Appendix D-2

Summary of Survey Responses – Outside of 5km of FEP/WSF

DILLON CONSULTING

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Safety of Workers / Increased Traffic at Landfill Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
What will happen if the ICI waste returns to Otter Lake? No provisions have been made for that possibility. The focus should be on prevention not mitigation.
Chances of increased animals in area such as bears could put workers in scary and u safe situations
Increased smell, rodents
What about the increased traffic at the beginning of Prospect Road
Because there is insufficient information provided. This discription is written with a bias...if there is only an increase of a couple trucks, probably not a concern but if there a few hundred more trucks...a few signs is not going to address safety aor accidents.
More frequent trips, additional materials lost along the roadways creating littering & unsightliness, affect on wildlife
Current mitigation measures in place are not enforced, I have no faith in new ones.
I would need to hear from the workers, as they will have more responsibility to sort.
Too much traffic
Deviates from original agreement
Increased traffic. Laying off FEP workers and re-hiring them to be traffic spotters???!!!
My concern is the integrity of the people involved that made a decision to break all the promises to the surrounding communities when this system was put in place. Apparently legal contracts and promises mean nothing to HRM council. Shame on everyone who votes to change the terms of the original agreement. Obviously you have no honour.
Tip face dumping adds significant risk
Given that the municipality keeps trying to go back on its agreement, there is doubt that mitigation steps will be taken.
First; you concede that there will be a medium risk. Second. You are dealing with the public who are, at best, ocasional users and so unfamiliar and inexperienced so risk levels are higher especially for older people.
These "mitigations" are administrative controls, the second-least-effective in the hierarchy of risk management. These staff job is to collect garbage; they want to be in-and-out ASAP, so their adherance to these controls will be weak. Also, the description is purposefully misleading - it's actually a traffic increase of 50% (17-20 becomes 25-30). So it is 50% increase in risk.
Attracting rodent could expose workers to diseases
Biohazard concerns
One way in one way out figure it out. No more pressure on the traffic out here. The province put nothing out in the area for us but garbage.
Dangerous goods and hazardous waste WILL be sent to the land fill without ever being found and removed
Honor the contract!
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill. Keep FEP/WSF active.
It works great just the way it is.
This was not the original agreement
There is still an increase in vehicle trips a day resulting in additional noise and pollution
It's difficult to believe that areas of concern have not been identified given the impac that it will have on the community.
residential waste is not sorted correctly by many, and lack of present protocols and mechanisms to ensure proper disposal will affect the land and all the people in the closer and farther local vicinities
Traffic spotters, provided during peak periods only, will not mitigate the risk of potential harm to other employees. If extra staff (traffic spotters) will be employed to mitigate this risk, why bother? Doesn't sound like it will be saving the taxpayers any money, and if it does, it will be at the cost of employee safety.
Not too sure that these will address the problem properly.
The toxic conditions the employee will be forced to work in with decaying food placed straight into the landfill untreated and the increase infestation of rats among other animals
There is no guarantee that these rules will be enforced or changed. You cannot mix two different concerns into one category...worker concerns are different then traffic concerns. Bottom line-you are reneging a contract made by HRM years ago!
It still represent an estimated 33% increase of vehicular traffic to the landfill disposal area.
Deactivation of the FEP/WSF could have unforseen impact on worker and resident safety including but not limited to increased animal/traffic collisions, increased animal activity in the area, increased bird activity and related diseases.
The mitigation measures indicated do not come with opposing, possible issues related to the changes. This 'survey' does not provide a responder with the information required to make an informed decision. This is not a survey - it's propaganda
How about relocation all together
leave it as it is. don't give in to corporations trying to increase profit margins. Start taxing the rich even more.
We already see so much trash and debris falling from trucks there and the other site. More trucks equals more debris. No one takes responsibility when I get a flat tire from nails or glass falling from a truck!
poor management at the site will jeopardize worker safety regardless of the public policies, he heavy trucks spill enormous amounts of garbage and debris on the prospect rd, slows traffic, ruins the roads, and leaves lines of foul smelling decaying liquid on the public roads as they travel, this will only go from bad to worse with this change.
Addional traffic on the Prospect Rd
Who can determine peak traffic periods? May not have spotters when needed.
I am unsure how this will decrease traffic on Prospect Road. Also, there are always debris and garbage on the road and flying off trucks. It is very unsafe and costly for drivers. The sides of the road are always a mess.
They would need proper training as well, not just signage
Increased trips means more environmental impacts due to increased carbon footprint.
Daily litter collection on the highway results in people working in dangerous conditions.
You're stating that there will indeed be an increase of traffic. This concerns me as we travel on the Prospect road daily and the amount of garbage and waste and hazardous materials that falls off of trucks and onto the road is awful.
Med risk to high
Med risk too high
This increased traffic mitigation is moot. It does nothing to address the traffic to/from the landfill.
Increased traffic
Increase traffic
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
FEP deactivation is a very BAD idea

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Safety of Workers / Increased Traffic at Landfill Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Increased loads will create additional heavy traffic near the interchange which is currently growing
Garbage flying out of these vehicles on the sides and middle of our roads
Traffic volume is still increased.
Organic material will draw MORE RATS then we have now. We have a major problem with RATS NOW
Statement states "this is how it's done now" but does not say how it will be done after this deactivate
Pollution in the air, traffic, lowering our house values, worried about the water tables
U
The proposed mitigation methods are insufficient, and the structure of this survey express clear bias.
More trucks = more garbage along the side of the highway. It's a mess often because trash is lost off trucks
We need the fep working as it is supposed to so we don't have too many birds or animals attracted and getting diseases and we don't want the smells from organic waste worse. We need this equipment to stay in place. It is what we all agreed to
Traffic in this area is already expanding rapidly due to residential housing growth; even a small increase in traffic - especially during rush hour - will just make it worse. At least addition of Traffic Kights would possibly help
A promise was made to keep this facility as originally intended. A promise broken in the name of money is repugnant. Also, if this doesn't work, it will cost twice as much as was saved to restore it.
Extra trips waste time and money. More traffic on roads.
More waste going to the landfill, that is not sorted by the FEP/WSF, allows for probable increase in issues from organics being buried in the landfill.
The workers may be exposed to increase off gassing from the organics that are put in the landfill since they are not separated from the garbage.
Organic should not be put in the landfill
When the landfill was started we could smell the garbage and we already are overrun by rodents in the blt area, stopping the sorting facility could result in more. We have a state of the art facility and we are proud of it, it should remain the same. You can see how many households put out an atrocious amount of garbage and no recycling which tells us that there are lots of unacceptable products
We do not need any extra traffic in this area. We have enough large vehicles in the Brunello Estates area with construction on going.
Any garbage going into the ground should not be allowed.
Trucks are now going directly to the landfill ....which is effectively making Otter Lake a garbage dump and no longer a landfill monitors what goes into the cells. What follows after that is - rodents, odor, other things that the community when they accepted the location of the LANDFILL demanded they were protected against.
That's too many more trucks and much more waste. It already makes the community smell bad and it will also attract more scavenger birds like seagulls to the area.
See [redacted] letter of November 8, 2021
Still even more big truck traffic on our already busy Prospect Road
with increase in traffic on the road it also increases the amount of garbage on the roads in my community.
Bad for the environment and was not the when you sold us this fiasco
There will inevitably be more waste going to this area.
An increase of 8-10 vehicles per day is on the conservative end of estimation, what research is backing these numbers up?
Can there be a separate or passing lane put in for these turning vehicles not to obstruct traffic while driving on the Prospect Rd?
HRM should maintain its original agreement and not renig.
More traffic means the greater chance of MVA
There will be more traffic and if everything is not sorted than more debris will be on the roads
I see no mitigation factors for when the workers are short staffed.
What about the jobs of the workers? It sure doesn't sound like those are safe.
Too much increase
Anything can happen no matter what safety measures are in place!
I believe there could be safelty issues impacted, traffice increase could be greater than anticipated
Residential waste directly to land fill disposal area is concerning - birds, rats, odor etc. Increased traffic.
I do not believe your mitigation measures will go far enough to address my concerns.
Honour the agreements with the host communities. Actually, the 29 years is up. Kindly, honour the agreement a start looking for a new host.
In the environmental assessment, prepared for City Council before the voted to approve the site, it stated bedrock was fractured, so run off and toxic fluids could drain off the landfill into these fissures and cracks and possibly contaminate the groundwater.
Increased traffic at landfill sites without supervision creates a risk for unexceptable access and dumping.
I don't believe these promises. Promises were broken before and I believe they will be broken again and lives and the environment will pay the price
I am worried about smell and rodant issues increasing
Without a front end processor, I am worried that staff will be subjected to unsafe working conditions due to the increase in gases caused by poorly sorted waste entering the landfill. Also it's going to smell more and I wouldn't want to work in that!
It's a growing area and there is no need for more waste if it can be sorted.
Because fuck you thats why
Increase traffic will continue to pose a risk with the measures.
the smell, wildlife
That is 10 trips to many as it would be a 40 % increase in traffic
Safety protocols are not always followed.
I find it very disrespectful to ask my opinion and then tell me why I am incorrect.
don't trust they will be followed strictly
Safe Work Environment is Priority
Signage is great if people would read and abide by them but as we see on the highways everyday and at the bridge that doesn't happen

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Safety of Workers / Increased Traffic at Landfill Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Not what we were promised by HRM
Opposed to the removal of the FEP and WSF
I believe the increased vehicle traffic is dramatically underestimated. As well, it appears traffic spotters will only be provided during peak times even though accidents may well occur outside those peak times.
This would mean increased activity in an area without traffic lights.
Believe that increased traffic will occur and contribute to safety concerns on Prospect Rd
The route to Peggy's Cove is well travelled two lane road used by both local residents and tourists. Increasing the # of garbage trucks and the ensuing odors is detrimental to those who travel behind them and live in the area.
Still causes unneeded traffic
The land fill operations should remain as is. No changes.
Will additional staff be hired to make sure that the there are no accidents about to happen with the increase in traffic
Our area is to busy and this area is dangerous. Debris on the road and trucks pulling out in front of people
Traffic on the otter lake road is already out of control.
With deactivating the FEPand the WSP the toxins leaking out in the ground along with the rodent and bird influx is a real problem for all involved
Not convinced
Noone is looking to see what is being dumped
I don't think spotters is enough to help with traffic
We should we aiming for improvement to our processes and systems with improved safety of our workers. Removal of world class systems should never be an option. Much of what is described is education, which hurt workers.
Why are any changes (removing perfectly fine working components) even necessary? Shame on you.
Still increases traffic, and added large vehicles
The envisioned impacts of proposed changes to the FEP/WSFby Staff are hypothetical. The fact is that you will not know impacts until after proposed changes.
We need to be recycling more just like Chester Municipality
It's not enough being done
Doesn't seem to be enough effort to mitigate concerns.
Not happy with proposed changes.
not safe enough
more traffic
You need to listen to the community!
The front line was agreed to be in place when you were selling the dump to us now you are want to tell us it don't make a difference . You don't change a contract halfway through it.
I am still concerned
Larger vehicles on prospect rd who often speed cause traffic issues
This facility already creates traffic issues. Less control over over materials Meena's more vehicles and more issues for resident driving by the entrance
Mitigation measures are not enough to adequately manage risk not do they adequately consider the increase in traffic. Many pieces that are requiring no human error or complacency.
If the filters don't take out dangerous items the Employees will be exposed to more dangerous items as they are brought to Cells
Please honour the agreement.
Increase of traffic in area that is already impacted by heavy traffic congestion along with more to come with new construction
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
Why would we go back on the original decision. Even if there is a reduction of organic waste there does not appear to be an benefit to deactivating the facilities.
You should not be deactivating FEP/WSF
You have not factored in any of the new developments in the area that are currently underway or will be in the near future. Any additional trips is too many more.
You clearly state there is medium on-site risk by proceeding.
N
Those additional vehicles equate to approximately 7800 more individual tips in a single year. Stating 25 to 30 a day makes the equation referred to as minor, 7800 per year is not minor.
It is not a broken , so leave well enough alone , plus we DO NOTneed the increased traffic on our already crowed road .
Non-compliance.
These measures do not change the fact that unsorted waste will be going into the landfill.
You comment field would not take my whole comment - I guess you only want short comments? Leave it the way it is. Hopefully that is short enough....?
Not for a minute do I believe that there will not be an increase in noxious odours not an increase of gills and other such scavengers. Timberlea already had an increase in tat activity.
It is safest to keep it running as is.
How are we to know that non-residential waste will be dealt with correctly and not put directly into the landfill. Another concern is the extra traffic to the location
Does this mean their will be roughly a 33% increase in vehicle trips and deposits?
The increase of trucks pollutes our air and hurts our environment. There is an increased risk of traffic and worker safety. Unsatisfactory.
These vehicles often leave debris in the road causing issues
You have geared this survey to confuse folks.
The removal of the FEP WSF means workers have the potential to handle ICI material that is hazardous and dangerous. It also means unacceptable material will end up in the landfill affecting the health of the workers, surrounding property and environment.
They rely on people responding, and respecting the new processes. Since people cannot strap down garbage on the way to the dump and it ends up over the road and ditches, I refuse to believe this will work
An increase of 8 -10 vehicles per day is a concern. More traffic means more recycling to be processed.
Too much going into the ground. We need to keep diverting waste an keep the area small and odor free.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Safety of Workers / Increased Traffic at Landfill Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
This write is not clear as to how the danger to workers will be mitigated.
People are not going to read signs
Nearly 2500 extra trucks per annual year is going to significantly increase rats, odours, and other pollution methods.
More traffic, more risk
The smell
It's smoke and mirrors
Added traffic and noise in the community
These additional measures usually don't get enforced, so there is no faith in the proposed plan.
Medium risk is too high
Medium risk is too high.
Medium risk is too high
There is already too much traffic and waste on that route. Debris blowing out of trucks. An increase is more than this route needs. We need a ramp to the highway to get this scrap off the 333. Tourists don't need this. Emergency vehicles don't need this. Commuters paying taxes don't need this. We are done. Our deal ends at 25yrs. Go somewhere else with your poison.
There will be more vehicles on the roads will negatively impact the surrounding area
No inspection or separation of residential waste will take place at the tipping floor, allowing for all banned items to flow directly into the landfill cell causing major environmental issues and expensive costs to fix the resulting problems.
Lowering waste disposal standards from current practice is totally unacceptable!
Increased traffic, means increased volume. Already their is residential going directly to landfill. Sure the workers are safe from getting run over, but thats not what deactivation of FEP/WSF is all about. Question irrelavent.
Admit to increase in traffice - trucks. As yet, no identified concerns - re: safety/other impacts.
Elimination of the sorting of trash will result in many undesirable items entering the landfill, many of which will be toxic to the environment while items that would typically be composted will attract vermin and birds.
The number of trips having to be made are of concern due to fuel consumption and pollution by the vehicles.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Blowing Litter
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
FEP has worked well; no evidence supporting the benefits from making a change
The mitigation measures are not as effective as maintaining the FEP/WSF. This survey is not actually a balanced survey. It only presents the HRM/Staff/Mirror perspective as evidence and none of the concerns of the Community Monitoring Committee or others.
Who deems it necessary to install additional fencing and what is the citeria? Fences like in the picture are taken down in winter to reduce damage. Also, it is already indicated that blown litter is an issue as it has to be collected daily so the plan is to make it worse and then have someone spend more time picking it up outside when they could do it at the already established FEP/WSF inside.
I live near a couple of waste handling facilities in Bayers Lake there is ALWAYS debris blowing around and on the ground. Fence or no
Why bother with these mitigation efforts when the FEP/WSF are preventing the possibility of a problem in the first place?
Our climate and winters makes it difficult to clean up in the winter.
Do not believe that extra clean up will be adequate
Garbage can still blow over fences.
Have seen first hand what the litter was like around the old Sackville Landfill was like. Fences did not stop the trash flying around in the long term.
I'm not convinced regular clean up will take place.
Nets are there now and the highway is always full of litter. Hiking the area I know nets dont stop all litter especially in high winds. More untreated and stabilized garbage means more litter.
More vehicles = more litter
Due to high winds, debris still gets thru/over the screens and does not get picked up at all or in a timely manner.
litter blows around fences
What about all the garbage that blows on to Prospect Rd
Real world observations show these methods are not effectively being conducted
These measures sound like a band aid and based on my own experince on litter on the prohspect Road from the demo dump, I suggest that a more careful look at the risk and measures needs to be taken. Are the costs of increased fencing and cleaning included in the cost evaluation of closing the sorting facility?
More frequent trips, additional materials lost along the roadways creating littering & unsightliness, affect on wildlife
These are the same mitigation measures in place at C&D Recycling and they don't work. Highway 333 needs continual blown litter cleanup by community members.
They're animal & bird catchers
I see daily garbage along Exit3 to Bay road and I feel this will continue to get worse
NA
I have seen how other similar litter mitigations have not worked in other areas close to landfills or processing facilities.
Litter will still get out
Highways and roads are littered now
More funds being pumped into something that wouldn't need it
No impacts can be identified until the deactivation happens. This must not be allowed!
The litter is still happening
HRM Council does not honour its commitments. Why would this be any different!!! Shame on you.
Mitigation is great but why not leave the Fep/ wsf in place to minimize instead of mitigation
This will only address so much. some still escapes and with more not filtered out, more will spread.
The highest elev. of the cells appears higher than the fence. When trucks are dumping into a cell they may be higher than the fence, and winds can carry debris over the fence. Wind breaks (portable perhaps), adjacent to the truck dump site may be more effective in reducing airborne litter. However, I am not convinced that either, or a combination of these measures will be able to control litter.
My concern is that there will not be sorting completed.
You already admit that you expect more litter. There is no way to contain all the extra litter unless you can control the weather around the clock and year round. You know that's not possible. You will have the a degree of control within the fence. Even when garbage is contained at the curb in a container, it's not foolproof
What about the trash blowing out of trucks before they enter this monitored area?
I think this is not enough to prevent litter blowing outside of the fenced area.
Most lightweight material in our windy climate, particularly in the area which is a high point of land could easily blow over the fench as it is now proposd
Litter that blows (eg paper, styrofoam) is almost universally materials that should not be in the landfill. If this is causing increase in blowing litter on site, it means we are knowingly landfilling materials that shouldn't be. This is unacceptable.
A fence is not going to stop garbage
I have watched Garbage blow off garbage trucks as we're driving down the 103. It's nice for you to say you take care of the garbage in the dump but what about the roads that more trafic drive on.
stop gap measure that won't solve the long term problem
The litter will still be able to be blown around. The mitigation measures are reactive, not aimed at the cause of the litter.
Fencing is fine. Wondering if it will contain all. How are regular cleanups completed
too much litter on access road
What about the organic waste? Without sorting, everything g will just be there leeching I to the ground and nearby waterways
Birds will pickup garbage and dropped on road
Wildlife
All over the street during transport. Ive plugged three tires from the garbage being transported here
The beginning of Highway 333 near Exhibition Park is littered, constantly. Related to the dump? No idea. Don't care. It should be subjected to the same scrutiny. My immediate concern for the blowing litter is more broad than just within 5 kms of the site.
Nothing organic should be burried here. THESE MITIGATION measures do not meet my needs. Do not deactivate the FEP/WSF
Honor the contract
It appears to be a mere net, we all know on garbage day things blow everywhere including high unit the sky depending on the wind. And do you ply to net in the entire waste facility???

