

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|---|---|------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>SUMMARY - correspondence included in Item CCW 18-320</p> <p>245 written comments received from 161 households 186 of the 245 written comments were in a form letter format 16 comments received at May 9, 2017 public meeting (includes comments/questions from County Council)</p> | | | | <p>Most Common Comments Submitted: environmental (Environmental Impact Study did not demonstrate no negative impact, destruction of forest), traffic and road conditions, fire hazards, Siting Process (decision-making process did not conform to Provincial Policy Statement), nuisance issues (noise, odour, lighting), business case, relocation of snowmobile trail and land use (compatibility, use not permitted in Greenlands).</p> <p>Form Letter: Opposed to: 1. The inclusion of County forests in site selection process; 2. 50% of candidate sites for the facility being within woodlands; 3. 82% of County-owned sites were woodland areas, which should be protected from development; 4. County Forests should be excluded from site selection process based on natural heritage as well as social and cultural impacts to the broader community; 5. Sitingmatrix used during part 1-3 process is not consistent with requirements of the PPS. EIS has not demonstrated that there will be no NEGATIVE IMPACT to areas of provincial interest, such as woodlands, wetlands and wildlife habitat, as required by the Planning Act.</p> | | | | |
| Written Submissions | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | | January 3, 2017 | 1601 Rainbow Valley Road East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Request copy of updated conceptual plan from March 2016 reflecting the most recent location | Conceptual Plan | letter from S. Mack on January 4, 2017 letter from R. McCullough on January 20, 2017 letter from G. Merek in Planning on January 20, 2017 (in response to e-mails dated January 10 and 19, 2017) | Letter provided direction to specific schedules in supporting studies that were accessible on the County's website. | No further action required. |
| 2 | Cindy Mercer | January 10, 2017 | | On the conceptual site plan prepared by GHD, dated November 15, 2016, it is noted that the existing OFSC snowmobile trail to be relocated subject to further consultation with OFSC. As a neighbouring land owner with knowledge of this community area I kindly request to be part of this consultation process. | Snowmobile Trail | letter from R. McCullough on January 20, 2017 letter from G. Merek in Planning on January 20, 2017 (in response to e-mails dated January 10 and 19, 2017) | Relocation of the OFSC trail is not part of the planning process. Consulting with the public or nearby landowners on trail construction or relocation is not typically undertaken by County Forestry staff. The Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) recommended that the trail be relocated to the west side of the property in order to avoid natural features such as the wetlands and old growth hemlock. | County Forestry staff to consult with GHD biologists on the proposed trail relocation to the western side of the property and will incorporate the suggested mitigation measures in the Amended Scoped EIS. |
| 12 | | April 26, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 13 | Randy Mercer | April 26, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 18 | Jordan Mercer | April 27, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 19 | Brayden Mercer | April 27, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 25 | Sandra Dunlop | April 28, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 26 | Jerry Dunlop | April 28, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 209 | Randy Mercer, Cindy Mercer, Brayden Mercer, and Jordan Mercer | May 16, 2017 | | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route. Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan. | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 210 | Jerry Dunlop and Sandra Dunlop | May 16, 2017 | | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route. Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan. | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 223 | Cindy Mercer | July 11, 2017 | Confirmation of email address on project contact list by Solid Waste Management for ERRC | — | e-mail from Customer Service on July 11, 2017 | Confirmed on mailing list | No further action required. | |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|---|--------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| 226 | Cindy Mercer | September 14, 2017 | | Date/timeline when business cases will be available. | — | e-mails from S. Mack on September 15, 18, and 19, 2017 (in response to e-mails dated September 14, 18, and 19, 2017) | Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. | No further action required. |
| 227 | Jerry Dunlop and Sandra Dunlop | September 22, 2017 | | Pursued a family severance on their property with a hired team of professionals to assist. Environmentally driven approach and offered majority of property to Environmental Protection zoning plus a conservation easement. County and Township opposed severance at OMB and case was dismissed because it did not meet the Township's Official Plan. Struggle to understand how the County can pursue planning approvals to build major infrastructure in the very forest next door, inviting heavy truck traffic and industrial business operations into the heart of sensitive forest interior. Serious concerns developing in a significant woodlot with significant wildlife and appears to inconsistent with new the Growth Plan. Request clarification on how the project is consistent with the Growth Plan 2017 and how the preferred location demonstrates responsible land use planning. | Land Use Environmental Siting Process | — | Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. This work was carried out in consultation with and to the satisfaction of review agencies such as the MNRF and NVCA. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment. The siting selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. |
| 229 | | December 18, 2017 | 1601 Rainbow Valley Road East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Letter to editor shared related to County's bid for Amazon's second headquarters. 3 sizable potential locations were put forth by the County in the bid and this contradicts with my understanding of the County's availability of sizabel acreage suitable for development purposes. Why would the County build infrastructure, invite heavy truck traffic and industrial operations into a forest when their proposal to Amazon indicates that there is no shortage of land in this County suitable for development. Why is the County not doing everything within their power to keep our forest tracts off the chopping block for development. | Land Use Siting Process | e-mail from S. Mack on December 18, 2017 confirming receipt of email. | The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC. | No further action required. |
| 240 | | March 28, 2018 | | Please provide justification as to why the home located at 1293 Rainbow Valley East is not identified on Figure 6 of the Amended Planning Justification Report. | Land Use | e-mail from T. Thompson on March 29, 2018 | Figure 6 of the Amended Planning Justification Report is only meant to provide a general overview of the built-up area surrounding the ERRC including distances to sensitive receptors, settlements, estate developments. All sensitive receptors within 500 metres of the site boundary are shown in Figure 2.1 of the Facility Characteristic Report which includes 1293 Rainbow Valley Road East. | No further action required. |
| 241 | | April 2, 2018 | | Reply to County's email response from March 29, 2018. Figure 6 is clearly labelled distance to sensitive receptors - if it was intention to provide an overview of the sensitive receptors then it should be labelled accurately. To exclude some sensitive receptors and include others at a further distance appears misleading. | Land Use | — | Comment acknowledged. | No further action required. |
| 242 | Cindy Mercer | April 16, 2018 | | Submitting the attached letter for the public record. Letter stated that a fallen tree across Rainbow Valley Road East made the road unpassable. Families residing beyond the ERRC emergency access route were unable to leave until the tree was cut and removed from the road through the efforts of local residents. This type of occurrence in this heavily wooded area is not uncommon. Concerns for lack of emergency response plans for residents in the area of the proposed ERRC residing on dead end roads. A total of six families reside beyond the proposed ERRC entrance and why has the County not allocated in their plans a secondary access route for residents to evacuate the area in case of emergency? | Fire Hazards | e-mail from T. Thompson on April 16, 2018 confirming receipt of email. | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the Amended Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 3 | Broadview Strategy Group (Gordon Grainger) - on behalf of Friends of Simcoe Forests | February 28, 2017 | gordon@broadview.email | Concerns with the Odour Assesment. It will require a high degree of odour abatement equipment and technology and will be the OPF at the high end of financial estimates. Placing the facility in the middle of the Freele Forest is an inappropriate use of a County forest and is the result of a flawed process that eliminated industrial lands from consideration. | Odour Siting Process | letter from Warden G. Marshall on March 6, 2017 to confirm receipt of letter and clarify that experts are working on meeting ECA requirements, that the Facilities Characteristic Report does not indicate a preference toward any organics technologies but models various scenarios to help determine design specifications and that the business case would be forth coming. | Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. An Air Quality Impact Assessment was prepared by GHD at the request of the MOECC which is typically reserved for the ECA process. The modelling incorporated anaerobic digestion and composting based on technologies in similar operations within the province. The modelling of odour emissions did not identify any points off the property where discharges of odour may result in an adverse effect based on MOECC standards. MOECC comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the MOECC have no objection to the approval of the official plan amendment and that the technical issues will need to be addressed through the ECA application process. | No further action required. |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|---|----------------|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| 4 | Broadview Strategy Group (Gordon Grainger) - on behalf of Friends of Simcoe Forests | March 13, 2017 | gordon@broadview.email | Concerns with Noise Assessment. While preliminary reports indicate the facility could pass provincial regulations for noise, there is only a .3 dBA margin of error - lower than the threshold of human perception. As there are suggestions in this report that the noise produced could be higher, this suggests the facility will not pass once completed. It is important to understand these concerns would not apply if the County had chosen an industrial site. At best, the County would need to pay for extensive noise abatement, meaning higher costs for all County taxpayers. | Noise | letter from Warden G. Marshall on March 27, 2017 | Maximizing the separation distances between the proposed facility and sensitive receptors was considered as part of the site selection process as well as the development of the site layout. The closest sensitive receptor is a residential dwelling located approximately 370 metres to the southeast of the proposed ERRC footprint. Modeling of potential nuisance effects (i.e., noise, odour) has shown that the ERRC can be designed and operated in conformance with MOECC regulatory requirements. Modeling related to odour and noise as well as potential mitigation measures are discussed in the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. | Air quality (noise/odour) will be assessed through the ECA process (following selection of technology for OPF) which subject to MOECC guidelines and standards |
| 5 | | March 15, 2017 | | Concerned use of County forests for non-forest uses. Why were County forests included in the siting process? There are industrial sites that would be much more appropriate. Concerned about loss of greenspace, traffic increases and air pollution impacts. | Siting Process Environmental Traffic and Road Conditions | letter from Warden G. Marshall on April 3, 2017 | The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC. Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require 2:1 afforestation (replanting) and a Compensation Planting Plan to be completed prior to site plan approval. Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 166 | Ruth McKay and Jim Purnell | May 8, 2017 | 34 Trillium Trail, Coldwater, ON L0K 1E0 | PPS Requirements and EIS (as per Peer Review - see Friends of Simcoe Forests Comments) Sitingmatrix used during part 1-3 process not consistent with requirements of PPS. EIS has not demonstrated that there will be no negative impact of areas provincial interest (i.e. wetlands and wildlife habitat) | Siting Process | --- | The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. | No further action required. |
| | | | | Quality of Life Forest land used for recreational purposes daily and is a critical draw to the area. Facility will result in loss of greenspace and increase in air pollution | Environmental | --- | The Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study recommended that the trail be relocated to the west side of the property in order to avoid natural features such as the wetlands and old growth hemlock. As recommended in the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study, the County will be required to provide 2:1 compensation for the removal of woodland as a result of development. This afforestation is recommended to occur within 5 kilometres of the subject lands and will result in an additional 11 hectares of forest being added to the surrounding area. The 2:1 compensation along with a Compensation Planting Plan will be completed in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the MNRF and NVCA prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require 2:1 afforestation and a Compensation Planting Plan to be completed prior to site plan approval. |
| | | | | Use of County Forests for Non-Forest Uses Inappropriate Siting Process started with 500 sites; why is the County including forests as usable land for industrial purposes? | Land Use | --- | The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC. | No further action required. |
