unit. One element of this may include the restoration and afforestation of the existing Study Area access road/parking area off of Horseshoe Valley Road West. Afforestation measures will be detailed in a Compensation Planting Plan (CPP) developed in consultation with the NVCA and other stakeholders (e.g., Township, County Forestry Department). The CPP will identify planting details including location(s), species, stock size, and spacing. The CPP will be developed prior to site development, with compensation plantings initiated in advance of tree removal. The CPP will ultimately be included as part of the Environmental Management Plan for the ERRC.	Develop a Compensation Planting Plan as part of the detailed design for the ERRC. Initiate compensation plantings prior to tree removal.
	86	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Hydrogeological Assessment	Continued groundwater monitoring is encouraged in the established monitoring wells where GW monitoring is presently occurring to further document seasonal and annual groundwater trends and patterns.	Groundwater monitoring is currently being carried out at the Site, and will continue on a quarterly basis until the Site is developed. Formal groundwater and surface water monitoring programs will be developed in consultation with the MOECC and will form part of the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for the ERRC.	Continue quarterly groundwater monitoring at the Site. Develop groundwater and surface water monitoring programs as part of the ECA.
	87	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Hydrogeological Assessment	As recognized, the nitrate loading calculations will be completed at the design stage.	Acknowledged.	Nitrate loading calculations will be completed during the detailed design stage.
	88	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Hydrogeological Assessment	Identification is requested on how the site may impact GW quality and the associated risk management measures to prevent groundwater quality issues.	Potential impacts to groundwater were discussed in the Hydrogeological Assessment and the Facility Characteristics Report. Mitigation measures will include: conducting processing operations indoors to minimize the generation of impacted runoff; containment of process water in a closed system; separation of process water from stormwater; on-Site stormwater treatment; and environmental monitoring to ensure no impacts to groundwater quality. Groundwater monitoring is currently being carried out at the Site, and will continue on a quarterly basis until the Site is developed. Formal groundwater and surface water monitoring programs will be developed in consultation with the MOECC and will form part of the Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) for the ERRC.	Continue quarterly groundwater monitoring at the Site. Develop groundwater and surface water monitoring programs as part of the ECA. Assess potential groundwater impacts and proposed mitigation measures during development of the detailed design for the stormwater management system.
	89	Nottawasaga Valley Conservation Authority	May 15, 2018	Hydrogeological Assessment	A detailed water balance is required at the detailed design stage.	Acknowledged.	A detailed water balance will be prepared during the detailed design stage.

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
Agency Comments Addressed by the County of Simcoe							
1	90	Simcoe County District School Board	January 9, 2017	Circulation	Planning staff have no objection to this County initiated amendment.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
3	91	City of Orillia	January 24, 2017	Circulation	This is to advise you that your letter received January 2, 2017 respecting the above was presented to a meeting of Council held on January 23, 2017. At that time, Council received the correspondence as information and directed that a copy be forwarded to the Development Services and the Environmental Services and Operations Departments, as well as the Environmental Advisory Committee.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
5	93	Enbridge	January 27, 2017	Circulation	Enbridge gas distribution does not object to the proposed application. Enbridge gas distribution reserves the right to amend or remove development conditions.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
6	94	Canada Post	February 9, 2017	Circulation	Canada Post has reviewed the proposal for the above noted Development Application and has determined that the completed project will be served by a centralized mail delivery provided through Canada Post Community Mail Boxes. The owner/developer must comply to the conditions contained in this letter to provide mail service to this development.	A centralize mail box is not required for this proposal and therefore Canada Post conditions are not applicable.	No further action required.
7	95	Township of Oro-Medonte	February 23, 2017	Planning Justification Report	The proposed text amendment to the County of Simcoe Official Plan should specifically identify a maximum permitted area (in hectares) for the Environmental Resource Recovery Centre. While the background information states that the proposed facility would have an approximate footprint of 4.5 hectares (11.12 acres), there is no such limitation in the wording of the amendment that would prevent a future expansion of the facility. The purpose of limiting the area of the facility would be to provide greater certainty over the long-term with respect to the size of the facility and its potential impacts on the community, including the Township of Oro-Medonte.	Draft amendment to the County Official Plan proposes the following under Location: *The lands subject of Official Plan Amendment No. 2 encompass approximately 4.5 hectares (11.12 acres) within the total site area of 84 hectares (207.56 acres).*	Include reference to the 4.5 ha footprint in the draft County OPA.