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Blowing Litter
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Putting up some extra netting doesn't work keep things the way they are.
It's only containing all of the litter until a large storm picks it up
Why not stick with the agreement that is working?
There are still extra costs incurred with fencing and additional collections needed. You intend to save in one area but have increased costs in other areas, doesn't make sense
Are you indicating that this barrier will prevent litter from blowing overt he fenced in area. With the wind that blows across that community, it is very difficult to believe that litter will be contained.
hkdfjiewjjlij
Removal of the two front end systems will most likely result in more wind blown garbage
We were told that all intake at the site would be separate on site. You are now trying to do away with this critical component of our acceptance of the landfill agreement. No, no, no, this should not happen.
Seems like jobs are trying to be replaced with fencing, which in turn will require further collection efforts "as necessary". Why replace jobs with different jobs? Seems like quite a bit of effort for an outcome nobody would like.
Netting is dangerous for wildlife. would be interested to know how often people are cleaning the blowing litter
The wind is a cruel master and while the fence will mitigate some of the flying debris it is not reasonable to believe it will contain it all.
It remains to be seen whether or not the mitigation measures will actually work so what are the plans are there if the blowing litter issue is not addressed by these mitigation measures?
I see litter today
Litter can still blow over and around a cheap fence.
Have you ever driven on Prospect road? It's not just the litter from dumping but the cars and trucks bringing it to the waste facility. If you also add Dartmouth waste, all this increases.
Organic waste should not be buried in landfill
Fencing is only as good as the design and there is no design that will prevent the wrath of mother nature. Fences will fall apart, have maintenance issues, get damaged by animals and allow flying debris to enter the surrounding wilderness area and potentially cause additional choking hazards for animals.
There will be more litter.
Nova Scotia is THE dirtiest province in this country and each and every time mitigation measures are promised, they are not delivered. Fencing? Really? That's what's going to alleviate this environmental nightmare?
This isn't going to fix the mess on the road way to and from who cleans that?
leave the processing facilities there as was promised by city council years ago.
I do not believe this happens on a regular basis. Only when a community group schedules a clean up day.
I have had much vehicle damage, three puncuntured tires this year, i have called waste mangement on many occasions when garbage was flying out of truck beds, told drivers that the load was unsecured, they did nothing continued to spead garbage around my community, why would i think this will change for the better??
No follow through. Garbage on # 333 is a great example.
My experience is that the clean up is not adequate and that the litter is more far reaching.
I am concerned with the flying debris on prospect road that flies off trucks into traffic and the mess on prospect rd.
Litter collection to date has not been done on a regular basis, seems only when people complain
The more litter blowing around the faster these fences will deteriorate then they will have to be replaced more frequently which will either cost money or won't happen and there will be more litter blowing around
More fencing means more interference to wildlife. More on site clean up means more expenses.
Fences no matter how high will not address the issue.
With winter weather there will not be people cleaning up the highways. If so that is dangerous.
Litter removal and maintenance of fencing on other sites proves to be infrequent and inadequate.
Too little too late usually with a portable or temporary fencing solution as they are usually put in place as a reactive measure otherwise it would be permanent and quite ugly. As for staff collection of debris, that just seems unnecessarily dangerous for the employees
The amount of litter along this stretch of Prospect road is already bad enough. We've been told extra precautions and clean ups will happen but they never do!
We already have a litter issue from the waste facility.
Please deal with litter along the highway that blows out of the trucks and is left.
Med risk to high
M r too
The 103 highway has litter issues from garbage trucks now. Increasing that will only increase the litter issue. During winter months crews will be hindered by snow.
Litter is a consistent problem in the Goodwood stretch, whether from this facility or from drop off facilities. If the material is not preprocessed there will be an inevitible increase. Any increase is unacceptable.
Litter can easily blow over fencing. A lot of litter is also left beside #333 from trucks going to C&D
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
With the high winds we receive on a regular basis no fencing measures work. I have seen this at other sites and the litter is still present.
Ultimately, dunking garbage is NOT a solution. I have lived [redacted] Since returning here I've been disgusted at his proud people are, saying how great we are for garbage separation. We suck.
Escaping litter along highway from Waste trucks heading to processing plant
Because there is litter all over the prospect Road, from the start to the landfill. There needs to be more regular cleaning of the roadways/ditches from the beginning of prospect Road to landfill.
The fencing does nothing about birds scattering litter. And allows lots of litter to pass through regardless (e.g., the large gaps visible in the photos where the mesh meets the posts, which inevitably get larger over time).
fences will not stop it all
Already in winter there is a noticable amount of litter and waste on the roads and highways leading to the facility. High fencing will mitigate into point but with our winds it is probable that litter will escape the entrapment area and create additional waste outside of the dump. This will affect animals,plants and be a be a bad reflection on our city.
Even with a fence, increase in litter will attract more rodents to the area
The fences will not stop the wildlife from removing trash
fences don't seem to be high enough for the winds we get in this area

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Blowing Litter
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Maintenance of fence will decrease and those fences make rats etc bears etc will get around those
That fence is too low.
?
You are still creating negative impacts if you need 'mitigating controls'
Contaminants from blowing garbage will end up in Governor's lake.
Without the FEP it is guaranteed that paper products and plastic wrap will be caught by the wind and fly over the fences and into the surrounding areas affecting water quality and posing a hazard and danger to wildlife.
This is now- how will it impact later- we see what happens at other sites
I drive by all the time and litter maybe is suppose to be picked up but does not happen is not monitored enough
I
What about the route to the garbage centre. We have enough garbage on the road that is not being picked up
Birds
No one has ever addressed the flying litter years ago, even after repeated promises.
Promises to do extra personnel pick up will not be done due to further budget restraints, increased windy days will move some garbage past these barriers
More birds will be attracted to the landfill if the FEP/WSF is deactivated. Litter will be carried off by the birds and distributed to the surrounding areas.
This neighbourhood is already full of garbage. I remember the smell of the garbage from when I was growing up! This is a growing area that people are putting lots of investment into, we don't need it to smell like garbage. Thank you.
The proposed mitigations are unlikely to be followed or implemented because they rely on additional expenditures for staffing and fencing. I have zero confidence that if the front end processing is removed these things will actually be done. It seems like weak lip service to assuage concerns.
These are reactive mitigation measures and not proactive.
There is DAILY trash along the highway. Sometimes for days
Some but not all
Increased animal bird presence
Fencing is not a 100% effective measure to control litter
There is still way too much garbage being blown on to the roadside. There should not be any!
Garage has a way of getting loose
Litter has been a growing problem along the Prospect Road and area. I doubt clean ups will be as effective as they should be.
Spreading garbage will attract more wildlife.
I am concerned that inappropriate materials will find their way into the landfill if monitoring decreases.
We need to keep the employees there sorting the trash so birds don't over populate the area and carry the trash elsewhere
This won't block 100%
The additional litter is preventable if sorted properly.
Mitigation measures such as additional litter collection and removal effort by on site personnel would likely not need to be increased if the FEP/WSF was in operation.
Strong winds keep increasing with climate change so there needs to be better controls.
There will still be litter escaping this system.
Organic should not be put on the landfill
Too much depends on human managed efforts to address/ limit the risks. Portable fencing likely will not stand up to our winds and weather. If this system fails then the risk to the environment is concerning. What if the facility is closed with damage for days in a storm? The risk is identified as medium. The associated mitigation measures do not provide enough security
With all the budget cuts, how does the city expect to provide extra man hours and staff to do this collection.
Because the fep was a main part of the original contract, anything less is unacceptable
So if there a risk of more blow litter, as there would be in a dump site - because no one is regulating what is being dumped - see answer to the previous question same concerns still exist.
Impossible to manage
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
I still feel that this will not block debris well enough.
Not rodent/bird proof
Litter has been a problem at this site since its inception, it requires constant monitoring! See [redacted] letter of November 8, 2021
A specific contact phone number for nearby residents to call if there is increased garbage
Concerning Portable fencing, rats etc are not deterred.
More garbage will still get spread by birds and wind storms
Continue doing what the facility already does: open all garbage bags upon arrival, sort and remove organic materials from the rest of the rubbish, and treat the organic matter to make them inert before dumping them in the landfill. We know this treatment process works well, so why are you even considering taking it away???
This only works on the 103.
The roadsides are NOT cleaned every day. I see things that have fallen from trucks/trailers lying on the road/in ditches for up to a week before it is removed. Trees are decorated with plastics for months at a time.
birds accessing theist will also distribute litter not caught in border barriers
Not enough control.
My tires regularly are punctured by nails from debris
Wind can and will blow the garbage around unless you build a dome of netting around the whole place
Litter easily blows above a 6 foot fence. More litter (ie recyclable papers, lightweight plastics and all other debris)

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Blowing Litter
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I do not understand what the waste is not covered at the end of each day by a biodegradable cover as in other provinces
I do not want the problem being created in the first place.
There is a great deal of trash that blows off trucks not properly covered.
there is currently a significant amount of blowing litter that is not dealt with and I don't trust HRM to deal with an increase in litter
This was not the deal with the people when you shoved this project down our throats tests sho
Because there will be more waste going there and it won't be sorted.
It's more about litter blowing off of trucks on the Prospect Rd and less about litter blowing off site.
I don't trust it. I think HRM should maintain its original agreement f.
i drive by the area daily and there is always litter from the exhibition park to the landfill site. It doesn't appear that it is cleaned up daily.
Not certain its sufficient. The wind in this area is intense.
The fences are not lower the amount of litter being blown around. The garbage in the ditches on the 103 will increase.
The litter on the Prospect Road now is rerrable! What measures will be done to clean that area?
Because over time this stuff will not be maintained. I work in [redacted] and maintenance is always underfunded and forgotten.
Prospect Rd is a great example of how these fences don't work when there is a storm
The mitigation measures have resulted in a medium risk for blowing garbage.
It time this was moved for another community to put up with...
So who will keep the portable area's clean and maintain the fences
It is still a risk.
I do not want any changes made to the sorting of all garbage as i feel it will destroy the landfill.
Stuff can blow above these fences.
Wind blown litter does not respect the height of your fences
for example, these nets should be higher for more collection of debris. Why are we changing what is working as it is currently in place as it is today?
Failure of the facility to follow the original agreement, makes me doubt that this fencing will be installed, and maintained
Temporary fencing and other fencing is only as good as it's maintenance. As soon as a fence is knocked over or damaged it ceases to work.
It is inevitably that increased unprocessed garage will increase additional blowing litter.
Continues to be litter blowing off of vehicles along Highway 103 and Hwy 3 as they make their way to the landfill site
I do not believe that these measures will efficiently prevent litter from blowing into forest and lakes
Litter is an ongoing issue. Daily pick up does not happen as indicated. The current plan does not keep up with the existing situation. It will only get worse with these changes. Trucks often have garbage falling out of them - enforcement of covering is lacking.
Birds and other animals will pick up litter and transfer it
Humans are lazy.
I already see garbage on the 103 that is not collected. I do not believe this is going to help.
Honour the agreements!
I drive past every day and the 103 and the parkway is always littered in garbage
It's the smell n rodents it will bring even more. A net won't stop everything
Unexceptable. The agreement was for a clean community. Blowing paper creates mess and is visually dirty.
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
We don't need a fence, we just don't need the landfill size increased
your current mitigation isn't working and a few extra fences won't make much difference, rather than going against what you promised you would, why don't you take some of the tax money that we all pay for the things we don't have (sidewalks/sewers/water) and actually keep the area clean
It is a lot of nice words, but quite frankly the risk is 100% with us residents
Waste is already present on the road sides near the landfill, it is not enough to mitigate it at the landfill. What is being done to limit waste falling off trucks en route?
A fence doesn't cover the risk of blowing garbage or animals getting into the waste.
There will be a higher volume due to residents reducing diligence with green bins etc. Roadside debris will worsen
I dont want my community to smell like garbage
A high fence will not mitigate the affects of a strong north east storms capabilities.
This will not provide the litter control that is currently in place now. No one has been able to curb the debris on the Prospect Road from the construction debris facility. Why would it work there at Otter Lake.
Litter will still be blown around and not be caught with the catch fencing
A taller netting should be in place. What if debris is smaller than the netting? Debris could easily go through
This would put the on site personnel at more risk than before
Present efforts are in place for present conditions, present efforts are a bare minimum and will not be sustainable with reduced waste processing.
You don't catch it all
Again. There are no guarantees. You cannot predict weather impact on these issues.
You're dense if you think there won't be more litter
I've seen litter
It won't stop the issue
Good grief, people. Are you serious????