| | | | | Increase in Traffic | Traffic and Road Conditions | --- | Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 6 | Sandra McElwain | April 20, 2017 | 2039 Crosslands Road, RR1, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | --- | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 7 | Laura Bayly | April 23, 2017 | laurajeanbayly@rogers.com | "We do not want you to approve a Waste Management Site INSIDE A FOREST!! We have lots of unused industrial land. Our forests are necessary for oxygen, nature and recreation. Why would you destroy our forest for a Waste Management Site????!! Please act in the best interest of the environment and the people. We don't need another forest destroyed. It belongs to the people! Please do the right thing." | Siting Process Environmental | e-mail from R. McCullough on May 26, 2017 | Comment acknowledged. | No further action required. |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 8 | R. W. Wagner | April 24, 2017 | 2928 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter 6. Numerous industrial-zoned sites available in the County which would result in equal or greater savings in garbage transportation costs | Siting Process Environmental | — | The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 212 | Mary Wagner and Robert Wagner | May 18, 2017 - 7:24 am | | Concerned about safety of their home and surrounding properties. Chose to build in the interior of the forest and have a long driveway to access road. Tour of Guelph facility arranged by County staff for nearby landowners confirmed that fires are a common occurrence. In 2014 a facility smaller than the ERRC burned to the ground after 16 hour battle and that facility had fire protections in place. This facility should be located on an industrial site better suited to deal with fires and better access for emergencies. Cannot locate an emergency response plan that address evacuation routes for residents nor County's plan to upgrade roads for better access to the neighbouring properties at risk. | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the site and surrounding community]), layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of an Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 213 | Mary Wagner | May 18, 2017 - 7:48 am | | Concerns after walking the site with Jim Dougan and Bob Bowles. Observed salamander egg masses in several locations and amphibian pools that were not considered by the County consultants. The County is in receipt of a copy of the peer review comments on the EIS. | Environmental | — | Additional field work was undertaken by the County's consultants, GHD, in 2017 which included amphibian calling surveys, bat surveys, snag tree densities, updating vegetation inventory and stick nest survey. The original EIS was amended with these findings. The Amended Scoped EIS has been reviewed by the MNRF and NVCA and both agencies have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 214 | Mary Wagner | May 18, 2017 - 7:58 am | | County stated that rather than go to a Stage 4 Archaeological Assessment, the find was to remain in-situ and possible fencing of the site would take place. The find resulted in moving the facility footprint. Please advise if the archaeological study has been updated to account for the movement of the footprint. Also, have the roadways been subject to the archaeological assessment? The presence of the find and the church and graveyard would indicate that this forest could have been a community at one time. | Archaeological | — | Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment has been received and entered into the Ministry's records. The Stage 3 report incorporated the relocated facility footprint. A Stage 4 Archaeological Assessment is required and will be completed prior to site plan approval to protect the site in-situ. Cultural Heritage Evaluation will be completed for the stone foundation prior to site plan approval. No other archaeological resources were recorded on the property. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Cultural Heritage Evaluation prior to site plan approval. |
| 215 | | May 18, 2017 - 8:16 am | | Reviewed the revised map from County staff advising of the change in the footprint resulting from the archaeological find. The movement placed the facility closer to my home reducing my setback to less than 300 metres. The west neighbour to the Freele Forest has a 10 acre building lot that is intended for their retirement home. The change in the footprint put the property line of her residential lot within 100 metres of footprint. This residential lot should have been considered in the original site planning. The significant environmental findings may change the footprint again. | Facility Footprint | — | Maximizing the separation distances between the proposed facility and sensitive receptors was considered as part of the site selection process as well as the development of the site layout. Following the revised facility footprint, the closest sensitive receptor is a residential dwelling located approximately 370 metres to the southeast of the proposed ERRC footprint. The facility footprint was not revised as a result of the further environmental field work undertaken in 2017. The neighbouring vacant lot to the west has been identified in the Amended Facility Characteristic Report however, no sensitive receptor is currently located on property. | Air quality (noise/odour) will be assessed through the ECA process (following selection of technology for OPF) which subject to MOECC guidelines and standards |
| 220 | Robert W. Wagner | June 26, 2017 | | Proposed Re-Location What is the proposed location of the relocated OFSC snowmobile trail and its distance from nearby residences? Why would trail need to be relocated rather than having it next to the proposed road? Noise and Traffic Noise and ATV traffic would result in negative impact on neighbours quality of life Consultation Process Were neighbours informed of trail re-location? Is it true that Mr. McCullough denied neighbour's request to participate in meeting with Ontario Federation of Snowmobilers Club (OFSC)? | Snowmobile Trail | — | Relocation of the OFSC trail is not part of the planning process. Consulting with the public or nearby landowners on trail construction or relocation is not typically undertaken by County Forestry staff. The Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study recommended that the trail be relocated to the west side of the property in order to avoid natural features such as the wetlands and old growth hemlock. | County Forestry staff to consult with GHD biologists on the proposed trail relocation to the western side of the property and will incorporate the suggested mitigation measures in the Amended Scoped EIS. |
| 222 | | June 28, 2017 | | When will the business cases be available? What are the County's plan for ERRC expansion in the future and how will this be addressed in the business cases? What additional field work was completed by environmental consultants - the Township and County received a very thorough peer review of the EIS by Dougan and Associates. | Business Cases Environmental | letter from R. McCullough on July 13, 2017 | Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. The ERRC is sized to accommodate current and future growth projections for the County until 2049. Additional field work was undertaken by the County's consultants, GHD, in 2017 which included amphibian calling surveys, bat surveys, snag tree densities, updating vegetation inventory and stick nest survey. The original EIS was amended with these findings. The Amended Scoped EIS has been reviewed by the MNRF and NVCA and both agencies have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 237 | Mary Wagner | March 6, 2018 - 8:29 am | | Facility will be located in the proposed Greenbelt expansion area | Environmental | — | Draft study area for potential Greenbelt Expansion was released in early 2018. This is a draft study area with no proposed or approved policies to date. | No further action is required. |
| 238 | | March 6, 2018 - 1:40pm | | Excerpt from MMA webpage regarding infrastructure in the Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan noting that it is permitted if it serves a significant growth and economic development expected in southern Ontario. Locating infrastructure in the Natural Heritage System, key natural or hydrologic features/areas is discouraged wherever possible. Where there is no alternative, impacts on the features and their functions must be mitigated/minimized. The updated studies by GHD are not consistent with the provincial policy and the facility belongs in an urban or developed setting. | Environmental | — | Amended Planning Justification Report discusses the key heritage feature policies of the Growth Plan 2017. The original Planning Justification Report was completed prior to the in-effect date of the Growth Plan in July 2017. Letter received from Ministry of Municipal Affairs dated November 15, 2017 confirms that the ERRC is considered 'infrastructure' as defined by the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement and therefore is exempt from Growth Plan policy 4.2.3.1. | No further action is required. |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|----------------------|----------------|---|--|---------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 239 | Mary Wagner | March 23, 2018 | | Several comments have been provided on fire concerns at similar waste management facilities. Fire within this forest poses a threat to homes, livestock and residents that have no egress due to a single access road from their homes to a place of safety. Please involve the fighting MERF fires combined with the experts in fighting forest fires. Please advise if you have consulted and budgeted for the upgrades to roads to withstand the equipment to fight a fire of this nature. Please advise if you have considered what the impact will be to the environment and waterways when such a fire is battled with chemicals and large volumes of water. | Environmental | letter from T. Thompson on March 29, 2018 | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 243 | | April 19, 2018 | 2928 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Phelpsston, ON L0L 2K0 | "I respectfully request to know the provincial staff that have consulted and determined that the proposed ERRC on this site is exempt from the prohibition 4.2.3.1. I have spoken with MOECC district staff today, April 19th and they do not presently have a record of this consultaion." | Environmental | — | Letter received from Ministry of Municipal Affairs dated November 15, 2017 confirms that the ERRC is considered 'infrastructure' as defined by the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement and therefore is exempt from Growth Plan policy 4.2.3.1. | No further action is required. |
| 245 | Robert Wagner | May 3, 2018 | | Letter to Premier Wynne providing an overview of the project, residents concerns and planning policy documents such as the Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan. | Land Use Environmental | — | Comment acknowledged. | No further action required. |
| 9 | Joram Wilander | April 26, 2017 | 16 Whitfield Crescent, Elmvale, ON L0L 1P0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 10 | Esa Wilander | April 26, 2017 | 1 Pine Hill Drive, RR2, Phelpsston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 11 | Denise Wilander | April 26, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 14 | Beverley King | April 26, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 15 | Kevin Graham | April 26, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 204 | Beverley King | May 16, 2017 | 1275 Baseline Road, Phelpsston, ON L0L 2K0 | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 205 | Kevin Graham | May 16, 2017 | | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 16 | Clifford Graham | April 26, 2017 | 607-329 Blake Street, Barrie, ON L4M 1L2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 17 | Ann Truyens | April 27, 2017 | 1352 Old Barrie Road West, Oro-Medonte, ON L0L 2L0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 20 | Peter Macleod | April 27, 2017 | 13 Moran Street, Phelpsston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 21 | Krista Reynolds | April 27, 2017 | 1487 Gill Road, Midhurst, ON L9X 1M5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 22 | Doug Drinkill | April 27, 2017 | 16850 County Road 27, Tiny, ON L0L 1P1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 23 | Cassandra Rutherford | April 28, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 65 | Peter Rutherford-Epp | April 29, 2017 | 14 Oren Boulevard, Barrie, ON L4N 4M1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 66 | Dinah Rutherford-Epp | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 184 | Bryn Epp | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 24 | Morgan Theriault | April 28, 2017 | 2 Moon Crescent, Oro-Medonte, ON L0K 1N0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 91 | Shannon Gardiner | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 27 | Dennis Kavaratzis | April 28, 2017 | 57 Hillview Crescent, Midhurst, ON L9X 1N3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 28 | Walter Kamel | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 32 | Sonia Kamel | April 29, 2017 | 33 Ironwood Trail, Coldwater, ON L0K 1E0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 29 | Kadweje | April 29, 2017 | 9 Admiral Crescent, Angus, ON L0M 1B4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 98 | Jason Ough | April 30, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 30 | Romain Pelletier | April 29, 2017 | 18 Horsfield Drive, Barrie, ON L4N 7X8 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 31 | Melissa Price | April 29, 2017 | Apt. 303, 80 Little Avenue, Barrie, ON L4N 7P9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 33 | Katelyn Joseph | April 29, 2017 | 47 Gibbon Drive, Barrie, ON L4N 6K8 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 34 | Kevin Joseph | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 35 | Doug Mason | April 29, 2017 | 56 Cloreghley Drive, Barrie, ON L4N 9T7 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 36 | Rob O'Neill | April 29, 2017 | 19 Maplewood Parkway, Oro-Medonte, ON L3V 0K2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 49 | Julie O'Neill | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 37 | Julia Melchiorre | April 29, 2017 | 16 Green Mountain Court, Oro-Medonte, ON L0L 2L0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 38 | Jeff and Melissa Snow | April 29, 2017 | not provided | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 39 | Chris Stewart | April 29, 2017 | 2022 Penetanguishene Road, RR1, Springwater, ON L4M 4Y8 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 42 | Emma Stewart | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 40 | Elizabeth Voight | April 29, 2017 | 22 Thomson Street, Barrie, ON L4N 1X5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 41 | Colleen Stevens | April 29, 2017 | 2343 South Orr Lake Road, Elmvale, ON L0L 