	96	Township of Oro-Medonte	February 23, 2017	MMF Updated Business Case OPF Preliminary Business Case	That a business plan be submitted with the application identifying, among other things, any potential for expansion and/or for receiving source materials from outside of the County of Simcoe. As with Comment No. 1 above, this comment pertains to achieving a level of certainty regarding the scale and intensity of the operation and its resulting impacts.	Business case development is outside the scope of the land use planning process. It is noted, however, that business cases for both the OPF and MMF were presented to County Council in September 2017 (staff reports Item CCW 17-222 and Item CCW 17-223). 20-year projected tonnages outlined to be managed at these facilities are provided in the business case reports and are consistent with information provided in technical reports for the land use planning application. Consideration for acceptance of material from outside the County of Simcoe is discussed.	No further action required in regard to the planning approvals process.
	97	Township of Oro-Medonte	February 23, 2017	Traffic Impact Study	That a traffic management and enforcement plan be prepared and submitted with the application. A traffic impact study has been prepared in support of the application and concludes that the proposed facility will have negligible impacts on the surrounding road system. Township Operations Staff have advised Planning Staff that no direct impacts on the Township's road network are anticipated as a result of the proposed Environmental Resource Recovery Centre. However, Planning Staff notes that no information has been provided with the application that would address and identify specific haul routes for materials being delivered to and from this proposed County-wide facility. There has also been no information provided with respect to a strategy for the enforcement of the haul routes, speeding and load weight limits. This type of traffic management and enforcement information is commonly required in association with other proposed land uses, such as pits and quarries, which generate traffic in the form of large trucks. Such information would provide the Township with a better understanding of potential truck traffic impacts in Oro-Medonte.	Movement of vehicles inbound and outbound from the facility is outlined in the Traffic Impact Study. Curbside collection trucks currently travel throughout the County's sixteen member municipalities every day (including the Township of Oro-Medonte) and development of the ERRC will not impact these collection routes. It is anticipated, however, that the curbside collection trucks will stop at the ERRC facility in the Township of Springwater prior to returning to their home base for fueling (the Waste Connections transfer station in the City of Barrie). It is anticipated that any out of area material will be transported primarily on County roads and provincial highways. In regard to outbound trailers destined for end disposal/processing locations, it is anticipated that they will utilize Highway 400. Speed and load weights of waste management vehicles will comply with all regulatory requirements.	No further action required in regard to the land use planning approvals process as the Traffic Impact Study has been undertaken. Further details regarding management of vehicles on-site may be included with the Design and Operations Report for the facility.
	98	Township of Oro-Medonte	February 23, 2017	Facility Characteristics Report	That more information be provided regarding the composting technology options being considered, their associated risks in terms of odour impacts and the mitigation methods proposed. The history of organics composting in Ontario has demonstrated that such facilities have the potential to emit odours resulting from failures in the composting process. Such failures are commonly referred to in the composting industry as "going anaerobic", when low oxygen conditions inadvertently occur in the compost mix, resulting in a strong ammonia-like odour that can be detected over many kilometres. Source materials such as grass clippings have been demonstrated to be particularly challenging from an odour management standpoint. Considering that the proposed Environmental Resource Recovery Centre site is located approximately 2.5 kilometres from the Township's boundary and approximately 3.5 kilometres away from the Craighurst Settlement Area, an odour related failure would likely impact residents of the Township.	Air quality information (including an Air Quality Impact Assessment) is found in the Facility Characteristics Report. Review of this study, provision of an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA), and ensuring future compliance will be the responsibility of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). The County will be expected to meet odour limits at the property boundary. It is noted that organics processing technology has not been selected for the facility (including whether or not it will be aerobic composting or anaerobic digestion). Odours will be minimized, in part, by managing source-separated organics indoors. The purpose of the OPF will not be to compost leaf and yard waste (including grass clippings) in an outdoor, open windrow-type facility.	Organics processing technology will be determined through a forthcoming procurement process (following receipt of the land use planning approvals). Once technology has been determined, a detailed Design and Operations Report will be submitted to the MOECC as part of the ECA process. It is anticipated that additional air quality information and details regarding odour control and management will be included with this submission.