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Blowing Litter
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
There will still be the issue of blowing debris
I see more garbage around our road ways then before this site was errected.I was behind the garbage truck one day and debris was flying out of it and no one on the truck stopped to clean up
With the processor currently in place, litter is already a factor in the area. This will not be made better with the removal of the processor.
The mitigation tactics described above are subject to individuals having ability to collect blowing litter. This could easily change with budget or staffing restrictions in future and should not be considered a solution.
More free floating litter means more interaction with wildlife and environment. Mitigation such as fences is a limited step to prevent these interaction. Why not keep the waste facility as is and keep the risk as low as it currently is.
The wind blows light weight litter everywhere
Look around it still blows
There will still be lots of litter blowing off of the trucks
Regular mess on prospect road. Takes a long time to get cleaned up. Your track record is not very flattering to your cause. It's an embarrassment
There needs to be more litter pickup
Opposed to the removal of FEP and WSF
I don't believe the netting will mitigate blowing debris.
Litter in the fence will be unsightly and personnel willhavean additional unpleasant job
Current set up allows for waste to blow through. I am not confident that mitigation efforts will work and/or be implemented in a timely manner.
there is regurally blowing litter along the 103 that falls of vehicles that is not cleaned promptly.
Have experienced litter blowing from trucks
Mitigation measures intended to decrease the litter and debris are already in place and not working the way they're intended. The road always has garbage on it and even flattened one of our tires going home.
With the fences shown in the pictures, litter can certainly go through the fences.
There will probably be additional clean up for the first part of the year but eventually it'll dwindle away and no clean up will happen.
It is amazing the amount of litter in the area and fences may get some but not even close to all. With the addition of non treated organic waste there will be more birds this more litter being taken off site
The current process was promised as years ago as world class Keep that promise. This is a terrible format for inputting. I received an invalid format notice and had to erase my other notes
The cost and maintenance of this infrastructure has already been included in the cost of the original site. This is additional cost to achieve the same result and a cost benefit analysis should be part of the decision process
Prospect road is a constant litter box between st Margaret's bay road and the landfill. With increased traffic this will only get worse and it is only ever cleaned up by community volunteers.
These measures will not solve the issue
The nets are not going to prevent litter
We should not create new issues where the current operations are controlling blowing litter.
There's evidence of large scale litter beyond 103.
I suspect that the additional cleanup efforts will be insufficient and will become an ongoing problem.
This doesn't address the litter on the highway leading to the landfill
Fencing can only catch so much and more proactive measures should be taken to ensure no litter is able to be blown around.
The trucks are not properly secure
If the first two steps are removed, the process is incomplete and will be obvious from its smell.
The proposed measures depend on a manager's ability or desire to put in extra fencing. This subjective component will result in variation of application he ce varying amount of blowing litter. This is a massive environmental hazard
This survey continues to tell me all the reasons why I should not be concerned about the things I am concerned about. Have you ever lived near a not managed dump?
I feel the measures are working now and do not need to be changed
That says it all you can not control the waste in the manor that you want to go in with the FEP and theWSF it will lower the amount that blows away
It doesn't address the people that drive to the landfill with improper tie downs. People have had near miss situations with large debris flying off the back of trucks
Garbage gets blown everywhere and the fences don't prevent the garbage from being blown all the time
the solution contains the words....as needed. That means yo wont put them up until after you know they are needed....or someone will then "determine" they are no longer needed..
The prospect road looks like landfill because no enforcement of how all this trucks and vehicle carrying garbage
Do not accept this will successfully mitigate in pract
Litter will still blow through open areas and if netting becomes damaged. The smell will not be blocked from the netting either.
What about the birds that might get into the litter?
I've seen this type of stuff "mitigated" similarly and it failed horribly.
There is currently constant litter, issues with nails in tires etc. Along the prospect road , increased flow,traffic and garbage is going to make this worse
with the changes there will be more litter and therefore probably not able to maintain amount of increase in litter
Fences won't stop it
Because on occasion I do see garbage along the Prospect road!
I see enough little along the highway as it is. I don't believe that putting the onus into site personnel will effect any change whatsoever. They are not personally invested in the outcomes.
Why make changes that will have such negative effects? You have a system now that should be improved not removed.
This is not a survey. This is shameful propaganda.
Who will monitor if this is actually being done and effiectively
impact of mitigation measures appears speculative rather than conclusive
Debris could blow up and over fencing
Fences may contain some of the blowing litter, but litter has a way of finding itself everywhere. Although cleanup is regularly now done along the Prospect Rd, there are still many days when there is an unacceptable amount of litter along this, on of the most visited tourist routes in the province. What does this say about how we care for our environment!n

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Blowing Litter
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I am worried more about the stench
I understand your minor attempts at containment but it's now enough, sorry.
illegal dumping is rampant in this area
I don't want to se this material in the land fill if it is biodegradable
You need to be recycling more
While cleanups will help to address the issue, allowing the litter to enter the environment seems like a mistake. I would also be concerned for residents in the area.
There is no guarantee that the "additional mitigation measures" will decrease the medium risk of littering at site
Concerned about chemicals and other hazardous items leaching into the ground affecting the water and soil quality
People will be dumping unbagged, loose items without thinking about the ramifications to the environment.
Fencing won't help with high winds. And rodents is a Big issue
Increased presence of vermin
It is really windy in that area and i'm not convinced that enough is being done.
Not happy with changed
even under the current conditions, there is too much blowing around
Inadequate measures at the site
I remember the sackville land fill nightmare
The Front end Processor would remove the need for fencing. The wind still blows the litter outside of the fencing
lots of litter to prove otherwise
I have seen drywall and insulation blowing off of trucks on the 103 highway.
We voted for the landfill based on these measures staying in place. A fence is not a substitute
More needs to be done to help Lee out community clean!
The mess seen along the highway isn't cleaned promptly now, it will not improve I'm sure
Litter along road is still bad even with cleanup and fencing
Take a drive along the highway and see the litter in the ditches along the 102 and then we got stuck with the compost building on Prospect road because also told us there would be no smell from this (WRONG)
"we will clean it up" is a promise anyone can make and easily break. trying to fix sloppy results is is no substitute for proper sorting and processing
Additional blowing litter stopped by more/ higher fence is still additional blowing litter. Do your offsite impact study (how much did that cost??) and account for drastic weather changes due to climate change or is the model based off current localised weather patterns? How much of the 2 million dollar savings will go toward additional fencing and blowing litter monitoring costs?
It's better to reduce the problem at source than cleaning up afterwards
They may clean the side of the highway but they don't clean the old existing greenhead rd
Need to address litter gathering on the 333 highway before the tipping station.
What backup plans are in place in the evening the net does not catch everything? Prospect road is a mess as it is
You stated that there's a medium risk for an increase in on-site litter yet the measures proposed are simple, basic and ineffective for a medium level of risk. This impacts the environment at the waste disposal site even more.
It's a bandaid solution. Dies not address the problem of proper elimination of waste.
There is already an issue with litter consistently from the facility. More waste materials, more litter.
I do not believe this will be sufficient
They are unable to keep up with the garbage presently
in a larger wind event (which happens often) this fencing would not be adequate to maintain a barrier for the unsorted garbage. Especially the lighter garbage.
There is garbage from the beginning of the Prospect Rd to the dump. this is not dealt with on a daily basis
I am concerned with debris blowing from trucks on Highway 333
Not enough
Fences have holes
Agreement was to keep this in place for the life of the landfill. Only way the community agreed to allow it in our area. You take it out, then you need to close the landfill
That fence ALONE is unsightly. Areas on both sides of such items elsewhere are magnets for trash.
The 103 leading to the landfill is always full of litter
Fencing will not work
To change the present routine is simply archaic and a step backward.
The FEP/WSF need to stay active.
It does not collect all of the debris that can blow away
These mitigations are good but do not fully work 100% of the time
High winds will still blow items over.
Lots of garbage in the woods surrounding 102 and 103 that blowss off of garbage trucks using the highways to reach the landfill
I simply don't trust that you will keep up with these mitigating measures. I'm not sure how you expect people to trust you at all with any of this.
As the height of the landfill increases, so does the effect wind has on loose debris. The fences are good but will not stop debris in high wind situations.
Organic material burial
I walk my dog in the neighbouring woods and certain trash could kill him if it had harmful chemicals or foods
High wind can blow things over a fence

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Blowing Litter
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Higher fencing does not allow for the fact that we have high winds and animals will be attracted and spread garbage.
Litter clean up should be expanded to prospect road which has turned into a tourist abomination in recent years. Community groups are currently the only ones cleaning up the mess left by trucks. In addition, more monitoring of trucks on prospect road without proper covering should be conducted.
Do not sufficient to address the issue
Currently the traffic is not a concern but I do not see people cleaning up the litter daily. Removing the extra sorting will mean more garbage going into the ground. It is super windy in the area and a fence is not going to stop the garbage from blowing.
This will not help. Please honour the agreement
There is already increased amounts of garbage blowing in the area and this will definitely increase
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
Wind does not only blow in one direction however it swirls at times and will easily carry loose paper and debris over these nets
We drive between exit 5 back and forth to city and there is always lost garbage along both sides of the highway. It is nice it is cleaned up. It is very concerning what the additional traffic will bring and long term will there always be clean up.
You should not be deactivating
if you disable fep/wsf but get new crew to pick up, that does not make sense to me. In addition, without FEP/WSF, there will be more chance of having increased loose litter
Have you seen the current state of trash around here? I don't believe for one second that extra "supervision" of blowing trash is a legitimate solution, nor is the fence proposed. You cannot possibly afford enough staff, maybe even find enough people who are willing to work in such a job, to collect the trash that's going to be blowing around.
I would prefer less litter to be blowing around in the first place, rather than more nets/fencing to catch it
There is no guarantee of upkeep. Regular inspections are not defined herein. Today it could be daily, in a month it could be monthly when they city wants to save a buck.
Based on extensive observation for many years in the landfill area I have noted a great deal of paper/residue in the area.
This fencing is easily ripped/damaged and with increasing wind strength in NS this will lead to numerous repairs/replacement.
Litter is frequent along 333 highway from landfill
Better container management should be utilized.
A fence does not stop rodents and wile life from being attracted to litter that builds up on a fence.
Litter is occurring all along the route as things stand already. It's a disgrace.
often these efforts see a short term fix, but do not address the main issue. holes in the fencing often occur and are not reapired
Just not convinced.
We shouldn't have to clean up after the fact. Unsorted litter should never be given the chance to blow around. That's unacceptable.
You comment field would not take my whole comment - I guess you only want short comments? Leave it the way it is. Hopefully that is short enough....?
I see plenty of litter along hwy 103 in area of landfill
All one needs to do to drive along the Prospect Rd to see litter from trucks that come to the waste facility there.
Absolutely not, fencing the garbage will not prevent rats and birds
Repairs to the fence...its just netting. Garbage can still get through
Because that's a lot of lip service and over time you'll stop doing it daily. It's also super windy up there and the garbage will likely start blowing out of the zone you clean up
Less precautions means more problems. Lack attention to detail already exists there and this will exacerbate the situation.
The potential hazards of floating and small flying debris is still too high and will impact the surrounding ecosystem and wildlife.
I dont believe these steps will be adequate. You may have workers picking up litter at the facility, but what about the litter that has already blown into the surrounding forest and area? For example, if there is a wind storm in the night, and trash gets blown away, it will be gone before ur workers can pick it up
Litter can still get out, especially litter that blows off trucks into our community
As someone who has volunteered to clean up, this isn't good enough
Transportation to the landfill is a concern
This survey is set up to confuse people
My concern is when the community agreed to allowing the landfill in the area this was not part of the agreement
The dump on the prospect road also said they would take actions to mitigate litter and there has been no improvement. That stretch of road is littered heavily. I have had to replace two tires on my car as a result. It is unsightly. Hard to trust that mitigation measures would be followed through on.
Litter is still blowing around
The mitigation measures do not control the litter issues. This area is filled including the 103 highway is filled the excessive litter all the time.
You can say litter is picked up, but I drive by daily and see stuff in the morning still there on the way home late afternoon
Additional fencing means more recycling that is likely to be blown from the site. Please prove that your impact study has alleviated any concern. Simply stating that "no off-site impacts due to blowing litter have been identified" is insufficient.
I don't believe these measures can effectively stop this problem.
Landfill footprint is going to grow without addressing the excess entering the gate
Are you prepared to spend money to mitigate litter and to continue to spend that money or will the expense eventually be deemed too much
not convincing
Too easily mismanaged
I live close and work very close. I have seen blowing litter many many times
There are too many vehicles now going to land fill with debris falling off vehicles and nothing done. Increased traffic will only make it worse.
High winds, will still allow garbage to fly over these fences that appear to be small.
More garbage, more risk