1P0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 94 | Randy Dunlop | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 43 | Shane Van Casteren | April 29, 2017 | 3161 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 44 | Shane VanGreuren | April 29, 2017 | 1529 Gill Road, Midhurst, ON L9X 1M5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 51 | Danielle Mosdell | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 45 | J. Mayarred | April 29, 2017 | 6 Carnoustie Lane, Port Severn, ON L0K 1S0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 46 | Mark Lawson | April 29, 2017 | 1098 Rainbow Valley Road East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 47 | Bob Turner | April 29, 2017 | 13 Forest Hill Drive, Midhurst, ON L9X 0J4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 87 | Nancy Burton | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 48 | Dragomir Tusevljak | April 29, 2017 | 1484 Old Second Road North, RR2, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 50 | Joanne Naccarato | April 29, 2017 | 166 Lillian Crescent, Barrie, ON L4N 5X5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 52 | Richard Morden | April 29, 2017 | 61 Browning Trail, Barrie, ON L4N 5A5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 53 | Mr. Price | April 29, 2017 | 116 Oren Blvd, Barrie, ON L4N 4M2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 74 | Marlene Price | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 54 | M. Misener | April 29, 2017 | 80 Idlewood Drive, Midhurst, ON L9X 0M5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 55 | Jim Wilson | April 29, 2017 | 30 Thomson Street, Barrie, ON L4N 1X5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 56 | Shayla Morris | April 29, 2017 | 126 Bell Farm Road, Barrie, ON L4M 6J3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 57 | Jackson Murduff | April 29, 2017 | 37 Belmont Crescent, Midhurst, ON L9X 0L4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 58 | Nick Maraschiello | April 29, 2017 | 15 Moran Street, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 59 | Donna Mackay | April 29, 2017 | 145 Hanmer Sreet East, Barrie, ON L4M 6W2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 60 | Jessica Maredo | April 29, 2017 | 250 Kozlov Street, Barrie, ON L4N 6R5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 61 | Ryan MacNaughton | April 29, 2017 | 6 Hillview Crescent, Midhurst, ON L9X 1N4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 62 | Aleks Jedrzejowski | April 29, 2017 | 18 Lloyd Cook Drive East, Minesing, ON L9X 0H5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 64 | Greg Jedrzejowski | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 63 | Donna Jackson | April 29, 2017 | 38 Slalom Drive, Oro-Medonte, ON L0K 1N0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 78 | Angela Cudmore | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 67 | Alex Rutrevich | April 29, 2017 | 2009 Wharencliffe Road South, London, ON N6P 1K9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 68 | Heather J. Rutherford | April 29, 2017 | 1484 Flos Road 3 East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|------------------------|-------------------|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 201 | Heather J. Rutherford | May 12, 2017 | 1484 Flos Road 3 East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | <p>Regular Occurance These facilities are infamous for fires, as was confirmed at the tour organized by Council</p> <p>Sprinklers When asked about risk of placing facility in a forest, the consultant indicated that buildings would be sprinklered. Notes that in 2014, a smaller facility, the Bertram Industrial Park (which was sprinklered), burnt to the ground and took 16 hours to extinguish, required 150,000 gallons of water, 19 apparatuses and 75 firefighters</p> <p>Evacuation Routes To the north is rainbow Valley Rd, Base Line Rd, and Flos Rd 3 E - all under 1 mile of the Freele Tract. This would make evacuation of the roads north and east of the property almost impossible if a fire were to occur</p> <p>No evacuation routes discussed in plans; suggests upgrading roads to provide an evacuation route</p> <p>All sites toured by neighbours were located on Industrial lands, where precautions are made to ensure separations from buildings, hard topped with easy access onto the site</p> <p>On proposed forested lands, added risk of fire spreading to neighbouring properties and household</p> | Fire Hazards | — | <p>MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval.</p> | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 69 | Joe Ryan | April 29, 2017 | 18 Morgan Heights Drive, Huntsville, ON P1H 1B7 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 70 | Becky Huber | April 29, 2017 | 2331 South Orr Lake Road, Elmvale, ON L0L 1P0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 71 | Sue Rauth | April 29, 2017 | 151 Yonge Street, Toronto, ON M5C 2W7 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 72 | Yvonne Patey | April 29, 2017 | 112 Birkhall Place, Barrie, ON L4N 0K1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 73 | Nathan Saunders | April 29, 2017 | 1373 Gill Road, Midhurst, ON L9X 1M3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 75 | Sue Rauth | April 29, 2017 | 341 Ashdale Avenue, Toronto, ON M4L 2Z1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 76 | Sarah Herr | April 29, 2017 | 11 Cathedral Pine Road, Barrie, ON L4M 4Y8 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 77 | Louise Smith | April 29, 2017 | 51 Huron Woods Drive, Coldwater, ON L0K 1E0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 79 | John Cordell-Kapteyn | April 29, 2017 | 3248 Horseshoe Valley Road, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 80 | John Cooper | April 29, 2017 | 64 Steel Street, Barrie, ON L4M 2E9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 93 | Ingrid Cooper | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 81 | Brenda Chin | April 29, 2017 | 849 Leslie Drive, Innisfil, ON L9S 2C5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 82 | Eleanor Alexander | April 29, 2017 | 19 Queen Street, Apt 6, Barrie, ON L4M 1Y9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 83 | Ann Bouldon | April 29, 2017 | 360 Blake Street, Unit 13, Barrie, ON L4M 1L3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 84 | Terry A. Behan | April 29, 2017 | 29 Whitfield Crescent, Elmvale, ON L0L 1P0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 85 | Angela Baker | April 29, 2017 | 322 Codrington Street, Barrie, ON L4M 1T1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 86 | Unknown | April 29, 2017 | 710 Horton Bay Road, Mayne Island, BC V0N 2J2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 89 | Toby Siclarey | April 29, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 88 | Candy Baker | April 29, 2017 | 2764 Telford Line, Severn, ON L3V 6T5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 90 | Unknown | April 29, 2017 | 261 Howard Crescent, Orangeville, ON L9W 4W4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 92 | Matt Daley | April 29, 2017 | 117 Birkhall Place, Barrie, ON L4N 0K1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 95 | Dallas Irwin | April 30, 2017 | 1293 Rainbow Valley Road East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 96 | Stacey Irwin | April 30, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 97 | Louise Fischer-Jenssen | April 30, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 99 | George Fischer-Jenssen | April 30, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 233 | Lisa Bostlund | December 19, 2017 | 1476 Rainbow Valley Road West, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | <p>"OK you people at County of Simcoe it's time for you to step up and protect our lands and Our Natural Heritage needs to be protected.. and that they not be developed to manage garbage. There are existing industrially-zoned sites which would be far more suitable and cost effective.. The employees of our townships have a tax paid duty to protect our lands and our future for a healthy Simcoe county.. You must have some kind of common sense. We can't have this happen to our small amounts of Green spaces we have left. It is not just a protection of a Simcoe forest but of our Ontario and our Canada. Thank you for your time and hopefully your good wisdom..."</p> | Siting Process Environmental | e-mail from S. Mack on December 20, 2017 | <p>The siting selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites.</p> <p>The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC.</p> | No further action required. |
| 100 | Rosemary Shoreman | April 30, 2017 | 1385 Baseline Road, RR1, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 101 | Michael Shoreman | April 30, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 202 | Rosemary Shoreman | May 16, 2017 | | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 203 | Unknown | May 16, 2017 | 1385 Baseline Road, RR1, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 218 | Michael and Rosemary Shoreman | June 14, 2017 | | Concerned about safety of their home and surrounding properties. Chose to build in the interior of the forest and have a long driveway to access road. Tour of Guelph facility arranged by County staff for nearby landowners confirmed that fires are a common occurrence. In 2014 a facility smaller than the ERRC burned to the ground after 16 hour battle and that facility had fire protections in place. This facility should be located on an industrial site better suited to deal with fires and better access for emergencies. Cannot locate an emergency response plan that address evacuation routes for residents nor County's plan to upgrade roads for better access to the neighbouring properties at risk. To date we have been unable to locate any type of emergency response plan that addresses evacuation routes for residents on neighbouring dead-end roads. | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 102 | | May 1, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 219 | Joseph Hermann | June 26, 2017 | 10 Pine Hill Drive, RR1, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Based on his calculations, Mr. Hermann alleges that there is an inadequate supply of water for fire protection | Fire Hazards | e-mail from T. Thompson on July 7, 2017 | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 103 | Christine Forsyth | May 1, 2017 | 4880 Concession 2, RR2, New Lowell, ON L0M 1N0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 104 | Logan Dunlop | May 1, 2017 | 1027 Peter Street West, RR1, Midland, ON L4R 4K3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 120 | Wendy Dunlop | May 3, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 105 | Nicholas Van Casteren | May 1, 2017 | 3066 and 3088 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter 6 . County forest is designated Greenland in the County Official Plan and should be protected - no justification for putting an industrial use on Greenlands designated land. | Siting Process Environmental Land Use | — | The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 106 | Linda Van Casteren | May 1, 2017 | | * Form Letter 6 . County forest is designated Greenland in the County Official Plan and should be protected - no justification for putting an industrial use on Greenlands designated land. | Siting Process Environmental Land Use | — | The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|----------------|--|--|
| 107 | Karen L. Smith | May 1, 2017 | 29 Lawrence Avenue, Minesing, ON L9X 0W4 | <p>Flooding No sewer services on site will entail the construction of a holding pond for leachate. During times of excessive rainfall (frequent in the area), water will overflow into wetlands immediately below site (via Matheson Creek which flows through the Minesing Wetlands).</p> <p>Noise and Light Contamination Caused by heavy trucks accessing site every few minutes during the day and security lights at night</p> <p>Dust, Odour and Oil Due to nature of operation and the garage, which will eventually be built on-site</p> <p>Wildlife Corridor A herd of deer is frequently seen here; the noise and vehicular traffic, along with the fencing, would almost certainly be disruptive to existing wildlife</p> | Environmental | — | <p>The facility footprint and access road are approximately 5.5 hectares in area with the 78.5 hectares of the property to remain forested. The Amended Facility Characteristic Report identified stormwater management controls and best management practices to be implemented on the site and the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study recommended mitigation measures to avoid potential impacts on natural heritage features during construction.</p> <p>Lighting impacts will be mitigated by using down-cast, low-wattage and motion-active lights on the site. The proposed hours of operation from 6am to 7pm will also mitigate the risks associated with light pollution. The buffering of the existing woodland between the facility and existing livestock operations on the northern side of Rainbow Valley Road East will aid preventing any lighting impacts.</p> <p>Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment.</p> | <p>Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval.</p> <p>Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval.</p> |
| | | | | <p>Common Occurrence: Each operation of this nature has had numerous fires, including one in Springwater that burn the facility completely</p> <p>Cost: There would be a considerable cost to the residents of Springwater due to the necessity of upgrading their fire fighting capacity</p> | Fire Hazards | — | <p>MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval.</p> <p>Costs related to fire prevention measures at the facility will be assumed by the County. The County will work with the Township Fire and Emergency Services staff to ensure that training and access requirements are met.</p> | <p>Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval.</p> |
| | | | | <p>Increase in Traffic and Dangerous Road Conditions Substantially increasing traffic on an already dangerous highway due to blind, steel hills, and is already heavily trafficked due to subdivisions</p> | Traffic and Road Conditions | — | <p>Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment.</p> | <p>Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval.</p> |
| | | | | <p>County forests should not be considered as a viable option for the construction of industrial facilities and should have been excluded from the selection process</p> | Land Use | — | <p>The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites.</p> | <p>No further action required.</p> |