8	99	Township of Springwater	May 15, 2017 (resolution dated March 2, 2016)	various statistics related to diversion, organics program	Whereas the Township of Springwater is fully supportive of sustainable waste reduction and diversion initiatives to reduce the use and need of landfill sites, and Whereas the County of Simcoe's direct curbside diversion rate has remained relatively stagnant since 2012 at 52%, and Whereas the 2015 Simcoe single family curbside audit revealed that the overall average waste generation of 574 kilograms per household remains similar to 2012 levels and is 8.5% ahead of 2010 levels, and Whereas nearly 50% of the material in a typical household garbage bag could be diverted through curbside blue box recycling and green bin programs, and Whereas the capture rate of curbside organics (green bin) continued to decline by 6% between the 2012 and 2015 audits (2010 47%; 2012 44%; 2015 38%), and Whereas increasing the capture rate of curbside organics remains the single greatest opportunity to decrease the amount of waste destined for disposal sites, and Whereas Simcoe County staff anticipates that it will take a number of years for the organics diversion program to become engrained, and Whereas the greatest opportunity for diversion improvement remains the green bin program, with 40% of the average residential garbage bag being made up of food waste and other divertible green bin materials such as tissues, paper towels, and paper cups and plates,	This information is outside the scope of the land use planning process. It is noted, however, that County Solid Waste Management staff continue to monitor collected tonnages and capture rates to effectively plan for management of all materials in the future. This is supported by initiatives and tasks outlined within the Solid Waste Management Strategy (an update was approved by County Council in 2016). The Preliminary Business Case for the OPF considers forecasted tonnages of source-separated organics and the impact of population growth and a potential landfill ban under the Waste-Free Ontario Act. In 2017, the County of Simcoe saw a significant increase in the curbside collected tonnage of source-separated organics. A 4-season curbside audit is currently being undertaken to determine changes in waste composition and capture rates. This information will be presented to County Council for consideration.	No further action required.

Agency Comment and Response Summary
County of Simcoe Official Plan Amendment No. 2 - received between January 3, 2017 and May 15, 2018

Correspondence No.	Comment No.	Submitted By	Date Submitted	Document	Comment	Response	Action
8	100	Township of Springwater	May 15, 2017 (resolution dated March 2, 2016)	MMF Updated Business Case OPF Preliminary Business Case	Therefore be it resolved that before continuing further with the Simcoe County procurement or development of an Organics Processing Facility (OPF) and/or a Materials Management Facility (MMF), that the County of Simcoe be requested to conduct a comprehensive Business Case and presented to County Council and to Springwater Council and to the public; That a Business Case include, but not be limited to, a risk analysis, market sounding process, a preliminary value for money assessment, including capital and operating cost projections, incorporating all costs related to the MMF and OPF development and cost projections for building and running an MMF and OPF under various growth and technology assumptions as well as recommended procurement and financing options; That the Business Case include an analysis of the alternative options of entering into a contract or contracts with the best choice of service provider(s) to fulfill the County's anticipated needs in waste management recycling, under appropriate assumptions, for a 7 to 10 year period post 2018;	Business case development is outside the scope of the land use planning process. It is noted, however, that business cases for both the OPF and MMF were presented to County Council in September 2017 (staff reports Item CCW 17-222 and Item CCW 17-223). Both reports are posted at www.simcoe.ca/errc. In regard to transfer, the MMF updated Business Case was updated over 2017 to consider site-specific conditions and the impact of the Waste-Free Ontario Act. Development of a County facility to manage the long-term transfer of garbage and blue box recycling until 2022 had the lowest total costs over a 20-year period. This report noted that continued reliance on outside contracts for transfer brings risk associated with cost increases, long-term availability, and control over our waste management operations. With limited transfer options in this region, the MMF would provide for secure, long-term management of our garbage. A Request for Information (RFI) seeking input on organics management options was undertaken and the results presented to County Council in a Preliminary Business Case for the OPF in fall 2017. This report, completed by Ernst & Young, recommended that development of a County-owned facility continue – noting that the OPF could provide a solution that is advantageous, comparably low risk, financially viable, and in alignment with the County's objectives. Following the land use planning process, procurement of technology will continue with a final business case presented for County Council's consideration and direction.	No further action required.
	101	Township of Springwater	May 15, 2017 (resolution dated March 2, 2016)		That a financial impact study be conducted as it include an assessment of the costs estimated to be incurred by Springwater with respect to the OPF and MMF, an assessment of the net effect on jobs and benefits to farmers;	This is outside the scope of the land use planning process.	Following completion of the facility, an assessment will be undertaken by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC) to determine applicable annual property taxes. Estimated annual property taxes were considered in business cases for the MMF and OPF.