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Blowing Litter
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I believe this should be sorted , it does not matter about clear bag usage , theres a middle in that clear bag that you cannot see . Also for big bulk companies like stores most do not sort there stuff garbage so anything and anything will just be dumped sounds like a wicked plan(sarcasium)
Increase of rodents and wildlife
Any additional litter in the area is a concern. With the landfill, extra duty of care should be taken not to impact surrounding communities or waterways. There are lots of lakes that could be impacted from blowing litter as well.
The smell
Litter fencing is not a good solution
There would still be additional litter
Crows will pick up litter and drop outside the fence. Then it will blow
I doubt that the proposed enhancements will be enough.
I am not confident that the litter will be fully collected, it is unsightly and negative for environment and creatures in the area.
Gaps in netting . Birds such as crows and sea gulls taking material outside fence line
It says medium risk, that is unacceptable, there should be NO risk of increased garbage.
This has been an ongoing issue and concerns have been ignored
Fences can be blown down, penetrated, and otherwise rendered useless. The mere mention of 'fences' implies that blowing litter is a concern.
Birds and rodents still carry away materials.
I've seen it too many times - promise it will be ok, do the thing and then apologize when it goes bad.
There is already an unacceptable amount of blowing litter
I support this facility solely for the environmental measures in place. No amount of fencing contains blowing plastic. Not enough is being done to collect litter from garbage trucks blowing.
This does not help all of the litter, especially that that falls before it reaches the facility.
Medium risk is too high
Medium risk is too high
Medium risk to high
Rogue Litter happens. The area around the OL site is the gateway to Peggy's Cove - it needs to be beautified to welcome tourists to the area.
Nets or catchment areas are a great idea in theory, but are not a fail safe
Nice holes in the fence. Run off into our lake systems and debris in the water/woods harms wildlife and could harm humans. We are supposed to be helping the environment. We are done. Go away.
Simple statistics. With more litter blowing there will be more that escapes.
I have seen the current state of the surrounding area and there is still blowing litter dispute the current processes
Without the FEP and WSF, who knows what will be dumped into a cell.
Mitigation efforts often do not work
Highway is covered with litter now. Can only get worse.
You are forgetting about the litter blowing onto Prospect Rd/333 the weekly cleanups do not happen and this area of road is disgusting
This doesn't stop litter from trucks
With climate change and more severe windstorms, I do not believe all litter can be collected.
Currently there is tuch litter along Highway 333 that is not being collected, much of this comes from trucks carrying litter. Additional fencing will not alleviate this problem the change proposed will lead to more litter.
Blowing litter has not been a problem and urll continue to not be a problem seeing that the landfill is surrounded by wooded area that filters blow out before it even hits residential areas. Again not relevant to residents.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Enhanced Attraction of Birds
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Lifting FEP/WSF is a leap of faith. Maintain the current system that has worked so well
I like the use of falcons, but they should be used in addition to the already in place FEP/WSF. The mitigation measures are not as effective as maintaining the FEP/WSF. This survey is not actually a balanced survey. It only presents the HRM/Staff/Mirror perspective as evidence and none of the concerns of the Community Monitoring Committee or others.
Minimizing the size doesn't reduce the attractivness to birds. If they can smell the food they will be there and then it is a learned behaviour until there is consistently no food for them. Again, this is already a problem and the plan is worse when we already have the FEP/WSF which helps mitigate.
You have acknowledged there is a medium risk what is the predicted effectiveness of the measures you describe here
Why spend money on mitigation efforts after the fact when you already have the tools to prevent them with the FEP/WSF? Also no thought given to the potential return of ICI waste to the landfill, a move that would increase the problem exponentially.
Still concerned re the deactivation and organics getting in landfill
No proof that they would work
There is no way, in my opinion, that you will be able to control the larger flocks of seagulls and crows that will be attracted to the now greater amount of organics available to them without then use of the front end treatment currently in place.
Just leave the current measures in place. That is what was agreed to and should be honoured.
Untreated waste means food they do not currently have. They will come. Measures dont work as seen at other landfill sites across north america
There will be more "stuff" to attract birds and for them to eat. Rememer Lwr Sackville?
They still can come sit on the grounds, posts do not make them go away.
more litter equals more birds
This is ignorance of the problem..off the top it in my opinion is likely high risk and I don't think there has been a landfill yet that has been able to reduce the impacts of attracting birds and vermin substantially.
More frequent trips, additional materials lost along the roadways creating littering & unsightliness, affect on wildlife
More organic garbage = more birds. You're going to need a lot of falcons.
Still so many birds
I don't believe these measures will be enough to deal with these birds
Bird fly we don't they will still find these way into the land fill and God knows what toxic materials they may get into which could hurt them too
it will require more labour to do this properly, therefore increasing costs and unkowns.
Don't agree with falcon handler and limited culling. We create a problem then kill the birds when they are attracted
Can't control the birds and other animals completely
These measures that are already in place may be effective for the current set up. But with increased food products Attracting birds these measures seem like they will be in adequate
Things work well the way they are now
Increasing the quantity of landfill but decreasing the landfill disposal area does not make sense.
I am old enough to remember the Sackville land fill.
Just leave FEP / WSF in place to minimize need if not eliminate instead of mitigating. Additional cover requirements will fill up cell faster
The more unfiltered food waste, the more birds it will attract. I can smell the offensive scents now often when I pass by now. Will get worse without front-end processing.
In the explanation, you mention bird and vector control. This question is asking specifically about birds, not other 'vectors'. I do not see anything new here that will be more effective than what is already done. The picture you provide does not inspire confidence. A better explanation is required.
Birds will still be attracted before these mitigation efforts can be applied. I am concerned about the birds' well being as well as the nuisance caused by the birds.
Culling birds to mitigate your failure to live up to your agreements is not acceptable.
It is noted above there is an increased ridge of bird activities. Mitigation efforts are vague and not quantifiable. No indication of effectiveness of proposed mitigation efforts or evidence based backing of their unstated effectiveness.
Noise makers will not deter gulls. At each step you admit to increased risks adding that steps will be taken. I have used landfills in the area for over 60 years. The current system is the best, lowest risk. I hate to sound sarcastic, but have you consulted the birds on the?
These are more band-aid solutions than anything
Additional organics will attract more birds. Adding noise makers will only increase public annoyance
Withput oversight separation, there will be more to attract the birds, even despite daily cover.
You are showing an area that is covered with grass, not dirt, which any bird will easily peck thru
I do not believe that they are enough to reduce the bird numbers
Again, these changes to the issue are because you want to substitute "elimination" (best) for "engineering control" (middling) in the risk management hierarchy. I don't know what a "whistler flare" is, and neither does google. And you should be putting "emphasis on minimizing the size (and thus the attractiveness to birds)" of the daily disposal area regardless of this consultation.
by examining similar techniques at similar facilities, the evidence is clear that this is highly likely to fail.
Regardless it's going to happen
Cannot eliminate all birds
First of all nice picture of the seagulls on the cap that was shown to the public. It would have been a better picture if you shown the garbage that was being freshly laid down with birds around it.
While these measures may reduce the number of birds, I have doubts it will be enough
It is the increased sources of food which will attract the birds. By deceasing the amount of food, there is less to attract the birds
The measures described do not detail how effective they are or how change will be managed
your cheap and only want to save money
Birds at landfills are not afraid to getting close to active equipment. More food availability will increase populations and the birds will spread out throughout the community and cause a nuisance beyond otter lake.
These solutions do not seem like they will solve this major problem
Birds will still be attracted to the waste and contamination also carrying garbage and disease
Seriously. You need a explanation