| | | | | <p>Cost-Analysis There has not been a true cost analysis done on this project to date</p> <p>Proximity to Businesses/Homes Extreme proximity to businesses and homes should have excluded the site</p> <p>EIS (as per Peer Review - see Friends of Simcoe Forests Comments) EIS has not demonstrated that there will be no negative impact to areas of provincial interest (wetlands and wildlife habitat)</p> | Siting Process | — | <p>The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites.</p> <p>The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC.</p> | <p>Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval.</p> <p>Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval.</p> |
| 231 | | December 18, 2017 | | <p>Another winter storm; another problem on Horseshoe Valley Road. Large trucks not able to make it up the hill; long line of cars waiting - another reason why the chosen site for the MMF is unsuitable. Recently, an endangered species was found at the site by a very well qualified naturalist - the little brown bat requires no trees be cut in the habitat it frequents. Re-examine the decision to site the facility on the property as there are too many cons than pros. Find a more suitable site.</p> | <p>Siting Process Environmental Traffic and Road Conditions</p> | — | <p>Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment.</p> <p>Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment.</p> | <p>Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval.</p> <p>Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval.</p> |
| 109 | Karen Koorneef | May 2, 2017 | 1336 Rainbow Valley Road East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 194 | Chris White | May 9, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 197 | Amanda Henderson | May 9, 2017 | 1336 Rainbow Valley Road East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 110 | Stan Ste Croix | May 2, 2017 | 215 Huronia Road, Barrie, ON L4N 5G2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 111 | John and Wendy Rumney | May 2, 2017 | 9 Maltman Court, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 112 | James Madore | May 2, 2017 | 4 Brillinger Drive, Wasaga Beach, ON L9Z 1L4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|--|-------------------|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| 113 | Frank Gerrits | May 2, 2017 | 1038 Gill Road, Midhurst, ON L9X 1L9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 114 | G. Claeu | May 3, 2017 | 120 James Street, Barrie, ON L4N 6X9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 115 | Amy Corbin | May 3, 2017 | 50 Diamond Valley Drive, Oro-Medonte, ON L0L 2E0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 116 | Celine Laurin | May 3, 2017 | 1205 Baseline Road, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 119 | Rejean Guerin | May 3, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 206 | Celine Laurin | May 16, 2017 | | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 207 | Rejean Guerin | May 16, 2017 | | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 221 | Celine Laurin, Rejean Guerin and Miguel Guerin | June 26, 2017 | 1205 Baseline Road, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | How is County planning on dealing with odour problem? This was an issue plaguing City of Hamilton due to rule introduced by province in 2016 that requires compost to be 40 per cent moisture or greater when cured. See article "Hamilton wants out of environmental regulations around smelly compost facility" (May 23, 2017) | Odour | — | Maximizing the separation distances between the proposed facility and sensitive receptors was considered as part of the site selection process as well as the development of the site layout. The closest sensitive receptor is a residential dwelling located approximately 370 metres to the southeast of the proposed ERRC footprint. Modeling of potential nuisance effects (i.e., noise, odour) has shown that the ERRC can be designed and operated in conformance with MOECC regulatory requirements. Modeling related to odour and noise as well as potential mitigation measures are discussed in the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. | Air quality (noise/odour) will be assessed through the ECA process (following selection of technology for OPF) which subject to MOECC guidelines and standards |
| | | | | How is County addressing high fire risk associated with OPF and MMF plants? Should a fire happen, it would block the only emergency access road Rainbow Valley Road E/Baseline Road. Does the County/Township have an Emergency Response Plan in place that addresses evacuation routes? Will County/Township take full responsibility should a forest fire spread to neighbouring residents? | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Add policy to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 117 | | May 3, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 232 | Tim and Judy Knight | December 19, 2017 | 52 Lawrence Avenue, Anten Mills, ON L9X 0C6 | Converting a valuable forestry ecosystem into an industrial processing plant is extremely poor and frankly irresponsible idea. The Freele Tract is recognized an important habitat for wildlife and contains a wetland area that provides breeding grounds for amphibians and many other animals. Wetlands are vital groundwater filters. Putting a recycling plant into the middle of a forest, in an area that is lacking industrial infrastructure not only poses an environmental risk but sets a dangerous precedent for industrial development in other forests in the County. There are already zoned industrial sites that would make more sense. Others have noted a ongoing fire risk. Traffic is increasingly busy along Horseshoe Valley Road and adding more trucks will bring noise and safety issues. | Fire Hazards Traffic and Road Conditions Siting Process | e-mail from S. Mack on December 19, 2017 | Although the overall direction has been to secure, grow, and manage forest tracts throughout our region since 1922, the County takes into account changing land use priorities. County Forests are privately-owned by the County of Simcoe and mandated as working forests. They are not Crown Land and, as working forests, the County can choose to designate sections for purposes other than timber management. This flexibility allows the County to balance usage of these properties for a wide variety of recreational activities as well as other productive and economic uses. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The facility footprint is located more than 180 metres from the wetland feature to the northeast. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. The site selection process considered a comprehensive list of County-owned properties, privately-owned properties available for sale, and properties owned by willing vendors through a Request for Expression of Interest process. The site selection process considered a broad range of evaluation criteria that were developed based on the requirements of the proposed ERRC. MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 118 | Louise Thom | May 3, 2017 | 18 Wolfe Street, Penetanguishene, ON L9M 1B9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|----------------|------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
| 121 | L. Walton | May 4, 2017 | 19 Deborah Road, Elmvale, ON L0L 1P0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 122 | Pauline St. Onge | May 4, 2017 | 3523 McNutt Road, Barrie, ON L4M 4Y8 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 123 | Ernest Stefaniuk | May 4, 2017 | 1996 North Orr Lake Road, Elmvale, ON L0L 1P0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 124 | Vicky Elvald | May 4, 2017 | 47 Stunden Lane, Barrie, ON L4N 0H1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 125 | Gary Weir | April 29, 2017 | 539 Baseline Road, Tiny, ON L4R 0R3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 126 | E. Troughton | May 4, 2017 | 5807 Vasey Road, RR1, Wyebridge, ON L0L 2E0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 127 | C. Doucett | May 4, 2017 | 11 Pine Street, Waubaushe, ON L0K 2C0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 128 | Lee Patton | May 4, 2017 | 174 Manly Street, Midland, ON L4R 3B9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 129 | Kola Phillips | May 9, 2017 | 3 Pine Drive, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 130 | Kyle Nudds | May 5, 2017 | 25 Monique Crescent, Barrie, ON L4M 6Y3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 131 | Gabriel Chartrand | May 5, 2017 | 101 Kozlov Street, Barrie, ON L4N 5L7 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 132 | Holly Bailey | May 5, 2017 | 31 Boyd Crescent, Oro-Medonte, ON L0K 1N0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 145 | A. Dunlop | May 5, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 133 | Robyn Nash | May 5, 2017 | 21-28 Donald Street, Barrie, ON L4N 4S6 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 134 | Maryse Dunlop | May 5, 2017 | 9 Duncan Drive, Moonstone, ON L0K 1N0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 135 | Edward and Scarlett Krajcir | May 5, 2017 | 1286 Rainbow Valley Road East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Industrial Sites Better Equipped An industrial property requires proper infrastructure including emergency response, environmental design to encourage fire suppression, and water supply and discharge that is linked to appropriate sewage treatment. | Land Use Siting Process | — | County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | County Forestry Policies 82% of County-owned sites considered for the facility were forested; this is contrary to forestry policies outlined on Simcoe County website | | | | | Siting Process | — | The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. | | | | |
| | | | | PPS Requirements and EIS (as per Peer Review - see Friends of Simcoe Forests Comments) Sitingmatrix used during part 1-3 process not consistent with requirements of PPS. EIS has not demonstrated that there will be no negative impact of areas provincial interest (i.e. wetlands and wildlife habitat) | | | | | | | | | Traffic and Road Conditions | — | Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| | | | | Rainbow Valley Rd E as Access to Site Inconsistent statements from County to not use Rainbow Valley Rd E as access/egress from the forest during development of the site, yet all Winter/Fall of 2016-2017, the County has used the road to access the site Backroads Cannot Support Extra Traffic Parking vehicles on the driven portion of the roadway in an unsafe manner and putting extra stress on the road surface which is gravel and now full of pot holes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Light and Noise Impact on Horses Facility's lights at night will impact the natural breeding cycles of mares. Noise of dump trucks, construction equipment, ventilation systems and crushers will be heard constantly in an area that is now silent. The constant noise will disrupt the development of horses, who are naturally highly susceptible to startle. Constant state of heightened stimulus and hyper vigilance will impede development of foals and conception rates and growth rates of mares | — | Lighting impacts will be mitigated by using down-cast, low-wattage and motion-active lights on the site. The proposed hours of operation from 6am to 7pm will also mitigate the risks associated with light pollution. The buffering of the existing woodland between the facility and existing livestock operations on the northern side of Rainbow Valley Road East will aid preventing any lighting impacts. | Air quality (noise/odour) will be assessed through the ECA process (following selection of technology for OPF) which subject to MOECC guidelines and standards. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 136 | | | | Anke Heaton | May 5, 2017 | 21 Willow Drive, Barrie, ON L4N 8T1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | |
| 141 | | | | Marcel Heaton | May 5, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | |
| 137 | Elizabeth Jackson | May 5, 2017 | 58 Commonwealth Road, Barrie, ON L4M 0E1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 138 | Margaret Jackson | May 5, 2017 | 92 Monarchy Street, Barrie, ON L4M 0E3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 140 | Sandra Jackson | May 5, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |
| 139 | Daniel Joyes | May 5, 2017 | 46 Penton Drive, Barrie, ON L4N 7A3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 | | | | | | | | |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|---|----------------|--|---|---------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| 142 | Peter Stibbard | May 5, 2017 | 19 Commonwealth Road, Barrie, ON L4M 0E1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 143 | Mark Schelling | May 5, 2017 | 118 Sundew Drive, Barrie, ON L4N 9M2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 144 | F. Gala | May 5, 2017 | 8 Fredrick Street, Barrie, ON L4N 2L5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 146 | Megan Dunlop | May 5, 2017 | 40 Lauder Road, Oro-Medonte, ON L0L 2L0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 147 | H. Denney | May 5, 2017 | 223 Wellington Street East, Barrie, ON L4M 2C9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 148 | Deborah Elvald | May 6, 2017 | 6 Kenwell Crescent, Barrie, ON L4N 0A4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 149 | Marion Collins | May 6, 2017 | 144 Simcoe Road, Bradford, ON L3Z 1Y2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 151 | Larry Murray | May 6, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 150 | Neil and Barbara Bower | May 6, 2017 | 5 Pine Hill Drive, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 152 | Marlene Galloway | May 6, 2017 | 65 Jagges Drive, Barrie, ON L4N 0W8 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 153 | Alfred Dunlop | May 6, 2017 | 1217 Golf Course Road, Minesing, ON L9X 0Y6 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 154 | Brenda Dunlop | May 6, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 155 | John Orange | May 7, 2017 | 9 Pinehurst Lane, Minesing, ON L9X 0C7 | Use of Forest Tracts for Industrial Activity I would ask that council should reflect on whether the proposal to utilize County Forests for industrial purposes is: -consistent with its public statements and policies; -will undermine the confidence of the residents of Simcoe in its Council; -is fair and reasonable to those residents who have relied on the status of the County Forest promoted by the County in the past; and -is the only viable option that exists to accommodate such as facility | Siting Process | — | County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. | No further action required. |
| | | | | Environmental Technology Industrial Park By selecting an appropriately serviced industrial site, Council could use the ERRC as an anchor tenant for an Environmental Technology Industrial Park that would utilize existing resources in the County, provide an incubator to support new technologies and attract established businesses in the environmental field. Such an initiative would preserve the existing agricultural land and provide job and career opportunities in the local economy. Benefit to the County is employment, increased industrial base, increased tax base and a leadership position in emerging technology Business Case Organic waste processing facility may not be financially viable (ex. Astoria facility in Belleville) | Land Use | — | County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. | No further action required. |