	102	Township of Springwater	May 15, 2017 (resolution dated March 2, 2016)		And it be further resolved, that until such undertakings have been completed, the Township of Springwater does not support the establishment of an OPF or a MMF within its jurisdiction, and That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to all members of the Council of the County of Simcoe, MPP's and the Minister of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change. Carried Unanimously	n/a	No further action required.
12	104	Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport	July 12, 2017	Archaeological Assessment Stage 3	Review and Entry into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports: Archaeological Assessment Report "Stage 3 Site Specific Assessment Simcoe Environmental Resource Recovery Centre Gribbin Site (BDGW-49) MTCS File No. 0005412	Acknowledged.	Recommended conditions to be included in site plan approval.
13	105	Ainley Group	November 13, 2017	Traffic Impact Study Addendum	Further to previous review comments of January 24, 2017 on behalf of the Township of Springwater. Based on the response prepared by WSP/MMM, generally concur with the consultants' conclusions with respect to traffic impacts from this project.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
14	106	Ministry of Municipal Affairs	November 15, 2017	Planning Justification Report	The MOECC has clear EA requirements for waste diversion and disposal facilities through O. Reg. 101/07 under the EA Act. To improve the EA process and give municipalities more effective tools for managing waste, in 2007 the province passed this regulation which exempts certain types of projects from the requirements of the EA Act through this regulation. 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 purposes of 2017 Growth Plan policy 4.2.3.1(c). Further it is acknowledged the ERRC project would still be subject to the approval requirements under other environmental legislation such as the Environmental Protection Act.	Acknowledged.	Planning Justification Report to be updated. No further action required.
15	107	County of Simcoe - Roads Dept.	November 21, 2017	Traffic Impact Study Addendum	Review of the Traffic Impact Addendum recently submitted by GHD in response to the Ainley comments on the behalf of the Township of Springwater. We have no further comments.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
16	108	County of Simcoe - Roads Dept.	February 16, 2018	Traffic Impact Study Addendum	Review of the Traffic Impact Study Addendum dated October 2017 submitted by WSP/MMM and find their responses to the review agency comments acceptable.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
18	109	Risk Management Official for the Township of Springwater	March 2, 2018 (formal letter March 7, 2018)	Hydrogeological Assessment	Having reviewed the materials provided by email on December 21, 2017 as well as the presentation provided during our meeting at he County of Simcoe Administration Centre on January 23, 2018, I am in agreement that the proposed activity would not be considered a significant drinking waster threat at this location according to the framework legislated under Ontario's Clean Water Act (CWA). It was noted during the meeting that numerous measures are planned that will contribute to protection of groundwater in the area of the facility. Although not explicitly required as a result of the CWA or Source Protection Plan policies, I would recommend that the above measures at a minimum be included in the final design of the site to ensure the protection of groundwater sources in the area of the facility.	Acknowledged.	Protection measures to be included in site plan approval and detail design.
19	110	County of Simcoe - Forestry Dept.	March 27, 2018	Amended Environmental Impact Study	Based upon the recommendations within the subject document, to mitigate any impacts to vegetation, wetlands, wildlife and wildlife habitat as a result of the OFSC trail relocation: the wetland features and old growth hemlock stand in the southeast of the property will be avoided and remain undisturbed by relocating he OFSC trail to the west of the ERRC access road and facility footprint; installation of the trail will be completed outside of the breeding bird window; tree removal will be limited by following existing forest access routes to the degree possible; ground disturbance will be minimized by maintaining minimum width requirements of the trail and routing the trail to avoid grading; staff will confirm the exact location of the trail with GHD biologists prior to installation.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
Indigenous Community Comments Addressed by the County of Simcoe							
4	92	Chippewas of Rama First Nation	January 26, 2017	Circulation	Please be advised that we have reviewed your letter and shared it with Council and forwarded the information to Kerry Sandy McKenzie, Williams Treaties First Nation Process Co-ordinator/Negotiator. Ms. McKenzie will review your letter and take the necessary action if required.	Acknowledged.	No further action required.
11	103	Nation Huronne-Wendat	April 20, 2017	Circulation	Request if any archaeological assessments have been completed regarding the project.	Email response from County Planning Staff including a link to the archaeological assessments posted on website. The paper copies of the archaeological reports were sent in the December 2017 circulation.	No further action required.