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Enhanced Attraction of Birds
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
You have not offered the questions of what overall concerns me. Not monitoring what goes into the landfill puts us at risk of biological and hazardous material which is unacceptable and not what was agreed to.
It does not seem you are proposing to change the current mitigation measures to offset deactivation of the FES.
More food / organic waste WILL find its way into the site without pre screening
Stated earlier, 10% of waste are organics. Birds and rodents will be attracted to 10%, this is a big number
Honor the contract
Seagulls and Pigeons are dirty and smart (crafty) even if they aren't right at the landfill they will migrate close by, hence neighborhoods and parking lots.
Hurt wildlife that's what happens.
Please provide additional information related to current and proposed frequency bird mitigation measures. There is no specific information provided above.
If the sorting functions weren't being shut down there would be no need to "cull" or control the birds
Birds ingnore these measures and what about the noise pollution to the area caused by these additions?
Without separation on the front end it will lead to increased odours, rats etc. It also goes directly against the signed agreement with residents. The format of this survey is also appalling.
Again extra costs required to mitigate something that will result from the proposed changes
Wild birds carry disease especially to for example chickens and other domesticated fowl species, these measures will have little inpact to deter birds from flocking to the open areas
Medium risk is still an increased risk
My concern is that there won't be sufficient follow through by HRM once the changes take effect.
We all know what is captured in/for particular situations does not always capture the full truth of the matter. When we accepted the location of this facility promises were made. We will not accept changes to the agreement (just as you would not)
Not sure why all these after the fact mitigation factors are being suggested when the present 'front end' mitigation processes are already in place
If the proposed process is used elsewhere in HRM, then why do they soo mNy birds there and Otter Lake has minimal in comparison using our current process?
Whistle flares, use of a falcon and handler, and limited culling? Really? That sounds like extra expenses, and I doubt any nearby residents will enjoy any of them.
Birds and rats will over run .
this is not a photo of what will happen iffep andwsf are removed from process
Birds do not deserve to die because they are naturally drawn to a food source... if the garbage is broken down to an inedible form, the birds will not come. Be considerate of nature in this entire process
I don't believe these measures will stop birds from scavenging , if they do this will be harmful to them as they can ingest litter
Without pre-sorting and burying of garbage it is my opinion that the current measures will not be sufficient.
I do not want any change that currently manages the waste as house prices will impact all people living
a visit to the site shows lots of birds in the area. With the increase of organic how can it not attract more birds, rodents
I don't love the idea of whistler flares
The increase of decaying food placed directly into the landfill will not only attract more bird but other animals as well. Timberlea already has a rodent problem with the deactivation it will only increase and attrack not only rats but other animals as well.
My understanding is these mitigation measures are going to be decreased as per the CMCler
I don't think the efforts will work
You can't stop birds from trying to get at garbage. Go to any landfill in the world and you'll see an issue. This excuse is just trying to make people feel like you're doing something.
If you are implementing mitigation measures, you are admitting to the bird problem. It is unhealthy and unnatural for birds to scavenge waste. If you know anything about animals, you know that they are relentless once a supply has been introduced to their area.
This will not deter the birds
I'm skeptical the measures noted above will be effective.
Organic waste should not be buried in landfill
without front end processing, there is an increased probability that some unprocessed food waste will find it way to the landfill and attract more bird and rodents, as is found in every other landfills in the province landfill
The material attracting birds i.e. orgaincs which will no longer be removed from the incoming stream is still present. My preference is to eleminate what attracts the birds from the landfill
A tarp cover is not going to keep birds from flocking to the landfill if there is an increase in unsorted waste entering the stream, have you not looked around HRM on a garbage day, birds have a field day with bacs and tarps.
It still doesn't address the fact that more organics will be making its way into the landfill.
There will be more birds at the facility as well as in the general area of commercial and residences. They are loud and will leave their feces.
The image you've chosen to represent this question yet again assures me that I'm being sold - show us a real picture - be honest about this process and you might have had proper public buy-in instead of disdain and backlash
Not good enough. Do not want the sorting stopped
Birds are attracted to garbage,as well as other rodents. There are already enough rats around the neighborhood.
There are already too many bird problems. Maybe of the hrm provided adequate garbage cans like compost this problem would be reduced.
you just want to make an upper Sackville landfill site to increase profits.
Birds, rats, raccoons, etc.... No one will patrol to see that these do not take over the landfill
Every other change has brought more foul to the area, i have run into birds, their feces litters the area now, the proccess in place don't work and the new ones won't either.
You can't stop the birds
Feel daily cover will be a protocol soon forgotten
Keep the birds out in the first place..Don't cull them. It isn't the birds fault. My concern is for the birds and again, I consider a lot of this to be smoke in mirrors or wishful thinking. The plans might be good and might sound good but often times they are not carried out as they should be. Just put a check mark on a checklist so the auditors are happy.
no off-site impacts due to an enhanced attraction of birds have been identified. If it hasn't been deactivated yet how can you know for sure there will not be an increase
These measures get rid of the birds once they come to the landfill. A larger issue is that when you attract more birds to the landfill you are drawing them away from their natural habitat and that has negative effects on the ecosystem
Again more expense to have bird controls.
What are the actual plans. What are the plans of the "increased frequency" of bird and vector control
Birds and any animals will get used to the counter measures and be present anyway.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Enhanced Attraction of Birds
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
It's not just birds that will be attracted to the landfill.
Where there is litter there will be birds. How do you plan on stopping the birds from spreading the garbage? And pooping in and around the lake? Do you plan to just kill the birds? These problemas could be avoided by keeping things in place as they are
More waste means more birds.
Obviously from your statement, items are going to be going into the landfill that shouldn't be; otherwise there would be no increase in birds.
Who is going to be there to monitor any increase in bird population & if the so called cover is actually being placed properly every day or if it gets missed for a day or so.
Med risk to high
Med
Noise makers only scare the birds away after they've been attracted to the landfill site. Seagulls then circulate to the surrounding area for food.
Medium risk too high
Media risk to high
No 'OFF site impacts' have been identified to date, and pre-processing is still in place. There will be inevitable impacts ON site if the process is deactivated, and the trickle down of that will most definitely happen. Not acceptable. We have more than enough wildlife to contend with without adding 'garbage gulls' to the equation.
When we met with the city prior to the installation of this waste facility, we were given promises regarding capping the cells, sorting waste, no odor, etc. We have odors now, what you are proposing will make it worse. Is a promise made to residents not binding on future Municipal Governments??
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
Moving backwards then adding a band aid is not a solution
Odors draw scavenger birds- food products not separeted from garbage will emit odors and gases
Any additional birds are too many
These mitigating are like trying to hold back the tide when the draw of food remains.
Organics need to be removed from the waste buried. Birds will be a significant problem.
This problem continues to exist even as other waste facilities have put into place the exact same measures. How about rodents, rats, and other wildlife?
There is already significant seagulls and other birds. It will get worse
There is increased risk to the birds being posioned
Mitigation efforts will never outweigh the food potential
Still be tons more birds than Whitley can stop
These claims cannot be substantiated
approach hasn't been successful at other landfill sites
I still think
If you stop the two step-there will be more birds
It sounds like this is more geared to keeping the birds from being a problem off-site rather than reducing the attraction to birds overall
You cannot eliminate birds flying 24/7. Mitigation strategies will reduce wildlife including birds but not 100% effective.
You cannot control birds. But you can control the smell by keeping things the way they are
It's currently not working. It causing problems in the area daily Halifax transit in Ragged lake has tons of birds and the poop is EVERYWHERE
Processing garbage as currently being done, minimize the attention birds give it. Since we are coastal it's important that the birds don't see this as a constant food source
Detracting birds is a good measure, bit once the birds learn a new food source is present they will get to it eventually.
Easier said than done. I don't believe the measures will be taken.
All the extra methods used to mitigate will cost HRM funds that they claim will be saved by shut down of FEP, HRM is growing & mostly with apartment buildings, having personal experience, I see what residents don't separate, we need the FEP, we need HRM to stand by their promises.
The best mitigation is to not deactivate the FEP/WSF.
I am not satisfied that sufficient labour or the required equipment will be available to mitigate the impacts
Birds shit and carry diseases!
Guysborough landfill is covered in birds
I am still concerned with untreated organic waste going into the landfill which is then eaten and carried through the birds and can cause diseases to spread
Lots of fancy words saying basically do more of what we already do. Appears to me to be just words unlikely to be as effective as the front end processing facility.
More trash leads to more pests.
I am sure the birds will be attracted and am concerned they will be destroyed
Mitigation plans are vague and unproven to be effective.
Other areas have tried toco trol birds and pests with little success
We know that won't fix the problem!
The measures use terms like 'increased frequency', 'emphasis on minimizing size'. I would prefer to see monitoring of effects and a tio s taken based on effect.
Scavenger's will come for an easy meal if it is available
More garbage equals more birds. They spread garbage and shouldn't be feeding on our waste.
I believe if we keep the trash being sorted it will deter more burds
Increase of litter will increase the desire of birds to come.
I work in an industrial setting with some of the same mitigation measures. We still have a bird problem.
I worked [redacted] Ws had falcons, shotguns and every type of noise maker money can buy. Gulls aways came. Soon as the falcon was gone, they would land in droves. Noise makers thsy would land right on top of them.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Enhanced Attraction of Birds
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill. If the FEP/WSF is still in operation, additional birds would not be attracted to the site in the first place, and additional mitigation measures would not be required.
Measure in place are to deter birds. Not proven to be effective at other sights
With increased organics due to not doing all of the promised treatment, there may be increased birds and other wildlife.
We Were told when we accepted the composting facility that there would be no smell. That was a lie. It's hard to believe anything we are now being told about Otter Lake, as a result.
Organic should should not be put in the landfill
Because this is a bandaid solution. The second point has no specifics, it simply states "emphasis on". That's not good enough
So far there's been no issue... why stop these measures now?
We do NOT need any more seagulls, crows or other rodents in this area. It will devalue our homes, bird poop on our vehicles and homes is not appreciated either.
There will be way more organics. Therefore more birds and rats period.
More unsorted items going into the cells - will attract rodents, birds, create odors, as dumping happens garbage will blow around - attracting more birds, rodents. As for dealing with this by having one type of bird kill another type of bird - is absolutely not acceptable.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
There is no way that you'll be able to control the birds from not being attracted to the garbage.
Not clear on how these measures would help
The photo clearly shows the problem has not been resolved!
Critics say these measures don't work... I don't know
These bogus measurements don't address basic issues of ground water pollution. Process of waste needs more accurate, well illustrated clarification for public to fully understand this process and why it is detrimental to the environment
Not enough actions to counter birds
hy are you even considering taking it away??? Without these measures, birds will swarm the landfill, ingesting rotten food that can be seriously dangerous to their health and the health of the ecosystem they are part of.
Wildlife will come if food waste is put into a landfill
Just because you haven't identified them doesn't mean they don't exist.
We are being told there will be more frequent bird control measures but is that just a story to appease us?
Birds are always present where garbage is. They arrive with the trucks just as they do with fishing boats full of fish.
there are no known effective measures to stop such increased bird activity
You can't control nature.
They will come!
It will change as soon as the proposed change occurs
No off-site impacts due to an enhanced attraction of birds have been identified Try looking for them first. You can't provide an answer as the changes have not been made. C'mon!
The increase in non sorted material entering the landfill must increase the use of mitigation methods because of an increase in bird population.
As with the previous issue, I would prefer the possibility of a bird problem not be created, rather than be mitigated.
Not the deal
They will still be more around our area of living.
I also am not interested in hearing the noise makers. We already have an issue with birds, especially geese, in my area, so this doesn't seem to be a realistic way to mitigate the issue and will be bound to increase
Birds cam cause so much waste, not to mention the predatory birds that can be threats to small pets. And we have many in the area.
More garbage means more scavengers in general.
Maintenance fails over time
Solution has not been proven
All wildlife is affected
With garage comes birds rodents and bears I grew up close to the Halifax dump and have seen first hand of what it attracts fences and noise will not eliminate these animals
Birds will still be attracted and carry disease.
Thats now , once organics is added to the landfill BIRDS & RODENTS will be 10 fold. Ask the residents of Sackville NS the nightmare they experienced.
You are going to have putrescent garbage - that will attract more birds.
These measures are largely ineffective and I have no confidence in the municipality to deliver them consistently over the long term. They will inevitably become the subject of budget cuts just like the FEP
Additional waste caused by changing the way garbage is presently handled will provide more opportunity for wildlife to feed and gather
Applying a cover does not seem like enough of a mitigation measure. Consider garbage day in our communities, where birds are able to bite through bags, tear off coverings. When material is left from one day to another, the waste pile continues to get bigger and eventually to big manage and mitigate
if birds are attracted it indicates that compostable materials are not being processed properly
Was the same consultant did this study and reported that "no off-site impacts due to an enhanced attraction of birds have been identified", the same consultant that did the environment study in the 1990s. How about a different engineering consultant be hired to do the report.
Increased unprocessed garage will attract more scavenging birds who also flow into nearby neighborhoods defecating on car and homes and ripping apart garage.
Do not believe that culling is the appropriate response to this item
I have seen "dumps" where there is less mitigation, and there will be more birds and that is a danger to the birds too.
There is No "certainty" that allowing "any" further organic waste into the facility will keep the birds away.
The last thing neighbours need is the possibility of more gulls and gull droppings
Medium risk is unacceptable. There has been a noticeable increase in seagulls over the past 5 years before these changes even take place.
The attraction of more birds is a huge concern as they carry disease and spread litter.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Enhanced Attraction of Birds
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Hard on the birds. A source of food and hazards added.
I do not think these measures go far enough and I already see plenty of birds.
Honour the agreements!
Sounds like BS
Increase bird activity creates a negative environment for the birds, they become dependent on the e ology of the landfill
Waste that is not appropriately sorted will attract animals and their feces - not acceptable and not the original agreement.
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
Birds will still migrate there regardless
There is no guarantee your mitigation will happen or continue like agreed
Perhaps you could put a landfill in the south end of Halifax, then you could ask the residents how they like the landfill caps effect on the birds that come to terrorize their yards. Perhaps rather than wasting time and money to try and break your promise, and have us all spend our time filling out this incredibly skewed survey you could just do what you promised you would do in the first place.
So...it is starting to feel like these are loaded questions with only 1 "right" answer? Additional garbage will attract additional scavengers. That is a fact. And once again, the residents in the area take on 100% of the risk
Without the front end processor and waste stabilization facility, the garbage is going to smell more, which will make it more attractive to wildlife. Also I am worried about birds being poisoned if organic materials and other contamination gets into the surrounding watersheds.
The birds still have access through the fence
The bird traffic will increase regardless
My yard is already tore up from birds I DONT WANT ANY MORE BIRDS
How does one control the size of the disposal area with increased traffic.
There will still be an increase of scavenger birds and therefore cause more or a concern for safety and feces mess from the increase at or around the landfill area
What about surrounding areas? If birds are being 'shooed' they are going to find residential areas nearby.
Birds are a natural predator that will adapt to any of the above mitigation measures.
Medium risk is too much risk. The risk level should be set at low
Spite what is written here I am still concerned about scavenger birds carry diseases caused destruction. In addition these birds contaminate and we have no control over where they fly into our community
nice picture, but those arnt birds, rats with wings is a better description. Apparently present measures do not deter them from being there. Again, present measures are for present processing activities. If you stop it, they will come, nice picture though.
more organics more birds
The birds stay in the area causing damage to home property and safety concerns on main road. The geese have been out of control and huge nuisance past 3 years
You are only giving what YOUR data says but again, with no ability to truly guarantee this won't happen
They stay close by and cause hazards on main road and damage to personal yards
The birds may be held back from the landfill proper, but that will not keep them from the surrounding tax-payers' properties!
There are not enough measures to eliminate birds at facilities such as this
Birds are Important too
More open garbage more birds and Rats
This plan doesn't look like it will help
While a cap is placed on fresh waste, birds would already be discouraged from scavenging as FEP is removing organic material. With FEP removed, what is the certainity that birds don't have more incentive to dig?
Once again, if you have to enhance the mitigation due to the changes, why make the changes. The system is working well, so let's change it to reduce cost but then turn around and incur cost to increase mitigation efforts. This seems like a very short sighted plan.
Bird and vector control- means what? Poisin? More chemicals?
No
Noise makers sound like a nuisance to the surrounding community, and killing birds is a very poor solution. A better solution would be to continue the front-end processing promised to this community.
Opposed to the removal of FEP and WSF
With the track record of continued cutting back at Otter Lake it is laughable to believe this will be something that will have any chance of surviving new cutbacks that will certainly come.
I have seen the numbers odd birds on an open landfill and this photo didn't even come close.
Addressed but not resolved
I am concerned the enhanced attraction of birds will lead to increasing populations in the area. I would be concerned that mitigation measures would not be consistent enough to stop the attraction of birds.
The removal of the FEP and WSF and expecting residents to do the sorting that is needed, will make things worse than they are now. These measures don't sufficiently address the issue when the FEP and WSF are removed.
With on-site impacts identified as representing a medium risk which includes an enhanced attraction of birds, this translates to off site impact in the community. The birds have to travel INTO the site from the surrounding community.
Still feel it will attract crows and they are on the increase and noisy and aggressive toward other nesting birds. Feel that your protocols listed will not be used or will be stopped after a short period of time.
You can not control birds and where they land
Humans cannot and should not control birds. We will see increased untreated organic material, thus more birds, does that mean we will « cull » more to try and control them?
They will carry garage away. I have to keep my answers short. Poorly developed survey
This change is considered medium risk. The current system has not created issues and should be retained.
These are currently in place. The consultants report indicated that pests and birds would increase. How will we mitigate that increase?
Animals will do what comes naturally. Where there is more food, there will be more naturally be more wildlife. I believe the problem will be ongoing.
Organic waste is not stabilized or the incoming waste is not streamlined so not what gets into the land field. Unprocessed Organic waste attracts more birds/rodents
Birds and rodents are attracted to garbage. If you have garbage out you are going to try more of these type of animals or mammals.
The dump already emits foul smells. Increasing the organic waste can only mean more smell more birds and more rats (a big problem since the dump was established)
Deterrents are only so effective, especially if the waste itself is more attractive. I have significant doubts of the effectiveness of the measures proposed.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Enhanced Attraction of Birds
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
If there is more material in the landfill that attracts birds, they will eat more plastics and items that they should be ingesting. This will lead to greater environmental impact.
more mitigation measures should be explored to combat the medium risk of increase in birds
We ate already plagued with rats. Gulls are the rats of the sky. We will get birds.
more birds more bird poop. Why when things are working do things change to save money now and may cause more money in pollution in the long run.
Their will be more smell's and waste in the ground it will bring a lot more birds to the area
Not enough
They can sneak into any small thing that will attract them not only birds but all scavenger
Wishful thinking if you have any familiarity with seagulls
We see lots of seagulls here. I don't see how this will eliminate them. You have lots of people who do not separate food waste and put it directly in garbage.
with changes there will be more waster and more birds therefore hard to control
We all know it won't work
I do not believe that your study took into account all of the potential issues and even this survey is only asking questions that you want to ask. You have not identified what the frequency of bird or vector control will be or how it will be carried out. Your responses with regards to mitigation efforts are much too broad with no specifics.
Again the system you have now works and should be improved not removed.
BS "survey"
I do not believe it will be effective
increased mitigation efforts appear speculative as to their outcome rather than conclusive
Taking out the additional sorting will certainly attract animals. Full stop.
I already watch flocks of crows head to the dump every morning. It is disingenuous to propose that more feeders will not be attracted.
Additional waste = additional birds
Don't believe it
I've been in the landfill, about 10 years ago. Your picture is great, but I saw many more birds than are represented by that photo, and I feel they would definitely be increased if there is more food for them to find.
I remember the bird and rodent issues in Sackville where is was horrible
No
No guarantee that the additional measure will mitigate the risk
That won't work
"Increased frequency" is extremely vague
I'm not convinced that the measures would be effective.
I dont believe these measures will be effective
Increased organics will lead to increased bird
As stated i remember the sackville land fill nightmare
Leaving the Processor operational will eliminate the need for bird management & eliminate the killing of wild birds.
The birds will still keep trying to get to the landfill and instead congregate closer to our residential area instead.
Your leading people
Not going to help
Organic materials will attract more scavenger birds
By not sorting the garbage you will increase animals and birds to the area.
Many people still put organic in the bags instead of green bin, hence why the the crows are always tearing them apart. With no sorting at the station it will now go in the landfill
Better fix is to not have anything to attract them in 1st place
Come just before dark and see the crows/ turkey vultures and owels
attracting more birds and killing them is terribly inhumane. the animal is being punished for its natural behaviour. again this is a sloppy countermeasure for a sloppy job. just do it right
Medium risk of increased attraction of birds? Where do you think the birds are coming from? They're not all born there. They will get there by flying over, and having a pit stop, on my roof. How much are these mitigation measures costing? Where can I get a copy of the study we paid for?
It's better to reduce the attraction by removing organics than it is to scare birds and other wildlife away
the quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog the quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog the quick brown fox jummped over the lazy dog the quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog the quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog the quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog the quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog the quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog
No specifics.... No timelines.... Just very general platitudes...
Specifically the increase in different material and the impact on water and bird feces
By removing the FEP and WSP you will attract more scavenger birds and vermin that carry disease and cause destruction.
I do not believe this will be adequate when the lack of FEP results in a greater noncompliance in separation of organic from waste at the residential source.
Keep sorting facility as agreement
-
some of the unsorted garbabe would be hazardous to the animals and birds nearby. In addition the smell/food waste is likely to attract a much higher volume of birds and animals
No specific information is provided concerning the current or proposed frequency of bird management measures.
With the stoppage of the fep/wsf I am concerned that birds will increase.
I don't see any mitigation

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Enhanced Attraction of Birds
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
A lot of smoke and mirrors. Not true
This mitigation has little to do with impact of shutting down FEP
Birds bring disease
Noise pollution, killing birds, etc
There will be less noise generated if the front end loaders are shutdown.
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated
With more blowing littler it will attract more birds
It is an almost round the clock job. More garbage, more birds, and you can never get rid of them, only try to limit their numbers.
Once again, lack of trust. Also, this area is a nightmare of pests already with so much construction going on, I can't imagine adding more fuel to the fire.
Trying to nudge birds to behave the way we want is done constantly throughout planet, often with dubious results, think Scully, etc.
There are quite a few seagulls around the area now. The numbers will only increase unless you plan on killing them which I would disagree to
If you remove the safeguards in place more scavenger birds will be attracted due to the lack of sorting with compostables.
Deactivation of FEP and WSF will lead to the accumulation of more organic waste, attracting more wildlife.
The attraction of more birds will still occur even with items that are in place as they are probably in place currently and it is not making a difference. Always lots of crows around to get into the trash and having more things there that attract them will only make things worse.
Birds are already an issue and this will increase it. Please honour the agreement
City pigeon are now out here shittin on everything dirty birds rats
The more organic material the more birds and rodents will increase period
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
with increased garbage and organics there will be an increase in the already multitude of existing birds. Birds carry diseases and in addition fly to and from the land fill daily over residential housing.
Very concerned about the outer band of the area as it moves into more and more residential areas.
You should not be deactivating
It works now, but will not work if you make the changes
If you figure that people will not put food waste in their garbage, I believe that you are wrong - therefore, getting rid of FEP/WSF removes a step where wet waste can be removed from what goes in the landfill
Would prefer to attract less birds in the first place then assume that the additonal mitigation efforts will be enough
Pictures of birds with the current FEP/WSF measures in place are meaningless relative to what the bird situation will potentially be when the Front End Processing activity is discontinued
these measures were tried in the previous landfill to no avail
So we will spend more money on staffing and equipment. I have a hard time believe the appropriate cover would be placed to meet the expected increase in unsuitable waste.
Concern for the well being of the birds - and potentially more birds being exposed to this "limited" culling
More organic will attract more birds and vectors
Paint it whatever colour you want, this is still HRM trying to break an agreement they should not be breaking.
With the addition of waste and new waste streams there will be more birds/rodents attracted to the site. More control equates to additional control costs, which are and will be passed on to taxpayers.
Those measures don't always work as designed.
You can't control where birds want to go off landfill property
Still think the effects will out weigh the mitigation treatment as there is no data to support
with the addition of tonnage of non approved organic materials, the sheer additional availability will lead to the attraction of more birds
no diversion measures have been considered to keep them away
Would need more info.
These do not address the issues at the root of the problem. There is no way of predicting the effect on the bird population.
I remember Sackville. You comment field would not take my whole comment - I guess you only want short comments? Leave it the way it is. Hopefully that is short enough....?
This measure might be working fine now but we don't know how well it will work once the change is implemented. I have visited the site and the main measure is just a loud noise that barely works as it is.
I do not believe that once the front - end processor is shut down that there will not be an increase in unwanted activity and cannot be controlled .
Define the increased frequency of bird and vector controls
The facility is running well in our community
The birds leave the dump and fly elsewhere right now in our community. They are attracted to the dump but hand out elsewhere and fly back. Nothing is being done to stop this and it will only get worse
Even the potential of a slight increase in organic matter entering the facility will increase the amount of birds entering the area, as well as rata, mice and other scavenging animals
If you're expecting to attract more birds then is sounds you're expecting more organic waste, which means more critters in general. Medium risk is not low risk.
Birds can pick things up from the dump then carry them else where. All ur mitigation, will not deter all of the birds and the loss the the FEP/WSF will likely attract more birds
There is no clear explanation on how you are going to implement these measures.
Bird are persistent. If the waste is not processed and organically will be present, birds will make a mess with or without a daily cover on fresh waste.
?????
My concern is when the community agreed to allowing the landfill in the area this was not part of the agreement
It will still draw more birds to the area
We know for a fact traditional landfills abundance of birds. Otter Lake Landfill is NOT a traditional landfill and requires the operation of the FEP and WSF to ensure the residential communities that surround the Otter Lake Landfill are not burdened by offensive odours, scavenging birds, unwanted rats, rodents, and vermin that carry disease and cause destruction.
With non-quantifiable terms like increases, it sounds more like you're saying we hope this works but we have no idea. We know the current system is effective. Do not change it