| | | | | | Siting Process | — | Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. | No further action required. |
| 160 | Pamela Orange | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 156 | Rocco and Teresa Corriero | May 7, 2017 | 2007 Highway 26, Minesing, ON L0L 1Y2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 157 | Margaret Prophet | May 8, 2017 | 36 Hillview Crescent, Midhurst, ON L9X 1N4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 158 | Margaret and Dan Oschefska | May 8, 2017 | 1402 Gill Road, RR1, Midhurst, ON L9X 1M9 | Wildlife and forestry will be destroyed Impact on community's water source | Environmental | — | Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. Confirmation was provided by the Township's Risk Management Official (RMO) in a letter dated March 7, 2018 stating that the facility would not be a significant drinking water threat according to Ontario's Clean Water Act (CWA). In siting the facility, the County incorporated criteria from the Source Protection Plan to avoid vulnerable areas. The facility footprint is located in a low area of vulnerability in a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area. The County has planned to protect groundwater resources through measures included in the Amended Facility Characteristic Report even though these are not required by the Source Protection Plan or CWA. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. Incorporate recommended groundwater protections as recommended in Amended Facility Characteristics Report as conditions of site plan approval. |
| | | | | Location is on a hill; can see many accidents happening as roads tend to get icy and dangerous during the winter Increase in noise due to traffic Traffic will impact people who frequent highway via foot, bike, and snowmobile | Traffic and Road Conditions | — | Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 159 | Thomas Oliver | May 8, 2017 | 8410 10th Line, RR2, Barrie, ON L4M 4S4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 183 | John Good | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 161 | AWARE Simcoe submitted by Don Morgan, Chair | May 8, 2017 | aware.simcoe@gmail.com | Alternative Site Recommendation: 540/528 Penetanguishene Rd, Springwater Proximity to major roads (adjacent to Hwy 11, 400, 93) Proximity to Barrie Buffered on 3 sides Partnerships and Opportunities for Innovation (partnering with Georgian College/research groups to use the property's topsoil for urban gardens, demonstrate crop production techniques/solar power/low impact development groundwater techniques) *New environmental facility should be showcased in central location, not hidden on protected greenlands | Land Use | — | County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. The siting of the facility footprint will enable the County to meet the required setbacks from sensitive receptors with woodland to buffer any potential impacts. | No further action required. |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|--|---|----------------|---|---|
| 162 | Suzanne Carlaw | May 8, 2017 | 2 Trillium Trail, RR4, Coldwater, ON L0K 1E0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 163 | Helen Carswell | May 8, 2017 | 2008 Highway 26, Minesing, ON L0L 1Y2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 164 | Todd Oliver | May 8, 2017 | 8394 10th Line, RR2, Barrie, ON L4M 4S4 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 165 | Marissa Marcotte | May 8, 2017 | 42 Davies Crescent, Barrie, ON L4M 2M3 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 172 | Terry Mercer | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 167 | Charlotte Fuller | May 8, 2017 | 14 Pine Hill Drive, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 171 | Sean Fuller | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 168 | Paul Miller | May 8, 2017 | 11545 Simcoe County Road 27, Midhurst, ON L9X 0M2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 169 | Lori Sheffer | May 8, 2017 | 1223 Crossland Road, Minesing, ON L0L 1Y0 | Simcoe County Forests which were set apart as protected land should not be a viable option for the construction of infrastructure and should be excluded from the options. I believe there are better ways to accomplish this than to destroy our wildlife and forests. There doesn't seem to be great consideration towards the many residents who also provide the buffer of protection for these lands. By turning this forest land into a commercial space it would surely have a negative impact on the lives of countless human families. I am disappointed in the lack of adherence and consistency to the decision making process required by the Provincial Policy Statement during the process of Part 1-3. The environmental studies that have been done have not, in my estimation, demonstrated accurately the negative impact on the forest land, the animals and the people who would be directly affected. This due to the desire to push through the County's plan. | Land Use Environmental Siting Process | — | The site selection process is not subject to the Planning Act. The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 170 | Anne Learn Sharpe | May 8, 2017 | 58 Michael Street, Angus, ON L0M 1B5 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 173 | Sue Williams | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 174 | Barry Williams | May 8, 2017 | 1329 St. Vincent Street, Midhurst, ON L9X 0P7 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 175 | Nuwan Wick | May 8, 2017 | 36 Graham Street, Elmvale, ON L0L 1P0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 177 | Jasmine Wilander | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 176 | Y. Park | May 8, 2017 | 12 Chaplin Court, Richmond Hill, ON L4B 2Y1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 178 | Xiaoyan Sun | May 8, 2017 | 18 Gallagher Crescent, Midhurst, ON L9X 0K1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 179 | Jeff Thomlinson | May 8, 2017 | not provided | "Past government fought and acquired these properties for use by the people. As a long standing member of the ofah. And a tax payer I'm am insulted that this project would even be considered. Has no one looked at the records to see what poor management decisions made in the past. Poor land use practices can be devastating. Please consider land that has already been properly designated. Not in my forest." | Land Use | — | Comment acknowledged. | No further action required. |
| 180 | Sherrileen Weld | May 8, 2017 | 12 Pine Hill Drive, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 181 | Aidan Weld Jr. | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 182 | Aidan Weld | May 8, 2017 | | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 185 | Berandette Wells | May 8, 2017 | 11 Maltman Court, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 186 | Maggie Curran | May 9, 2017 | not provided | De-forestation site will result in soil and water flowing downhill into the "already saturated Minesing Wetlands, which in turn will flood areas in Angus" (see attached photos). | Environmental | — | The facility footprint is approximately 8 kilometres from the Minesing Wetlands. The facility footprint and access road are approximately 5.5 hectares in area with the 78.5 hectares of the property to remain forested. The Amended Facility Characteristic Report identified stormwater management controls and best management practices to be implemented on the site and the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study recommended mitigation measures to avoid potential impacts on natural heritage features during construction. | Erosion and sediment control measures will be conditions of site plan approval and stormwater management controls will be reviewed prior to site plan approval. |
| 187 | Linda Chernecki | May 9, 2017 | 1360 River Road East, Wasaga Beach, ON L9Z 2R8 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 188 | Bruce Missen | May 9, 2017 | not provided | "I am writing to you to express my beliefs about the County Forests and their use. I do not believe County forests should be used for garbage transfer sites. I do not believe County forests should be used as the site for new road dept garages. I believe County forests should be used for forestry operations and preserving the natural areas. Industrial uses DO NOT PRESERVE NATURAL AREAS OR PROMOTE FORESTRY!" | Environmental | — | Comment acknowledged. | No further action required. |
| 189 | Annette Bays and Robert Eaton | May 9, 2017 | 2950 Concession Rd 5, Loretto, ON L0G 1L0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 190 | K. Clune | May 9, 2017 | not provided | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 191 | Dustyn Dinsmore | May 9, 2017 | 17 Stokes Drive, RR1, Minesing, ON L0L 1Y0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 192 | Ray Greenhalgh | May 9, 2017 | 26 Rakies Road, Oro-Medonte, ON L0L 2L0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 193 | Chris White Jr. | May 9, 2017 | 24 Centennial Avenue, Elmvale, ON L0L 1P0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 195 | David Strachan | May 9, 2017 | 47 Finlay Mill Road, Midhurst, ON L9X 0N9 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 196 | Bryson Lehman | May 9, 2017 | 4 Stokes Drive, Minesing, ON L0L 1Y0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|--------------------|-------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| 198 | Diane Cole | May 10, 2017 | 1097 Flos Road 3 West, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Increase in Traffic Hazardous Winter Road Conditions Horseshoe Valley Rd is a whiteout in winter | Traffic and Road Conditions | — | Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| | | | | Sets a Precedence Once you allow projects like this to happen, it is setting a precedence to all facilities on other forest sites Inappropriate Location A quiet serene COUNTRY setting not appropriate for large commercial/industrial site Site Capacity Inevitable City of Barrie and Orillia will be coming to this site once their landfills become full | Land Use | — | Although the overall direction has been to secure, grow, and manage forest tracts throughout our region since 1922, the County takes into account changing land use priorities. County Forests are privately-owned by the County of Simcoe and mandated as working forests. They are not Crown Land and, as working forests, the County can choose to designate sections for purposes other than timber management. This flexibility allows the County to balance usage of these properties for a wide variety of recreational activities as well as other productive and economic uses. Each development is evaluated on the details of the project and the planning policies in-effect at the time of application. Infrastructure as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and County Official Plan limit the occurrences and agencies that could potentially develop 'infrastructure' in any designation or land use category. | No further action required. |
| | | | | Increase in Noise Levels | Noise | — | Maximizing the separation distances between the proposed facility and sensitive receptors was considered as part of the site selection process as well as the development of the site layout. The closest sensitive receptor is a residential dwelling located approximately 370 metres to the southeast of the proposed ERRC footprint. Modeling of potential nuisance effects (i.e., noise, odour) has shown that the ERRC can be designed and operated in conformance with MOECC regulatory requirements. Modeling related to odour and noise as well as potential mitigation measures are discussed in the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. | Air quality (noise/odour) will be assessed through the ECA process (following selection of technology for OPF) which subject to MOECC guidelines and standards |
| | | | | Loss of Wildlife and Habitat, Natural Forests (water, hiking trails) | Environmental Snowmobile Trail | — | The Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study recommended that the trail be relocated to the west side of the property in order to avoid natural features such as the wetlands and old growth hemlock. | County Forestry staff to consult with GHD biologists on the proposed trail relocation to the western side of the property and will incorporate the suggested mitigation measures in the Amended EIS. |
| 199 | Bruce Beard | May 10, 2017 | 12036 County Road 27, Midhurst, ON L9X 0M1 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 199 | David Lawrence | May 11, 2017 | 7189 Highway 93, Wyebridge, ON L0K 2E0 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |
| 208 | Illegible | May 16, 2017 | not provided (Rainbow Valley Road/Baseline Road neighbours group) | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 211 | Audrey Fitzpatrick | May 16, 2017 | not provided (Rainbow Valley Road/Baseline Road neighbours group) | Group of neighbours whose homes are located in Freele Tract Facility is fire hazard; only one emergency exit route Asking for details about Emergency Response Plan | Fire Hazards | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 216 | C. Spek | June 7, 2017 | 47 Doran Road, PO Box 59, Midhurst, ON L9X 0L5 | Inappropriate Use of Land Located beside a key agri-tourism market place, on an important tourism destination route, and poorly accessible for fire fighters Suggests looking into alternative sites located on the 400 corridor where road access for materials from Barrie/Orillia can be delivered | Land Use | — | MNRF comments dated May 3, 2018 note that the forest areas surrounding the ERRC are low to moderate risk from a wildland fire. Fire Protection measures for the ERRC are discussed in Section 4.4.1 of the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. This includes details on the overall approach to fire protection, planning (preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan [with input from the Township of Springwater Fire and Emergency Services and guidance documents such as the Ontario FireSmart Manual] and an Emergency Response Plan [including emergency access routes and evacuation plans for the Site and surrounding community]), site layout and construction (addressing requirements of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, Ontario Building Code, and Ontario Fire Code), fire breaks within the Freele Tract and facility operations (procedures for maintenance, staff training, site access, and inspection). An Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan will be prepared in consultation with, and to the satisfaction of, the Township of Springwater prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Emergency Response Plan and Fire Prevention Plan prior to site plan approval. |
| 230 | C. Spek | December 18, 2017 | | "The finding of this endangered bat is reason enough for Simcoe County to put a hold on rezoning. The County is home to many special an endangered species, please obtain the data from Mr. Bob BOWLES, a highly respected field naturalist." | Environmental | — | Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 217 | Marion Davies | June 14, 2017 | 64 Paddy Dunn's Circle, Springwater, ON L9X 0T2 | * Form Letter | Siting Process Environmental | — | * See response in Comment 12 | * See action in Comment 12 |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|--|-------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| 224 | Anonymous | July 20, 2017 | not provided | 1992 Cindy Halliday unsolved murder; contact family re: use of County forest | Miscellaneous | — | County staff contacted the Ontario Provincial Police on numerous occasions by email and phone to confirm if there were any concerns related to the case and the proposal. The County did not receive any correspondence from the police objecting to the proposal. | No further action required. |
| 228 | Jesse Johnson | November 30, 2017 | jesse.johnson@hotmail.ca | "Just curious as to why you would want to destroy beautiful forests and replace them with a garbage facility? You shouldn't only think of the money and contracts involved. Let's start using our brains." | Siting Process Environmental | e-mail from S. Mack on December 1, 2017 | Comment acknowledged. | No further action required. |
| 234 | Donna Deneault | December 21, 2017 | ddeneault88@gmail.com | "We are awaiting tests that could prove this habitat is extremely significant to wildlife. Our Natural Heritage needs to be protected, not developed to manage garbage; especially when there are already existing industrially-zoned sites, which would be far more suitable and cost effective. This is evidenced by the County's recent offer of multiple 100 acre + site options to Amazon. The project will make our roads less safe, as hundreds of trucks will be coming and going on a steep and hilly stretch of road. This forest is critical habitat to species like the brown bat and salamanders. Please select an already existing industrially-zoned site." | Siting Process Environmental | e-mail from J. Fairchild on December 21, 2017 | Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNR and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. The County's bid for the 'Amazon' headquarters included lands that may have been suitable for the development of an office use but would have not met the parameters of developing a facility like the ERRC (setbacks from sensitive receptors, avoidance of agricultural lands, groundwater features etc.) | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 235 | Sher Arminson | January 4, 2018 | sher@shiatsybysher.com | "You need to find an appropriate site other than the Freele Forest, better suited for your industrial project. Our Natural Heritage needs to be protected, not developed to manage garbage. There are existing industrially-zoned sites which would be far more suitable and cost effective, as evidenced by the County's recent offer of multiple 100 acre+ site options to 'Amazon'." | Siting Process Environmental | — | County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. The County's bid for the 'Amazon' headquarters included lands that may have been suitable for the development of an office use but would have not met the parameters of developing a facility like the ERRC (setbacks from sensitive receptors, avoidance of agricultural lands, groundwater features etc.) | No further action required. |
| 108 | Friends of Simcoe Forests Inc. (submitted by Mary Wagner, President) attachments: Dougan & Associates Preliminary Peer Review, dated April 28, 2017 Jennifer Lawrence & Associates letter, dated April 28, 2017 | May 2, 2017 | 2928 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Key findings from Dougan and Associates (DandA) peer review of EIS prepared by GHD Ltd.: Summary: DandA believes that the GHD Ltd.-scoped EIS document does not adequately characterize the study area, provide appropriate interpretation of policy, or discuss impacts and mitigation in sufficient detail. 1. Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) The site meets criteria for several more SWH categories than are indicated in the EIS 2. Significant Woodlands Implications of the Significant Woodland designation are not brought forward into the impact assessment (does not speak to functional attributes which underlie the concept of 'significance') 3. Species at Risk (SAR) Insufficient SAR findings and impact assessment (i.e. no systematic bat surveys conducted); Exec Summ of EIS states no SAR present, but DandA assert that this is incorrect as several Special Concern species are present 4. Vegetation Classification Inaccurate vascular plant identification and Ecological Land Classification (ELC) vegetation classification completed for the Freele Tract, based on both the adequacy of the vascular plant list and the accuracy of the ELC classification; these inadequacies understate the significance of impacts of the proposed facility on the ecological features and functions of the site 5. Invasive Species and Predatory Species Compostable waste would include invasive plant species and pests affiliated that | Siting Process Environmental Land Use | — | The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. The Planning Act does not speak to matters related to a site selection process. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. The selected site requires approval of Official Plan and zoning amendments. These matters create the need to assess the proposed site and applications against the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). This was undertaken and the proposed site and applications were determined to conform to the PPS and Growth Plan 2017 through consultation with the MMA. Further details of this process are provided in the Amended Planning Justification Report. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The determination of 'no negative impact' was evaluated based on the ERRC not resulting in degradation that threatens the health and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions, as per the PPS definition of impact. The Amended Scoped EIS advises how the proposed development demonstrates no negative impact on the habitat of endangered and threatened species and confirmation has been received that MNR has no concerns as it relates to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) provided the proposed mitigation is followed. The Amended Scoped EIS addresses requirements of the PPS as well as other more detailed policy guidance found elsewhere. The site selection and environmental investigations conform to the requirements of the County and Township Official Plans. The review agencies including the MNR and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------------------|---|----------------|--|---|---|----------------|--|--|
| 108 <i>continued</i> | <p>Friends of Simcoe Forests Inc. (submitted by Mary Wagner, President)</p> <p>attachments: Dougan & Associates Preliminary Peer Review, dated April 28, 2017</p> <p>Jennifer Lawrence & Associates letter, dated April 28, 2017</p> <p><i>continued</i></p> | May 2, 2017 | 2928 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | <p>may affect biodiversity of surrounding forest; effects on local wildlife will likely include increases in predatory species, and forest interior habitat will be converted to edge. These effects are not identified or discussed in the EIS</p> <p>6. Adjacent Lands No clear discussion in EIS of Adjacent Lands</p> <p>7. Vehicular Impacts of Facility The EIS does not adequately address the road and traffic impacts - this includes traffic impact of waste management trucks and private vehicles engaged in drop-offs, clearing width for the access road</p> <p>8. Inadequate Details on Site Plan EIS does not include graphic representation of project apart from generic mapping of development footprint; no discussion of potential grading requirements, and no Mitigation Plan</p> <p>9. Water Balance Impacts EIS only makes passing reference to the GHD Hydrogeological Assessment for the ERRC, without a summary of its key findings. The assessment determined that there will be a significant reduction in infiltration due to the impervious character of the proposed development; it provided only generic mitigation measures but did not specifically address how the existing wetland features as sustained today, and will be sustained after development.</p> <p>10. Cumulative Effects EIS indicates facility may be expanded in the future; given high likelihood of expansion, and the constraints identified outside the proposed 4.5ha development site, cumulative effects are likely but not identified or discussed</p> <p>Key findings from Jennifer Lawrence and Associates review of all ERRC Planning Documents: Summary of issues raised with respect to Part 1 EIS documents: 1. Document does not contain sufficient reference to Planning Act and PPS; 2. Screen 1 Evaluation Criteria should have, at minimum, included the avoidance of a habitat of endangered species and threatened species. Without this, it is not consistent with PPS; 3. Screen 1 Evaluation Criteria could have taken a conservative approach and eliminated all sites within the Council approved Greenlands designation; 4. When establishing evaluation criteria, reference is made to technical documents from other Provinces and the United States with no apparent reference to technical documents created pursuant to PPS for evaluating impacts to natural heritage features and functions; 5. Screen 3 evaluation criteria refer to 'no net effects' which is not the same as the 'no negative impact' test established by the PPS. As such, Screen 3 evaluation not consistent with PPS, County of Simcoe OP and Springwater OP</p> <p>Summary of issues raised with respect to Part 2 of EIS documents: 1. Preponderance of County Forests in the list of candidate sites, lack of consideration for natural heritage features such as habitat of endangered and threatened species, significant woodlands and significant wildlife habitat as exclusionary criteria and consideration of 'no net effect' rather than PPS requirement of 'no negative impact' has led to identification of a short-list of sites that may not be consistent with the PPS, County, and local OP policies; 2. Springwater OP policies would suggest that County Forest sites would, at minimum, meet the Natural Heritage (Environmental Protection) Category 2 criteria, however, the mapping has not been updated;</p> <p>3. The County is relying on out-of-date Springwater OP and zoning designations, whereas they need to be brought into conformance with County OP thereby resulting in County Forests having a Greenlands designation at the local level</p> <p>Summary of issues raised with respect to Part 3 of EIS documents: 1. Report concludes that co-locating facilities is appropriate, contrary to a staff recommendation made earlier in the process. Issues raised by staff previously have not been addressed in the report; 2. Report does not provide sufficient discussion with respect to written comments received from public; 3. Evaluation uses a test of no net effects rather than no negative impact; 4. County has not demonstrated that they have adhered to requirements of the PPS throughout the site selection process</p> <p>Neighbourhood Landowner Meeting Notes and Follow-Up, County of Simcoe, September 8, 2016: 1. County stated "we are past the Siting Process and now at the stage of proving the site is viable by the studies done". At the time of the meeting, no ability for public to participate in a legislated process. As such, siting process not complete but rather, still needed to be vetted through Planning Act process. Suggests response provided by County gives erroneous impression that the public has no further say in the site selection process and that they must simply accept the preferred site 2. Given November release of supporting studies, County staff could not have known at time of meeting whether studies supported the preferred site selection. In summary, County response suggests to public that determination of viability has already been made based on Part 1-3 EIS reports, even though they undertook no detailed site investigations of any of the candidate sites</p> | Siting Process Environmental Land Use | — | <p><i>response continued from previous page</i></p> <p>Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS). The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the boundary road network and no roadway improvements are required at any boundary intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West.</p> <p>The various components of the proposed ERRC are presented in the Conceptual Site Plan and outlined in the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. The proposed 4.5 hectare footprint includes buildings and infrastructure that will be sized to accommodate the long-term material management needs of the County.</p> | <i>action addressed on previous page</i> |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 225 | Friends of Simcoe Forests Inc. - represented by Donnelly Law attachments: Jennifer Lawrence & Associates Peer Review, dated June 5, 2017 Dougan & Associates Peer Review, dated June 16, 2017 | August 1, 2017 | 276 Carlaw Avenue, Suite 203, Toronto, ON M4K 3L2 - 8 Fieldgate Street, Dundas, ON L9H 6M6 | <p>Perceived errors in siting methodology, conformance to PPS, impacts to natural heritage features, and inclusion of County forests in the siting process.</p> <p>Demonstration of no negative impacts related to Significant Woodlands, Significant Wildlife Habitat, and habitat of threatened and endangered species has not been completed. Impacts related to traffic and on adjacent lands related to potential future expansion. Changes in runoff patterns as a result of development and impacts to wetlands and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Questions regarding 2017 Growth Plan and applicability to the facility.</p> <p>Impacts to Species at Risk, accuracy of vegetation classification, invasive species and predatory species, water balance, cumulative environmental effects, impacts to vegetation communities, ecological land classifications, watercourse verification, wetland delineation, interpretation of amphibian surveys, breeding bird surveys, wildlife habitat features, species at risk and regionally rare species, preliminary development plan.</p> <p>Consistency with regulatory/policy framework, Springwater Official Plan, County Official Plan, Species at Risk legislation, and the Provincial Policy Statement.</p> | Siting Process Environmental Land Use | — | <p>The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. The Planning Act does not speak to matters related to a site selection process. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. The selected site requires approval of Official Plan and zoning amendments. These matters create the need to assess the proposed site and applications against the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). This was undertaken and the proposed site and applications were determined to conform to the PPS and Growth Plan 2017 through consultation with the MMA. Further details of this process are provided in the Amended Planning Justification Report.</p> <p>Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The determination of 'no negative impact' was evaluated based on the ERRC not resulting in degradation that threatens the health and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions, as per the PPS definition of impact. The Amended Scoped EIS advises how the proposed development demonstrates no negative impact on the habitat of endangered and threatened species and confirmation has been received that MNRF has no concerns as it relates to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) provided the proposed mitigation is followed. The Amended Scoped EIS addresses requirements of the PPS as well as other more detailed policy guidance found elsewhere. The site selection and environmental investigations conform to the requirements of the County and Township Official Plans. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment.</p> <p>Amended Planning Justification Report discusses the key heritage feature policies of the Growth Plan 2017. The original Planning Justification Report was completed prior to the in-effect date of the Growth Plan in July 2017. Letter received from Ministry of Municipal Affairs dated November 15, 2017 confirms that the ERRC is considered 'infrastructure' as defined by the Growth Plan and Provincial Policy Statement and therefore is exempt from Growth Plan policy 4.2.3.1.</p> <p>As noted in the siting process, the facility will be sized to accommodate the County's future growth projections to 2049. This excess capacity will allow the County to potentially take in organics from the Cities of Barrie and Orillia until such time as the County requires the capacity.</p> | <p>Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval.</p> <p>Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval.</p> |