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Enhanced Attraction of Birds
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Please define what these statements actually entail, "Increased frequency of bird and vector control efforts at the landfill disposal area and around the landfill in general. Emphasis on minimizing the size (and thus the attractiveness to birds) of the landfill disposal area, as well as applying daily cover on freshly placed waste."
With no frp or wad the amount of food waste that DIES end up I the land fill will attract more than just birds. What about the vultures that are along the south shore and south west nova ? I'm sure they will make their way up to this future smelly facility.
Birds can carry waste, create a noise nuisance and make a mess in surrounding areas. I don't believe these measures will remove this additional nuisance.
If saving money is the reason these changes are being made then adding mitigation methods is an added cost which eventually will be deemed too expensive.
No definition of bird and vector control to accurately say this is sufficient/ limiting the size will not affect birds visiting
To easily mismanaged.
If you are cutting out certain aspects where there will be more leakage and odor will definitely attract more animals
Also need to address rodent issues
Sick of bird droppings everywhere now
How do you get rid of rodents?
I'm not convinced that the measures would be effective.
Eliminating the source for which the birds/rodents are attracted is a much more attractive solution, in my opinion, rather than exterminating those attracted to the site! No different than expecting private residents being expected to eliminate food sources for wildlife vs traps or poisoning!
Birds are attracted to garbage , dumped garbage will just attracted
I do not consider birds to have a major impact on the environment, which is my primary concern.
Flocks of birds will carry debris and cause issues with excrement in the area
It will attract more birds
No daily coverage isn't fast enough
These seem like short-term bandaids more than solutions.
I am not confident this will work.
Looks like a staged photo. Sea gulls don't naturally line up in pristine area.
Medium risk of increase is too great a risk. There should be NO increase in attracting birds. The FEP & WSF should be improved, not removed.
Birds have a way of getting what they want, as any birdwatcher will tell you. While I personally enjoy birds, we have all seen the results of their activity on waste pickup day, notwisthstanding well-meant but ultimately ineffective protctive measures.
Bird control measures are insufficient
The proposed mitigation is vague and unenforceable. Problem will persist.
I feel more seagulls will fly into the area of timberlea
Medium risk is too much risk. The Agreement entered into by HRM with the adjacent communities did not propose that the communities be exposed to medium risk.
I don't think it will be enough sorting measures are removed
We should not be killing birds because of our waste issues and you admit an increased risk if you remove the environmental measures.
This will only work to a point.
Medium risk is too high. Just because no off site risks are ID'd does not mean they won't occur. 4000+ putrid waste direct to landfill will attract birds.
Increased bird activity at the site will undoubtedly lead to increased presence in adjacent communities with negative outcomes.
Decaying material not properly processed will attract rodents, birds and give odours
What about other wildlife and other native plants and organisms
Birds are persistent. They will never be an non-issue.
Doesn't scare rodents. And that photo is not reassuring re: birds. 😊
At the end of the day, if you had a sorter/processor that mitigated these issues before the birds are attracted, they wouldn't potentially become more of an issue. The the sorter is a proactive measure as opposed to all of these other measures which are reactive measures.
Increased organic waste will result in more birds on site, the falcon will not be there 24/7 and birds get used to whistles
Again, currently we have NO PROBLEMS with birds, rats or environmental issues. With a truck and dump program, and not using the FEP & WSF safety measures that ensure only acceptable end up in the cell as approved by HRM staff. Keep the FEP & WSF
I worked [redacted] These measures only work for a moment and then they comeback. Birds will come in flocks without FEP/WSF. FOOD
Doesn't solve the root of the problem, wildlife should not be able to eat plastic and other toxic waste
Wherever there is unsorted organic materials there will be birds, rats and other vermin. The deterioration of waste disposal standards will lead to more problems.
More garbage, more birds, more ways to fix the probelm. If it is a problem at all.
Exposure of waste will attract feeders. Someday - include increased killings. We can't predict animal behaviour.
Unless you are willing to employ your proposed mitigation measures 24/7 352 days a year they real impact will be marginal

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
A commitment to the community was maintained for FEP/WSF. It has worked well and should be maintained.
Baiting means poisoning which endangers other parts of our ecosystem, which is already in deep crisis. Never bait. Poison baiting endangers falcons as birds also eat the bait. But baiting also endangers other birds of prey which eat rodents. The mitigation measures are not as effective as maintaining the FEP/WSF.
A baiting program is bad for the environment as the dead rodents will be eaten by scavengers and any still alive may be preyed upon. This will lead to bioaccumulation in predators and a poisoning of the local food chain. Again, this would be making the problem worse when we have a FEP/WSF established to mitigate.
So your response to potential rodents is to put down poison and attractants?
Why give rodent population a chance to grow when you already have the FEP/WSF to prevent a problem in the first place? Also no thought given to the possible return of ICI waste to Otter Lake and the effect that will have on the rodent population.
Unclear of what a baiting program entails and if it poses a risk to other animals. Safety of wildlife should be a priority as well.
That does not seem sufficient to prevent rodent issues in the local adjacent communities
Doesn't mitigate my concerns
No proof that they will wormk
bringing in unsorted materials could over power present control applications.
I doubt that the existing mitigation measures will be succesfull with the increased food availability. Do the existing measures irradicate the present rodent population? Rodents are prolific breeders and with a larger amount of food available there will definately be more rodents around.
Untreated waste introduces new food source.
There will be more food for rodents therefore more rodents
trash is still not segregated (garbage and food) and rodents still come looking for food.
Rodents travel from nearby locations
se same as bird issue in previous question.
Timberlea Village sees more rats than ever! More frequent trips, more organics, additional materials lost along the roadways attracts rodents & unwelcome wildlife
More organic material in the landfill will bring more rats. Baiting won't be able to overcome the attraction of tonnes of potential food.
The program can take a long time to put in place
If done properly NO rodents would survive
Again with the increase in additional waste will increase these rodents and these measures will not be enough and will only be a temporary bandaid
Ethics of baiting program
Rats etc produce very quickly and to lose the sorting process to remove food waste will open the door to more rats etc
The Rats throughout Timberlea are already bad as a result of this landfill, clearly they will only get much worse as these measures will NOT properly deal with the existing problem, which will only worsen with the proposal at hand.
We have rodents in our subdivision as a result of the landfill With The Front-End Processor. (I make sure NO food wasted or garbage is in my yard) expect it will be worse if removed.
Once again we create a feeding site then want to kill all the extra animals that come there. Have you given any thought to how this really doesn't manage the problem, you feel that trapping and baiting works. The grocery stores can't even keep them away or high density population areas. Why do you feel that you can control it you're not not realistic
Rodents will travel outside the landfill disposal area and spread to neighbouring communities. More information is needed on exactly what the plan would look like, both on roll out and general upkeep/inspections.
Rodents are getting worse all the time
This will add a significant amount of food waste to the disposal areas. For the amount of money it takes to continue these services it seems unnecessary to stop them and potentially harm the surrounding environment. The current rodent mitigation Does not sound adequate to address the proposed changes.
To many rodents now as it is
I would like to know how the study deducted 'medium' risk vs 'high' risk!
I do not trust that HRM will do what is needed.
Leaving FEP / WSF in place will continue to minimize or eliminate this problem instead of requiring mitigation
It is not like the rodents just stay there. They will travel to other areas and the more inappropriate landfill items, the more rodents will be attracted.
The effectiveness of baiting doesn't allay my concerns.
I did not see an explanation of why there are no off site impacts are expected. It is easy to say this, but I want to see some analysis. Without the FEP/WSF, there will be more food and better 'denning' opportunities (due to the inferior compaction of waste) which will result in increased populations.
Rodents run downhill and this is going to add to the pre-existing rodent issue in this community
Baiting rodents is inhumane.
You are suggesting we remove the solution to the root cause of the now non-existent issue and substitute out for a bandaid on an issue you are about to cause. This is sort sighted planning.
You really have to be kidding!!! Of course there will be more rats. Anyone next door to someone with a bird feeder will tell you that. Even when garbage and green bin material is secured. This is really quite insulting.
No amount of baiting can handle that amount of rodents especially when the bait has to compete with food waste.
Another band aid solution. If it can't be automated, it's not worth doing.
Adding organics will increase rodents. Supply food and they will come. Look at all the restaurants in town trying to keep rats out
Should we not try to prevent more rodents, rather than attracting and then trapping them?
The rodents would have to be poisioned and these chemicals could then leach into the water table
General concerns about poison animals dying off site
If there is food, there will be rodents
The landfill would represent an all-you-can-eat buffet for rodents, even with a daily earth cap put over the material (a rat can easily dig through that). Baiting program might reduce their numbers, but it would hardly control them. Preventing the additional rodents from accessing the site is much more effective, perhaps by implementing some kind of "front end processing" to separate them...
Baiting programs reduce risk but the addition of more organic material to the site will significantly impact the population. Baiting programs have proven unable to keep up under similar stress tests.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Rodents are a big problem in Halifax as it is being a port city. Nothing's going to stop the rodents. It never does. What do rodents attract? DISEASE
Bait only kills them. They will still be attracted to the area
Rats can't be stopped - an increase there will lead to an increase in surrounding areas.
Baiting programs have limited success and create risk of poison to natural species in area (mink, otter,etc)
The issues seem to be the same. It is not the mitigation measures but the effect the increased waste will have on the facility. Less sources of food waste will attract less rodents.
Halifax has a rodent problem. Not sure how effective these measures will be. I live in Whites Lake and there are rodents in the neighborhood, presumably from the garbage trucks. If the organic sa will increase in the landfill so will the rodents
big rodent problem in nearby residential area
Rats and other small rodents continue to be a concern in the Timberlea area even with the current measures. Removing measures at the landfill site will only make this issue worse as rodents delivered to site seek sources of food further from the landfill.
Depending on population levels, bait traps may not be effective. If there is an abundance of human food waste it is unlikely that rodents will even visit the bait stations. Rodents that get delivered may also be wise to bait stations making them ineffective. With more food, populations will increase and spread out to the local area.
Unacceptable
We will see a large increase in rodents and baiting will only slightly diminish it
Baiting will not decrease the rodents being attracted to this site and increasing their population within the surrounding areas
Come on. Lies you cant prevent that
If you do not prevent organic matter from entering the landfill, you have not met the expected requirements of the public that pay for this location to exist.
We already have many rats running through this area because of landfill, mg dog died because of a rat poisoned that it grabbed
Again food / organic waste WILL attract them
What mitigation measures are inplace to eradicate/control the rodents venturing outwards of the landfill and making their way into nearby communities, then multiplying and spreading to more surrounding communities (wild fire)?
Stated earlier, 10% of waste are organics. Birds and rodents will be attracted to 10%, this is a big number
Honor the contract!
Let's be realistic. Rats are not a new problem when it comes to trash. If there were such a wonderful solution they'd be gone
Common sense you can bait all you want does not mean they will kill all the rodents Infact they adapte. Of there is any source of easy food they will only get worse and multiple at a extreme rate.
This portion of the survey appears to address "delivery of rodents" to the site. If waste is no longer sorted before entering the facility, will rodent populations increase due to increase volume of organic waste onsite?
Very disappointed that you would be risking our community to save money.
I am well educated in the matter. These silly excerpts are not what I expected. And unappreciated. A medium risk is an understatement.
you are just being extra cruel with extra poison. we need to have a process that will do its best not to attract rodents all together. Why create something that attracts more rodents and then kill them after the fact.
Where there is edable waste there will always be rodents such as rats congregatine within the local areas.
Medium risk is still an increased risk. Rats are already an issue and any increase is intolerable
Rodents on site are another reason for additional bird activity.
This would not be adequate to address the increase in rodent population.
see previous comment
Again, currebt process works. Proposed process is unknown and could become unmanageable
Look at the Sackville site
More rodents, more bait, more problems. Just keep sorting waste for crying out loud.
Baiting will also kill wildlife and birds and or can be carried back to the near by communities as well .
Baiting programs are ineffective at controlling rodent populations. In any unmonitored ecosystem filled with unnatural/human waste, more rodent populations will thrive, creating a hot spot for diseases.
this may not be effective if fep and wsf are removed
So you will bait rodents so they die, which will attract more birds and animals to the decaying carcasses.
Thee has been a significant rise in rodent activity in part due to the reduced restaurant activity and easily accessible garbage. I believe that the proposed changes will only provide a more easily accessible source of food.
No changes should occur to waste management as people have bought homes in areas with the undetsrr tree and I g that it would always be managed as it was originally set up
The increase in rodent population is becoming urban/suburban/rural issue. The green bin program has brought pest into homes and other areas in our communities. The suggestion that by allowing more organic into the stream will not increase the rodent population, disease spread to other animals flies in the face of logic
I don't believe that a baiting program is going to be sufficient in keeping rodents at bay from the landfill disposal area.
medium risk needs to be reduced to small risk, and not allow to grow to large risks
The increase of decaying food placed directly into the landfill will not only attract more bird but other animals as well. Timberlea already has a rodent problem with the deactivation it will only increase and attrack not only rats but other animals as well.
Don't think baiting is enough
Too many rats now and this will make it worse
Just like the birds issue, you're not going to stop rodents from being attracted to the area. They're rodents. They find a way.
Again, you are admitting to increased problems by saying you are implementing mitigation programs. Rats will come when there is a source of food no matter what you do. Just take a look at the docks or warehouses, even where there is no source of rotting waste!
With all the new expenses it will cost to solve all the problems this will make why not just keep it the way it is, doesnt make much sense.
There's no way you'll stop determined rodents
I work in an environment that tends to attract mice and it doesn't seem to matter how frequently pest control is contacted the problem persists.
Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill
We got too many rats now in Timberlea They get immune to the poison
Same reasons as for the "bird" question above.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I dontbelieve this will be sufficient
Current steps hat were part of the original agreement to allow the facility to operate in that location are being removed
Baiting is no solution to rodents and other pests. Bait sites simply move the problem up the food chain to larger animals that get hold of dead baited rodents. The solution is simple, maintain organic diversion in the FEP/WSF
See last answer
There will be more rodents which will be a nuisance, plus increased potential for disease.
These mitigation measures would be the first of thier kind to ever work in the world - ever!
Rodents will arrive, why have less sorting at the front end. There will be more than there are now.
Not good enough. Do not wantbthings to change
Apparently it is not working so well as i have noticed an increase in rats in our area
don't make changes. keep the promises as made years ago by city council.
garbage dumped is an open invitation for rodents
As before, no way to avoid the issue if there is a food source present
because again the city is being disengenous, the rodent problem is horrenous as is and will clearly get worse, the baiting does not work, the rodents learn.
There has to be a better way
Once rats get offsite they need to go somewhere
Moderate risk sounds serious yet this survey down plays this issue. More measures need to be taken than a baiting system.
Additional decaying product dumped will increase rodents obviously, not deactivating the procedure will at the very least not cause an increase
Rodents are incredibly smart and multiply quickly. Whatever trap is used in the beginning, the rodents will eventually outsmart and then a new trap will have to be developed which will cost more money.
More baiting means more expenses.
THis will not be enough to deter a large increase in rodents which is inevitable. Baiting program not enough
Once rodents are established in a specific area where food waste is present it is nearly impossible to get rid of them.
This is an absolute joke and betrayal of the community that has hosted this landfill for years...it is considered a world class facility and should be maintained as such...a couple questions into the survey and you can tell how biased it is already....
Refuse
Poisoned rats are left to die on peoples properties. Of pets become in contact with poisoned rodents.
It is difficult to appreciate how no increased rodent activities can be a potential given the nature of the change. Other hrm rodent control measures have proven only to have moderate success in much less prone areas. Baiting in a plethora of organic food will have limited effectivness
Rats have been an ongoing issue in the BLT community for several years now. A baiting program is not going to sufficiently control the problem. Rats carry diseases and there are many pets in this area that are susceptible to illness because of rodents
You plan to implement a baiting program? Wow. Maybe just don't deactivate the FEP/WSP (which was supposed to be kept in place as per the contract). Why is this even being proposed? Part of the reason the community agreed they were ok with waste management site was because of the FEP/WSP and now you just plan to take it away?
You can't catch all of the rodents and we've already seen a large increase in rodents in this area.
Not really because rodents are not stupid, they adapt & learn, and if no one is policing what is actually being dropped at the facility there is bound to be an increase in rodents & smells.
Med risk to high
Mmmm
Timberlea has a rat problem now. They come down the waterway from the landfill looking for food. It will only get worse.
Medium risk too high
Med risk to high, should be no risk
Baiting on site is a band-aid and we all know it. There are ALREADY rats in the 5km perimiter. Any potential for increase is unacceptable. Plus, baiting will target non-rodent life and I have a large issue with that also.
When we met with the city prior to the installation of this waste facility, we were given promises regarding capping the cells, sorting waste, no odor, etc. We have Rodents now, what you are proposing will make it worse. Is a promise made to residents not binding on future Municipal Governments??
Rats and rodents often do not stay contained to the dump location; they often will travel into the surrounding community. Not removing organic matter will encourage more rodents onsite
Uncomposted Organics should NOT be going into landfill. PERIOD!
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
Rodent control at that level is impossible. There will always be a rodent population that will expand out from the waste area.
Moving backwards and adding a band aid is not a solution. "Let's kill the creatures that WE attract!!" Lovely!! NOT!!! It's inhumane!!
Rodents are prolific & maximum removal of food items from waste to keep ahead of multiplying rodents.
Because there will be additional food waste in the landfill and thay WILL cause an increase of rodents in the area... If they learn to avoid the landfill, they will go to different areas in the community
Suggesting some baitboxes are an adequate counter measure is absurd. Relatively clean commercial businesses often struggle for years with rodent issues. To suggest some baitboxes can deal with this at something like a dump is a joke.
The presence organics will multiply the rat problem
Why change what has already been working in Hope's that the mitigation measures will prevent issues? What if it doesn't.
Any increase in rodents will only make it worse
Timberlea already has too many rats this will cause so many more.
Baiting itself won't limit rodents
Rats are a problem in the HRM as it is including my area thanks to green bins. You can’t fix the rodent issue
Mitigation efforts will not be enough to offset the feeding potential
Still have rats and desease getting into birds etc
These claims cannot be substantiated