| 236 | Friends of Simcoe Forests Inc. - represented by Dougan & Associates | March 2, 2018 - submitted by Dougan & Associates dated March 5, 2018 - submitted by FoSF dated April 6, 2018 | 77 Wyndham Street South, Guelph, ON N1E 5R3 | <p>Facility will be located in the proposed regional natural heritage system under the Greenbelt Plan and significant woodland - if the Greenbelt Plan is extended in the future to cover this area, Policy 4.2.1.2(h) would prohibit such a use. Facility will cause significant fragmentation of the forested natural heritage system - estimate that 18 ha of forest interior will be eliminated. Habitat for endangered species will be removed. Site contains key hydrologic features and areas and studies to date have not addressed adjacent lands policies beyond the minimum 120 m. Invasive and/or predatory species are likely to be transported or attracted to site. While the proposed facility and access roads will occupy 5.5 ha, the study criteria in the County's One Site, One Solution includes criteria for a 20 ha facility space.</p> | Environment Land Use Groundwater | e-mail from T. Thompson on April 16, 2018 - confirming receipt of FoSF April 6, 2018 e-mail | <p>Draft study area for potential Greenbelt Expansion was released in early 2018. This is a draft study area with no proposed or approved policies to date.</p> <p>The facility footprint is 4.5 hectares and the access road is 1.0 hectare for a total area of 5.5 hectares. Compensation in terms of afforestation will be required at a 2:1 ratio (11 hectares) which will result in the overall net increase to the woodland by 5.5 hectares.</p> <p>The geology and hydrogeology of the Site is summarized in the Updated Hydrogeological Assessment. This includes details related to field investigations, groundwater and surface water monitoring, wetlands/watercourses, source protection, water balance, and impacts to recharge areas and private wells.</p> | <p>Incorporate recommended groundwater protections as recommended in Amended Facility Characteristics Report as conditions of site plan approval.</p> <p>Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval.</p> |
| 244 | Friends of Simcoe Forests Inc. - represented by Jennifer Lawrence & Associates | April 19, 2018 - submitted by Mary Wagner dated April 23, 2018 | 8 Fieldgate Street, Dundas, ON L9H 6M6 | <p>Perceived errors in siting methodology, including lack of appeals process, not following Environment Assessment process, and exemption from Growth Plan policy 4.2.3.1. Conflicts with natural heritage planning policies within the Growth Plan. Concerns with the Planning Justification Report relating to Natural Heritage System mapping, negative impacts under the Provincial Policy Statement, Significant Woodland, Significant Wildlife Habitat, agricultural areas, Greenlands, compensation planting, Environmental Protection Land Categories, amphibian surveys, breeding bird surveys, regulatory/policy framework, and Species at Risk.</p> | Siting Process Environmental Land Use | e-mail from T. Thompson on April 25, 2018 | <p>All review comments received from stakeholders on the preliminary planning reports have been addressed in the revised reports, including the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study, Amended Planning Justification Report, (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report, and Updated Hydrogeological Assessment. Responses to peer review comments are summarized in a separate table.</p> <p>The site selection process considered a broad range of issues and site selection criteria. The Planning Act does not speak to matters related to a site selection process. Although an Environmental Assessment (EA) is not required under the EA Act for this project, elements of this process were adopted to ensure comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders including the public and the application of environmental, technical, and social criteria to the evaluation of more than 500 candidate sites. The selected site requires approval of Official Plan and zoning amendments. These matters create the need to assess the proposed site and applications against the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). This was undertaken and the proposed site and applications were determined to conform to the PPS and Growth Plan 2017 through consultation with the MMA. Further details of this process are provided in the Amended Planning Justification Report.</p> <p>The Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study (EIS) discussed the Natural Heritage System (NHS) mapping in anticipation that it was to be adopted. The NHS mapping for the site did not change between the draft and adopted versions. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped EIS to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The determination of 'no negative impact' was evaluated based on the ERRC not resulting in degradation that threatens the health and integrity of the natural features or ecological functions, as per the PPS definition of impact. The Amended Scoped EIS advises how the proposed development demonstrates no negative impact on the habitat of endangered and threatened species and confirmation has been received that MNRF has no concerns as it relates to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) provided the proposed mitigation is followed. The Amended Scoped EIS addresses requirements of the PPS as well as other more detailed policy guidance found elsewhere. The site selection and environmental investigations conform to the requirements of the County and Township Official Plans. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment.</p> <p>The lands are not located in a prime agricultural area. Even though the subject lands are not located in a prime agricultural area, an Agricultural Impact Assessment Report (AIA) was completed. Impacts to agriculture have been minimized by avoiding land designated for agriculture, locating the facility on lower quality soils, and siting the facility with a vegetative buffer from the agricultural uses to the west.</p> | <p>Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval.</p> <p>Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval.</p> |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|--|---|----------------|---------------------------------|---|--|----------------|---|--|
| Oral Submissions - taken from transcripts during May 9, 2017 County OPA Statutory Public Meeting | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Robert Wagner | May 9, 2017 | 2928 Horseshoe Valley Road West | Concerned about accuracy of information provided in regards to the total facility footprint, feels that the clearing for roadway and for relocation of snowmobile trail are not included. Concerns regarding the calculated peak traffic increase of 6.2% is not representative of the true impact of the types of vehicles that will be going to and from the site. An industrial site would be cheaper to convert and would have required utilities in place. Asked for comparative costs to alternative, industrial locations when cost projections are presented. | Facility Footprint Traffic and Road Conditions Siting Process Business Case | — | The facility footprint is 4.5 hectares and the road access is 1.0 hectare for a total area of 5.5 hectares slated for development. Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment. Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. | No further action required. |
| 2 | Mary Wagner | May 9, 2017 | | The variety of wildlife in the Freele Tract and the recreational users such as cyclists, hikers, horseback riders, and dog walkers that enjoy the forest. Concerned Springwater and Oro-Medonte will be at constant risk for site selection of projects due to the fact they have the most forests. Could not find placement of similar facilities within a forest. Footprint is less than 150 m from people homes - stated other, similar facilities have minimum setbacks of 300 metres. Noise and odour allowances for similar facilities located in industrial areas should not be permitted in the forest. Friends of the Forest Inc. has provided peer reviews in relation to the planning process/site selection and the EIS to Council and staff. | Environmental Loss of Forest Land Use Noise/Odour | — | Maximizing the separation distances between the proposed facility and sensitive receptors was considered as part of the site selection process as well as the development of the site layout. The closest sensitive receptor is a residential dwelling located approximately 370 metres to the southeast of the proposed ERRC footprint. Modeling of potential nuisance effects (i.e., noise, odour) has shown that the ERRC can be designed and operated in conformance with MOECC regulatory requirements. Modeling related to odour and noise as well as potential mitigation measures are discussed in the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. Peer review of EIS was received by staff and provided to County consultants to review. Amended Scoped EIS was completed in early 2018 which included additional environmental surveys. The Amended Scoped EIS was reviewed by the MNRF and NVCA. No objections to the approval of the amendment were received by either agency. Recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. | Air quality (noise/odour) will be assessed through the ECA process (following selection of technology for OPF) which subject to MOECC guidelines and standards. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 3 | Edward Krajcir | May 9, 2017 | 1286 Rainbow Valley Road East | Questioned where in the process the interests of the farming community are considered. Concerned for impact to business and impact to horses - currently breed olympic caliber horses - ambient light and ambient noise affects breeding cycle. Inquired when the final costs and technology will be addressed. <i>Response to Councillor French re. if agricultural community was consulted about impacts</i> : 500 m neighbours were considered and brought in, acknowledged that they did not address farmland problem and issues brought up regarding horses as the potential impacts were not considered until later in the process | Land Use (Impact to local farmers) Noise Light Business Case | — | Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. Maximizing the separation distances between the proposed facility and sensitive receptors was considered as part of the site selection process as well as the development of the site layout. The closest sensitive receptor is a residential dwelling located approximately 370 metres to the southeast of the proposed ERRC footprint. Modeling of potential nuisance effects (i.e., noise, odour) has shown that the ERRC can be designed and operated in conformance with MOECC regulatory requirements. Modeling related to odour and noise as well as potential mitigation measures are discussed in the (Amended) Facility Characteristics Report. Lighting impacts will be mitigated by using down-cast, low-wattage and motion-active lights on the site. The proposed hours of operation from 6am to 7pm will also mitigate the risks associated with light pollution. The buffering of the existing woodland between the facility and existing livestock operations on the northern side of Rainbow Valley Road East will aid preventing any lighting impacts. | Air quality (noise/odour) will be assessed through the ECA process (following selection of technology for OPF) which subject to MOECC guidelines and standards. Lighting requirements will be incorporated into site plan approval. |
| 4 | Edward Krajcir - on behalf of Karen Smith | May 9, 2017 | 29 Lawrence Ave | Mr. Krajcir noted that his comments also represent those of Ms. K. Smith | Land Use (Impact to local farmers) Noise Light Business Case | — | * See response in Comment 3 (Oral) above | * See actions in Comment 3 (Oral) above |
| 5 | Charlotte Fuller | May 9, 2017 | 14 Pine Hill Dr, LOL 2K0 | While there are lots of forests in Simcoe County it does not mean the Freele Tract is not important. Concerned Greenland's are being turned into industrial land use. Concerned if this happens there will be a possibility that other forests will be considered for future industrial uses. | Environmental Loss of Forest | — | Although the overall direction has been to secure, grow, and manage forest tracts throughout our region since 1922, the County takes into account changing land use priorities. County Forests are privately-owned by the County of Simcoe and mandated as working forests. They are not Crown Land and, as working forests, the County can choose to designate sections for purposes other than timber management. This flexibility allows the County to balance usage of these properties for a wide variety of recreational activities as well as other productive and economic uses. Each proposed development is evaluated on the details of the project and the planning policies in-effect at the time of application. Infrastructure as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and County Official Plan limit the occurrences and agencies that could potentially develop 'infrastructure' in any designation or land use category. | No further action required. |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|--|----------------|--|--|--|----------------|--|---|
| 6 | David White - representative for Nick and Lynda Van Casteren, Nicholyn Farms | May 9, 2017 | 3088 Horseshoe Valley Rd West | Concerned about the impact on their lives, property, and business. Commented facility belongs in an industrial area and not near a natural heritage feature. An OMB process was recently completed that resolved green land policies and green land mapping - feels that the facility is industrial and does not comply with the County's Greenlands policies. Concerned business case has not been provided and that it will not provide comparison to other sites. Locate facility in an urban industrial area. | Land Use (Impact to local farmers/businesses) Environmental Siting Process Business Case | — | Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. Extensive fieldwork was carried out as part of the Amended Scoped Environmental Impact Study to determine the potential impacts to the environment (e.g., woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and habitat of endangered/threatened species) and mitigation measures that will be put in place during the development of the site. The Amended Scoped EIS has demonstrated no negative impact will occur to the natural heritage features and their ecological functions as a result of the ERRC. The recommended mitigation measures will be incorporated into the site plan approval process and will be implemented as conditions of approval. The review agencies including the MNRF and NVCA have no objections to the approval of the amendment. Infrastructure as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and County Official Plan limit the occurrences and agencies that could potentially develop 'infrastructure' in any designation or land use category. Infrastructure is permitted in the Greenlands designation of the County Official Plan subject to the other policies of the Plan such as natural heritage and transportation. The proposal has demonstrated conformity to the County Official Plan. | No further action required. |
| 7 | Gerald Morgan | May 9, 2017 | 1284 Flos Road 3 East, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Concerned about what end cost is going to be. <i>Response to Councillor French re. previous discussion on alternate property:</i> noted he had asked about available property on Bertram Drive - if it had been considered. Facility should be located on industrial site. | Business Case Siting Process | — | Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. | No further action required. |
| 8 | John Orange | May 9, 2017 | 9 Pinehurst Lane, L9X 0C7 | Previously questioned if/where there was a policy statement on the use of County forest as a land bank. That signs at forest indicates it is for recreational use. Concerned that urban sprawl into Greenland will happen and that it will be led by County - similar to previous experience as a former resident of Oakville. If intended policy is to use County forest for future industrial uses - it should be communicated clearly in statement/policy. The facility is desirable if located in the correct location (industrial area) and County could act as anchor to emerging technologies and attract new business. | Loss of Forest Environmental Siting Process | — | Although the overall direction has been to secure, grow, and manage forest tracts throughout our region since 1922, the County takes into account changing land use priorities. County Forests are privately-owned by the County of Simcoe and mandated as working forests. They are not Crown Land and, as working forests, the County can choose to designate sections for purposes other than timber management. This flexibility allows the County to balance usage of these properties for a wide variety of recreational activities as well as other productive and economic uses. Each development is evaluated on the details of the project and the planning policies in -effect at the time of application. Infrastructure as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and County Official Plan limit the occurrences and agencies that could potentially develop 'infrastructure' in any designation or land use category. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to include the submission of a Wildlife Management Plan, Environmental Management Plan, Compensation Planting Plan and afforestation at a ratio of 2:1 prior to site plan approval. Mitigation measures recommended in Amended Scoped EIS will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. |
| 9 | Cindy Mercer | May 9, 2017 | 1601 Rainbow Valley Rd E, L0L 2K0 | Comment amending the Official Plan to build the ERRC sets a clear precedence and strays greatly from the County's current Forest Management Plan. Developing greenlands for the ERRC does not meet the official plan. The County should be modelling the behaviour the official plan expects from the general public. | Land Use | — | Although the overall direction has been to secure, grow, and manage forest tracts throughout our region since 1922, the County takes into account changing land use priorities. County Forests are privately-owned by the County of Simcoe and mandated as working forests. They are not Crown Land and, as working forests, the County can choose to designate sections for purposes other than timber management. This flexibility allows the County to balance usage of these properties for a wide variety of recreational activities as well as other productive and economic uses. Each development is evaluated on the details of the project and the planning policies in -effect at the time of application. Infrastructure as defined in the Provincial Policy Statement, Growth Plan and County Official Plan limit the occurrences and agencies that could potentially develop 'infrastructure' in any designation or land use category. The proposal has demonstrated conformity to the County Official Plan. | No further action required. |
| 10 | Sharon Steinmiller | May 9, 2017 | 2826 Horseshoe Valley Road West, Phelpston, ON L0L 2K0 | Comment regarding existing excessive traffic on Horseshoe Valley Road West from Highway 400 to County Road 27 - addition of new homes on Gill Road will add to traffic as well. Concerned about increased traffic, noise, and pollution from ERRC. Concerned about affects to water supply. Concerned about property values in the future. Comment to put facility on an industrial site. | Traffic and Road Conditions Groundwater Property Values Siting Process | — | Truck traffic related to the ERRC and potential impacts to the surrounding road network are addressed in the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and Amended TIS. The TIS noted that the site traffic will have a minimal impact on the surrounding road network and no road improvements are required at any nearby intersections. An assessment of vertical sightlines indicated that there was adequate stopping distance. The TIS also noted that an eastbound left turn lane is warranted, a truck climbing lane will be warranted in the future based largely on background traffic, and recommended that provisions be made to signalize the Site access from Horseshoe Valley Road West. County and Township Transportation and Engineering staff had no objections to the approval of the amendment. Confirmation was provided by the Township's Risk Management Official (RMO) in a letter dated March 7, 2018 stating that the facility would not be a significant drinking water threat according to Ontario's Clean Water Act (CWA). In siting the facility, the County incorporated criteria from the Source Protection Plan to avoid vulnerable areas. The facility footprint is located in a low area of vulnerability in a Significant Groundwater Recharge Area. The County has planned to protect groundwater resources through measures included in the Amended Facility Characteristic Report even though these are not required by the Source Protection Plan or CWA. | Required road improvements and realignment of access road will be incorporated as conditions of site plan approval. Incorporate recommended groundwater protections as recommended in Amended Facility Characteristics Report as conditions of site plan approval. |

| Comment No. | Submitted By | Date Submitted | Address | Interpretation of Feedback | Key Words | Correspondence | Response | Action |
|-------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| 11 | Councillor French | May 9, 2017 | Township of Springwater | Question to Mr. Krajcir - did GHD or County have a meeting with agricultural community to ask what is the possible impact to you. Request to Mr. Morgan - share thoughts on industrial property to the west (Bertram Drive) as discussed in our previous meeting. Question regarding when/where comments received to date (public and agencies) are and when people can view them. Commented that under Springwater official plan facility would not be allowed, question if forest cover was removed to create the Moonstone County Road Garage. Follow up comment forest lands are being identified as lands to develop for municipal services. Question regarding resolution from Springwater Council that was submitted - should it be submitted again as part of the planning process - does it form part of the public comments or should it be resubmitted. | Agricultural Siting Process Availability of Comments | Deputy Warden - after meeting comments will be posted to website - all questions and comments will be available before Council comes back as a whole to vote. Ms. Korolnek - confirmed some forested lands were removed for the construction of the County Roads Garage Deputy Warden - encouraged the Township to resubmit comments | County landfill properties and willing vendor industrial-zoned sites were included in the scope of properties reviewed in the site selection process. Many of these sites were excluded in Screen 1 based on their size, distance from the centre of waste generation, and groundwater conditions. Land use and zoning was a consideration in Screens 2 and 3 – along with several other environmental, technical, and social criteria. This criteria was not exclusionary but rather used to assess whether a site offered an advantage in this regard. One of the short-listed sites (located at 540/528 Penetanguishene Road, Springwater), had areas zoned General Industrial/Outside Storage (MO). This was considered in the final comparative evaluation. | No further action required. |
| 12 | Councillor Allen | May 9, 2017 | Township of Springwater | Comment regarding business case and where and when it occurs in the process - noted that would like an update when Council will receive the detailed business case/budget for the projects. Question if information/update on the archeological findings and inquired about updated timeframe for business case. | Business Case Archaeological | Deputy Warden - There will be RFP's which will provide budget detail and it will be up to Council to make decision Mr. McCullough - Staff are working with consultant (Ernst and Young) on preliminary business case for OPF and an update on costs to provided MMF. Staff will provide through the spring an updated report to Council. GHD - Archeological assessment is a staged process, Stages 1 through 3 have been completed. Stage 3 - based on digs completed - has been submitted to Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. County is going forward with Stage 4 and approaching as a protection in-situ which protects area of archeological find during construction. | Business case was completed for OPF and MMF and presented to Council on September 26, 2017. Stage 3 Archeological Assessment has been received and entered into the Ministry's records. A Stage 4 Archeological Assessment is required and will be completed prior to site plan approval to protect the site in-situ. Cultural Heritage Evaluation will be completed for the stone foundation prior to site plan approval. | Policy added to proposed official plan amendment to require the preparation of a Cultural Heritage Evaluation prior to site plan approval. |
| 13 | Councillor Little | May 9, 2017 | Township of Adjala-Tosorontio | Comment seeking clarification from consultant team on setbacks - heard different number from resident and consultants. | Setbacks | GHD - setbacks from property line to sensitive receptors to the west is about 110 m and to the east is about 200 m - from the actual facility footprint to the nearest sensitive receptor is about 400 metres | Distance to the nearest sensitive receptor is located approximately 370 metres to the east at 2928 Horseshoe Valley Road West. | No further action required. |
| 14 | Councillor Cox | May 9, 2017 | Township of Severn | Question regarding questions put forward at May 9 meeting - will answers be provided. Follow-up question to Mr. Westendorp - referenced Mr. Krajcir - will he get answers to that. | Land Use | Mr. Westendorp - Planning will collect all written comments and oral submissions and summarize feedback in a table - all comments and responses will be provided to Council before the meeting where a decision will be made. Follow-up response - yes/will be looking at the best way we can provide answers. | Comment acknowledged. | Comment table completed as part of amendment process. |
| 15 | Councillor Keffer | May 9, 2017 | Town of Bradford West Gwillimbury | Question regarding County official plan amendment process - clarification on where the lower tier municipalities are within process, does lower tier have a say. | Land Use | Mr. Westendorp - Land use being proposed requires amendment to the zoning by-law at local level (Springwater), the local official plan and the County official plan, County Council is only body that can adopt the change to the County official plan. If a County official plan amendment is approved the decision is brought to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs for consideration. There will be a public meeting at local official plan amendment and zoning amendment (Springwater) held separately. | Comment acknowledged. | No further action required. |
| 16 | Councillor Clarke | May 9, 2017 | Township of Ramara | Question why process is starting with the County official plan amendment prior to starting at municipal level. If County official plan amendment approved then there is no power left to the local municipality. | Land Use | Mr. Westendorp - Typically the majority of developments don't require a County official plan amendment. The County public meeting is being held because it also requires the County official plan amendment, there is a requirement for all documents to be in steps - the largest, upper tier document is going first and then the Township (Springwater) will consider their document. | Comment acknowledged. | No further action required. |