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
People are putting things in their garbage bags that don't fo there. You can't assume everyone is being diligent about that. You get rid of the front end, there will be MORE rodents and other wildlife.
Timberlea is already full of rats. They are running around the neighbourhood getting into houses & sheds. We don't want more rats, get rid of them!!!
Again you are expecting an increase in rodents. Doesn't take much to trigger a population explosion and increased risk beyond site.
I'm seriously concerned about the attraction of more rodents coming into this area.
I have had my own rodent problems in and around my house and have spent thousands of dollars to repair damage caused by rats. I am concerned about the increase in rodents at the landfill and, possibly, in my neighbourhood again.
We have a major problem with RATS NOW
Bating is putting toxins (bait) into the surrounding area affecting water quality as well as other predatory animals that will feed on the dead rodents and spreading the poison further away from the landfill facility to adjoining communities
BLT is already ridden with rodents. Deactivation will make it worst
What is currently being done is not sufficient
I don't believe you
Again without processing and delivery of rodents would increase their chance of survival.
Rats are already throughout Beechville. These rats are difficult to eliminate and a massive food source nearby will only make matters worse.
I don't believe these measures will be taken.
Absolutely UNACCEPTABLE to increase poisoning as rodent population grows, this endangers our wildlife and environment even more, NO to increasing poisons, YES to maintaining what we have with the FEP.
The best mitigation measure to reduce rodents is not to deactivate the FEP/WSF.
Again I do not think there will be sufficient labour/equipment and the medium risk will become high. If the risk was low. To begin with then it of course would be better.
Cost of increased pest control and the increased danger to local wildlife with the pest control management.
People do not do a good job of separating their trash!!
More baiting is the mitigation strategy? Empty, hollow, and simply adds more poison to the environment. The front end processing works and does not rely on poison and trapping.
There is still a high potential for additional rodents to be present in the area where there is already a problem even with the current mitigation measures.
More trash equals more pests, which reproduce exponentially
No type of poisons or anything harmful to the land should be used. This area should remain as it was supposed to be.
Concerned about effectiveness of baiting program
As per my previous response, these mitigation strategies are not 100% effective so increase in rodents will occur
We all know that won't fix the problem!
What is meant by 'increased baiting'? All mitigation seems very vague.
I hear there are still many rodents and the baiting program kills the crows.
Baiting is typically not effective. Removing the reason for rodents is much better
More loose garbage and spread of garbage will only increase the rodent population.
Again, an increase of litter will draw more rodents in.
Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill. If the FEP/WSF is still in operation, additional rodents would not be attracted to the site in the first place, and additional mitigation measures would not be required. If a rodent population does become established should the FEP/WSF be shut down, and other measures are then used to deter them, the rodents will then move on to other areas.
Should the landfill become over run with rats they will migrate far and wide affect into our neighborhoods
With the deactivation of FEP/WSF there will likely be increased rodents which have already been increased in these areas. Please do not deactivate the FEP/WSF.
There will be increased rodents. Killing them doesn't solve the problem of what is attracting them if the trash isn't being presorted.
Organic should should not be put in the landfill
We will have more rodents in our communities and this is not acceptable. There were promises made when the facility went in so close to housing
What is baiting ? Poisoning? The fresh water system is at risk for being impacted. Has there been an environmental assessment ?
If the waste is not properly cleaned as it is now I believe it will attract more rodents
Again, if the current process is addressing these issues, why remove them
Does the city plan on keeping these "baiting programs" on going forever? How is the city going to pay for staff to maintain these baiting programs?
There is already a rodent problem. Having more organics will only breed more.
Right now the sorting is done in a specific area, rodent control is easier because of size of the physicial location. Once garbage starts to go directly to the landfil (AKA dump) - the rodent issue is transferred over a mjuch larger area making it hard/impossible to control.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
Baiting isn't very effective and also animal cruelty.
Insufficient measure to control issue
I owned property in Timberlea before and after the land fill was established. The rodent problem has not been reduced it gets worse each year. I had a rental property where they ate through the siding and the exterior sheathing and infested the attic! gotten been reduced, it continues to grow year after year.The rats are agressive and eat through siding and
Critics say they don't work. I am not sure what works
More information on the "mitigation of Rodents" needs to accompany this survey. Description is too sketchy.
Increased risk still
hy are you even considering taking it away??? Baiting is not enough! If a rat sees a giant pile of rotten food and garbage and a trap that has a tiny morsel of food, obviously it's going to go for the giant free for all rather than the trap. This unlimited source of rotten food will also encourage the rat population to increase exponentially.
Not good enough
Rats and mice thrive on garbage, especially things left lying on the ground for a period of time. They are scooped up with the trash during clean ups and dumped directly into the landfill.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
mitigation measures help but don't alleviate the increase of rodent activity that will occur after the present facilities are shut down
We have rats in this area already. I do not look forward to an increased population as a result of your actions.
I don't believe it. I believe increase rats and mice.
YOU ARE NOT ABLE TO ANSWER THIS AS THE FEP/WSF HAVE NOT BEEN DEACTIVATED !!!
We have rats and now weasels and traps DO NOT actually work all the time!!
Rodent impact will definitely increase, increasing the rodent mitigation methods in hopes of not causing large increases in rodent population
In an effort to not be too repetitive, I will point out that the system currently in place, the one residents agreed to, is working. Let's stay with it.
There will be increased rodents if the front end processing, stabilizer, and processing.
Not strict enough
Because we have rodents now and I don't want them to get worse.
Absolutely there will be more rodents! If we're not sorting and disposing of organic material properly there will most definitely be an increased issue of rodents.
If food residues are not burned prior disposal, there will likely be more rodents around
Its the smell I'm concerned about! Its already giving off an odour. I moved my home here based on the city honouring the operation as it started not to the changes. It will make my home environment less livable costing me hundreds of thousands of dollars in depreciated home value.
This survey is organized in an incredibly biased way. Where are the counter arguments ?
Rats are intelligent and will move into other areas of the neighbourhood.
Rodents have the potential to propagate and spread. I'd like to see some sort of system in place where we would have access to have rodent control services provided at residences if the issues arise.
More garbage means more rodents. The bait program would need to be increased exponentially
If there is no sorting, there will be increased rodents! Rodents can have a large territory. Our pats are at risk for injury and diseases form this increased population.
Baiting has not worked in other areas
Baiting hasn't worked to control the problem in downtown Halifax. There is no way it will curb the increased activity that will be seen around the site
More needs to be done these rodents get spread throughout community is disgusting
Where you have waist materials you will have rats and these multiple you will not be able to control this
The fact there is no separation of waste will automatically ensure a great number of rodents in the area. They carry disease and can travel throughout other areas into neighboring population. Cost savings do not equal the risk to the public health.
Rodents and organics go hand in hand, once they find food they are there for good!
If the sorting the rodents will take over.
Putrescent garbage will attract more and more rodents. Timberlea is full of them now. We don't want more.
Your current mitigation efforts are ineffective and this will only get worse with the closing of the FEP
What you are proposing will not guarantee the rodent problem will be satisfactory
There is alot of competing material - bait versus the actual material delivered. Rodents will enjoy the actual waste more than the bait!
Rats are smart and survivors trapping is not enough however i am not a pest control expert so i have no alternative suggestions
same reply as previous question
Baiting will not control pests when they have an entire dump at their disposal
The Timberlea community is well known to have rat issues. Decreasing protections at the dump will only increase these issues. We purchased an expensive home in a desirable golf community knowing there were safeguards at the landfill facility. This feels like a bait and switch tactic not in the best interest of the community, only the bottom line of HRM.
Dead rodents killed by baiting brings other issues and concerns around disease and smell
Is baiting more effective than fresh waste?
We have rodents now, so this will not improve the issue.
There has been an every increasing number of rats seen in the Timberlea area in recent years. I will grant that some of this might have been to the building of the Brunello subdivision and the loss of natural forest buffer.
This will not effectively decrease number of rodents when compared to current levels. An increase in rodents will naturally occur.
The last thing neighbours need is the possibility of more rats running throughout the neighbourhood. Halifax City has enough rats for Timberlea and area. To save a measly 2 million dollars to add rats, gulls, maggots, flies and the like is a pathrtic attempt to increase the bottom line.
Medium risk is unacceptable. There are already complaints of rodents in neighborhoods bordering this site before these changes are implimented.
The attraction of more rodents IS the concern, not how you kill these animals. Without the current facilities, you will be attracting more birds and rodents.
.baiting, aka poisoning could also have unintended impacts on wildlife. Including wildlife taking the bait, or feeding on poisoned rodents
Is it poison being used? What about groundwater?
There are already high instances of rats in the surrounding area so the existing mitigations are not sufficient.
Feel like their is more racoons and rats in area and this will continue to attract them and rapping measures should need to be even larger than planned to address the problem
Best control is working now. No changes needed. When it comes to the environment it is 2021 and step backward is the wrong step!
Rats are a huge problem now and it is only found to get worse.
We currently live on [redacted] and have rodent problems, so what is currently done isn't even enough.
Baiting stations just don't work
It's haven't stopped it so far. Rats are everywhere
Unacceptable - garbage that is not sorted appropriately will attract additional rodents. This is not meeting with original agreement
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
Rodents populate at a very fast rate, it's a huge food source you won't be able to control it

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
There is no guarantee you will still to your mitigation measures
There is no guarantee that the rodents will cooperate and take the " bait"
This WILL attract and deliver more rodents to the area. Baiting programs simply end up killing other wildlife and pets that live in proximity to the landfill site. Perhaps rather than helping to increase the rodent population, you can just do what you promised you would do and keep the front end processing in place to mitigate the rodent population.
What happens if you are wrong? Who is burdened with the risk? The local residents are! Question out of curiosity: if I answered this the "right" way...as this survey seems to be heavily skewed...and I getting additional information about why I am "wrong" similar to what I am getting now?
Delivery of rodents seems like an odd phrase... Organic materials will attract more rodents no? If you remove the waste stabilization facility, waste will not get the time to start to break down (if there is some organic material in there by mistake which there will undoubtedly be).
The rodent population will definitely increase and will not be managed by traps
Thats a lie. This poll is propaganda. The rodent problem is notoriously bad already in Glengarry Estates and Greenwood Heights it'll only get worse if you go through with this
I have lived in Timberlea fo[redacted]years and only in the last 4 years have we had a problem with rodents. I am currently paying $300. to a reputable pest control company. We already have rat tunnels around our house. Lack of sorting will further exacerbate the problem.
Introducing organics will help the rodent population to explode.
rodents follow garbage and rotting food waste. Baiting programs will not be enough to resolve this issue. Its an issue currently, so why would you think this would not make it a larger issue
Baiting rodents is not 100% effective.
rats, mice, bugs. there's nothing you can do to keep them completely away and this project is just going to bring in even more of them
no fresh rodents are delivered there daily and will just populate themselves over time
Medium risk is too high this should be low risk for rodents. Living in the area there are already a large number of rodents due to the facility if you make these changes there will definitely be a lot more rodents in the area which is completely unnecessary.
With the elimination of the FEP in the WSF residents will not be able to sort ways to the level that this operation does. We inherited this facility many years ago when no one else wanted and now we will be penalized because we've been good citizens. Hey Durham claims cannot be substantiated. Our community will end up having offence of voters rodents disease and health issues. Shame on you!
Rats are bad. Any industry that attracts rats should be held accountable to zero tolerance and HRM Council should not accept anything less.
more organics more rodents who will go to residentials area
There's been a huge increase of mice etc in area since construction of the facility which will only get worse.
Honestly? Your going to say there won't be an issue?!?
since the building has exsisted theres been an increase of rodents in area
In the last couple years they already got worse . This a all lies
There has been a serious increase in the last ten years of rodents in the area they might not actually be on site but the rodents are smart enough to inhabit the surrounding area
There are already too many rodents in my neighbourhood from what is in place now.
Rodents will migrate to other areas
What would the otters do
Since the green bins and otter lake came into effect, our area is crawling with Rats. They have holes and trails from green bin to green bin from house to house
Animals are able to leave an area into the surroundings.
Poisoning rodents is bad for the ecosystem; adding more poisoned rodents to this ecosystem is not the answer.
Baiting may limit the population, but it's not an overall effective process to limit rodents. We live very close to the landfill and have many rodents in our yard. We used a commercial pest control provider but after a full year it did nothing to reduce their presence. Increased organics is going to increase rodents, unless there's a specialized program to reduce their presence.
Baiting will not be enough to control the rodent problem.
Increased waste will increase rodent attraction, full stop. Without proper processing this will be inevitable.
Mitigation is not the same as prevention in the first place. Current system does not require increased baiting, so how does this change improve the waste management system other than a cost basis.
There was no problem with rats back in the day till the landfill was in place I've lived here my life I know this
Poison will get added to the food chain and is not an option
You can't identify an increase in pests before a measure is implemented. Moderate risk on site is quite high and would likely impact the surrounding community.
Organic material will attract rodents. Some people sort their waste well but many do not. We need personnel to sort at the front line
Controlling rodents by regulations not enforced by bureaucrats and operators interested in profits will have no chance of effectiveness.
I live in Alderwood Village, we already have a significant rat population. Anything that may cause this to expand further concerns me.
All the barring this side of hell won't control the numbers of rate in the area.
Bating sounds like poison..
I have seen many rats in the Timberlea area
If there is an increase in attraction how are baiting measures handled to ensure population doesn't increase?
there is a medium risk of increased rodents on site. Rats multiply quickly and baiting will not be sufficient. the changes suggested to the facility and not worth this risk.
How can you guarantee that expanding the existing rodent controls will adequately prevent off-site impacts?
What is the specific and tangible action to improve the onsite rodent control processes so that there is capacity to retain the rodents within the disposal area, given that there is a flagged risk of more rodents. Curious about the specifics more than anything. The solution seems fairly general.
Am unconvinced
No amount of baiting will eliminate all rodents and it will impact other animals in the area
I don't even live close to this landfill, we are definitely having a problem of rodents in our area.
Rodents are becoming an increasingly bigger issue around the area. They carry disease and and very unfriendly. They also attract other wildlife

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
You cannot control rodents. They will expand beyond the « baiting area » where their food source currently is
We need to avoid more diseases
These measures will not solve the problem
Baiting doesn't matter if there is organic material in trash. Just a band-aid solution
Currently with the FEP/WSF Rodents are a big problem in the area
It is impossible for a baiting program to contain to rodents. A review of a typical landfill without a front-end processor and waste stabilizer should provide an answers.
I am admittedly relatively unfamiliar with baiting programs; however, my concern is that the natural predators of the rodents will also be negatively impacted.
If the baiting boxes are on the perimeter of the dump it's not very likely that the rodents will go that far away from their source of food. The more garbage, the more rats.
Use of poisons impacts unintended species. Rats have increased in numbers since the dump was created and have been an issue for many BLT residents for years. Lessening the sorting can only increase the problem
Despite baiting program, the concern is around what is bringing the rodents to the landfill in the first place. Ideally, waste should be processed so there is no food/other waste that is attractive to animals/birds. Need to proactively prevent animals from being attracted to the landfill as opposed to reactively trying to drive them away.
They will need to go somewhere
The process doesn't allow smell or rats to linger. Garbage is broken down wetted and processed beyond any attractive material.
As the food source increases, such as organics, then there are more rodents and more potential to spread disease as increased vectors, etc.
I believe the current FEP/WSF approach reduces this mitigation of rodents. Having to bait the rodents does not seem ideal when the current system aids in alleviating this issue already.
leave things alone its working
If everything is separated and done the right way with the FEP and WSF we will be able to keep it under control
can't control the rodents
When there is a garbage they will come that makes the community will be known as landfill
Rats are an increasing problem in rural communities. Populations likely to increase exponentially
Baiting systems are not fool proof and if garbage is not separated properly then rodents will feed off the garbage and be less likely to go to baiting systems.
My workplace uses baiting programs like this and despite using different providers over the years we still have issues with rodents entering the building. My home as well as my workplace are within 5km of Otter Lake and given the food based nature of my work I don't want to see any increased pest activity in the area.
It's also goign to be other animals at this site.
If I get a rat you guys are getting the bill.
Again, lots of people still put food waste in their garbage. More and more people are seeing rats around our subdivisions.
more waste more rodents harder to get control
I do not believe that baiting programs alone will solve the rodent problem as these rodents can produce and multiple at an alarming rate and cause havoc!
We need to be getting rid of landfill not enlarging it. I'm concerned that a baiting program will affect other local wildlife.
If you have a system that works now, it needs to be kept and improved not removed.
.
There will be an increase due to the closures being pursued
Still going to bring more
Bait all you want it will add substantial rodent population
current technologies deployed at this facility are state-of-the-art in dealing with this potential problem; proposed mitigation measures cannot conclusively determine likely impact in preventing increased rodent problem
Regular baiting programs should continue.
I do not believe rat breeding is rectified with baiting, baiting also kills unintentional wild and domestic life
More will be coming to dig through the bags!
More untreated organic waste = more food supply for rodents.
Rodents are attracted to where there is a food source. There has been an undeniable increase in rodents along the Prospect Rd indicating that the present method of dealing with this problem at th landfill is working. More waste will attract even more of these disease carrying rodents in our residential areas.
Don’t believe it
There is already a huge rat problem in the area. Clearly what is already happening isn't enough, the added risk will only increase the already huge population of rodents.
We had an unusual amount of rodents at my home this past spring/summer. There was very little food waste to attract them. If there is more food waste at the landfill, I'm concerned that the rodents will procreate even more rapidly and will be forced to venture further away for food, causing an increased number of rodents in residential areas due to overpopulation in the landfill.
Where there are unsorted biodegradable material in dumps there is garbage. You will not know what is in the land fill. Silly measures indeed. Keep separating and there will be few rat.s
You really need to revamp your policies
There will still be an increase in rodent activity, even if there are programs to deal with it. This is fundamentally unfair to residents in the area, who were promised that this wouldn't occur.
Baiting may not be successful against rodents
The rats are already terrible in this area. It will only get worse.
That won’t work. Even with front end loading we had rodents on a clean property
- Rats wont be limited to the direct area, they will end up in the community as well
Recent report released by Orkin highlights Halifax in top 3 rattiest cities in Maritimes
Baiting programs rarely work for eliminating rodents. Additionally, rodents will not only be drawn to the landfill site but to surrounding residential areas which then it will be dependent on the residents to manage.
I don't see how this mitigation would help.
I do not believe this stops rodents from increasing in the neighboring areas

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
not sure it will work. Present measures are working.
Baiting will be insufficient and doesn't cover the full range of area from which rats can travel
Increased buried organics will increase rodent activity
A larger open pit will simply become unmamageable
Without the Processor being operational, small animals as well as rodents would be attracted to the landfill. They would be subject to the poison set out for the rodents as well.
A baiting program is not enough.
admitted it with "baiting"....
Your leading people
Will still have an increase although it may help a bit
We voted for the landfill with these measures in place. We don't want them removed it was not what the community wanted. We did not want a landfill without these measures and still don't
It will not be possible to mitigate due to volume of organics
By not sorting the organic waste and stabilizing it you are just dump food for rats into a hole!
I live very close to the landfill and have a huge rat problem that didn't exist before the landfill, with no sorting it will only get worse
Better fix is to not attract them in first place
never seen so many rodents
The population or rats continues to grow in the surrounding subdivisions. They were non existent in this area prior to the landfill.
I don't believe baiting will be successful enough to not increase the rodnt population in the area.
i lack the confidence that any these measures are effective. using the fluffiest words possible, all you are saying is "we will take care of it". why is our landfill revered for its efficacy if we're just going to adopt practices of lesser landfills? it's unacceptable and your optimism of dealing with these "medium risks " is naive
It's better to reduce the attraction, by removing organics, than baiting rodents
The area of blt is full of rodents that started from the land fill
What guarantees can be made that rodents will not spread to the surrounding areas? What happens if baited rodents die, then are consumed by other predators? Do they ingest the toxins as well?
experience, with rats in particular
Again, the report indicates medium risk for on-site yet fails to give a concrete risk level for off-site. More garbage will attract more rodents which in turn will have a significant impact on the wildlife and ecosystem of the surrounding area. Rodents are proven to carry and spread disease quickly and if they affect nearby wildlife that is a significant environmental concern.
Bating proframmes leave dead rodent bodies in every hole they crawl into to die...
More material, more rodents. This is a no win proposition
Again, there will be even more rodents and vermin causing more disease .
Increasing baiting and poisoning at the site is a negative, in my opinion. Furthermore, removing the FEP contravenes the contract between the municipality and the host communities. Shame on Council if they even consider removing the Front End Processing and waste Sroaration.
Keep sorting as per agreement
May not be enough to contain the extra rodent populations.
rats move around very quickly to other food source areas
With the increased volume of unsorted waste, more rodents are likely to appear in the community. Baiting for this much higher expected number of rodents will not be sufficient.
This facility was not designed for disposal and management of organic materials. Removing the front end sorting processes will increase organic waste and frequency of rodents.
Not sure a baiting program would be enough
Again with the stoppage of the fep/fsw I am concerned that rodents will increase.
Increased food waste
baiting is not mitigation
Again smoke and mirrors
Timberlea is overrun with rats & rodents.
That's not enough to keep the rat population in check. You need to
Again, this has nothing to do with the resulting infestation that will happen as a result of shutting down FEP
It's not working now we have rodents since landfill went in
These measures did not work at the Sackville land fill.
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated
We have noticed a recent increase of rodents in the area
Rats are a huge concern in our area already with a baiting program in place as it is. Bait works but around homes we always say to limit competing food sources (for example, don't have birdfeeders). Baiting around a dump full of more enticing foods will not be as effective as one would like.
My house is absolutely plagued with rats (no pun intended.) I just can't believe at all that no off site impact to rodents was found. We have regular pest control service at our house and still can't get a full control of the rat problem, I can't imagine baiting an entire dump will be very effective.
It's hard to control, but every effort must be made to keep rodent levels to a minimum. Maybe introducing predators like eagles or hawks?
I am concerned with the increased risk of odour, environmental impact and rodents in the area due to same
Rodents are already an issue in the area and damage properry
Honor the original agreement that was agree to.
I work in areas where rodent control is attempted with very little success, if you have more food source around the rodents, etc will come

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
There are many rats in my area now. We do not need any more being attracted to this area since they will not all go or stay at the dump site.
We already have a serious problem in HRM with rodents, an increase in volume of waste material that has not been accurately sorted and cleaned will cause a further problem with rodents
Maintaining FEP and WSF would be superior to relying on poisoning of rodents.
Inadequate mitigation
Having garbage that has food in it will increase rodent in the area as the smell and having more items that should be put in other facilities won't happen.
Rats are already a huge issue in Beechville. These measures will not make it better. Please honour the agreement
Not enough
Rats are already an issue in Beechville we see them in backyard on regular basis and set traps regularly. Please on the contract that was originally set up
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
Within HRM and the Timberlea, Lakeside area there is already a rodent issue.
I still believe the proposed modifications will increase rodent activity in the area
I lived in timberlea from [redacted] and there was a steady increase with rodents. So when they are run out of otter lake, they go elsewhere. The bird of prey have substantially increased over the years too which is good but if rodents are poisoned then eaten by prey, it can significantly impact them.
You should not be deactivating
Without proper sorting there will be more for for rodents. I don't believe your above mentioned solutions will handle the problem.
Same as previous question - getting rid of FEP/WSF will increase the amount of food waste and rodents will find their way to the landfill.
Again, the cost of an adequate rodent disposal system will likely be more than the government is willing to pay. In addition, everywhere I know has a rodent mitigation system in place and they still have rodents. This will just make it worse. From restaurants to hospitals, anywhere you don't want rats, there are mitigation systems and yet the rats are still there.
Rodents bring disease and I am not confident that the theoretical baiting program will offset the total increase of rodents and would need to see more data to support this
Baiting on-site will have some effect, the degree to which that will be efficacious is speculative.
these measures were tried in the previous landfill to no avail
Baiting will have little affect in an area of this magnitude. It may mitigate some but not all of the risk. Housing developments are getting closer to this area and its concerning.
Rodents will be attracted to the increased organic
Rats are on the increase in the hatchet lake area
As before.
The addition of new waste streams will only further enhance the population of rodents, current mitigation issues are not successful currently, ask the residents that live within the 4/5 kilometres of Otter Lake.
Those measures almost never work as designed.
You can't control rodents once they make it off site
Current rodent problem exists fear of overloading system mitigation and little data shown to support ability to comply
The proposed additional organic water will mice the rodent risk factor from a medium risk to a higher risk, this wil also negatively the workers at this facility
If "baiting" means poison, that is even worse, given its impact on other species.
adding food waste to the landfill will increase rodents.
There will always be rodents in this area. With the closure there is bound to be an increase. Not convinced on this one.
We already have a troubling rodent problem in Beechville. This will only make matters worse. The Waste Facility may implement a baiting program but they aren't going to help all individual residents when thé problem spills over into our neighborhoods.
I remember Sackville. You comment field would not take my whole comment - I guess you only want short comments? Leave it the way it is. Hopefully that is short enough....?
I am sure traps will help mitigate the change but the rodent population can get out of control very quickly and simple traps won't be enough.
We are already seeing an increase in rodent activity in Timberlea, this year alone over 10 rats have been killed in our backyard.
I have seen rats in my neighborhood in past few years
Define the baiting program. So far, efforts noted are vague and not well defined
The rodent population in Timberlea is already at an all time high. Higher than other areas bc of the dump like the birds nothing has ever been done to mitigate that. The leave the dump and head for the nearest other food source, our homes.
There will always be a large number of rodents associated with the dump, however with the possibility of increasing the amount of organic waste entering the facility the numbers will increase exponentially
Medium risk is not acceptable. Not when it comes to rodents and increased organic waste.
As with birds rodents travel. As u indicated there are on-site impacts. If it there is an increase of rodents at the site, it is only common sense that there will be more rodents in the surrounding are. A bigger food source means it can support a bigger population and when populations grow, so does there territory. Its bloody common sense!
Rodents are a huge problem that all dumps have, none of those measures have worked before, and they certainly won't now. Plus the dump smells.
Dumping unprocessed waste, with organic matter will lure additional rodents. A baiting program is required presently, with processed waste. How can increased organic matter not increase rodent population?
Neighbours have had issues with rodents that would not be this far from the city
Bait and kill. Hmm
Ditto
Would prefer if more rodents weren't attracted in the first place to be killed.
Baiting does not work and is a danger to other animals
What exactly does "baiting" entail, live traps , poisons, and how do these prevent rodents from persistently being attracted to the waste ?
Organics not pulled and processed by the operations of FEP WSF will attract rodents.
Concerned about catching all with the baiting program
Baiting programs do not have a high effective control rate and deals with a problem you're creating.
I have concerns with this statement, "no off-site impacts due to the delivery of rodents to the landfill disposal area have been identified". Identified by who and what specific measures may be implemented as there will be an increase in rodent activity.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
They are there now! And if more food sources are readily available they are going to continue to multiply. I live in a community in close proximity to the site and in [redacted] years here I have never had a problem , but last year they were abundant. So who else pay my exterminator bill ?? I'm sure it's not going to be the city. Not my issue not my problem is what HRM will say
More waste will invite more rodents.
Keep it clean and rodents will not be a great issue
Against killing
We already have a rodent problem in Timberlea related to the landfill .It has not been addressed so I don't expect this mitigation method to be anymore successful then it is currently.
The FEP/WSP were promised requirements and they must stay in place.
We have had rodents in our area ever since Brunelleschi was constructed and city isn't doing anything to get rid of them. I can't see baiting stations being a suitable solution. I believe more rodents will be attracted
Area is too large to manage
More odor more animals
There is a huge amount of rats and raccoons in this area. Way more than I've ever seen anywhere else. There needs to be more baiting and trapping in the residential areas and business areas because of the landfill.
We already have so many rodents in our neighbourhood, this could increase those numbers
We are now experiencing issues with rodents from increased blasting and very concerned it will only get worse in this area.
Rodents will be attracted to the area.
I don't see how this mitigation would help.
See previous comment.
This will not stop them enough
Whatever you are doing on plan on doing it's not enough to fix the Rodent activity that's stemmed from the facility. Stop trying to make changes and honour the previous agreements!!
Do baited rodents have impact on surrounding wildlife?
Rats will increase
The mitigation measures will not adequately control the infestation of rodents
Our area is already overrun with rodents and this will only make it worse
Look at rodent control anywhere. If there is more garbage there are more rodents
Rodents will be a continuous. As are the measures for birds, this seems like a short-term bandaid.
Smoke and mirrors. The reason the community agreed to having the landfill was the contingency of these practices be in place.
You will never address the issue with bait
There is annincrrase of rodents already due to extensive construction in the area. The meausres will not be enough- residents will see increased rodents.
I am concerned about the impact of de-activating the WEP/WSF. With organics not removed and stabilized, rodents may find more to attract them. BTW, "delivery of rodents" is not my concern; attraction leading to more rodents moving to the area is.
Birds eating contaminated rodents.
Medium risk of increase in rodents is too great, there is a terrible problem in the BLT communities already and removing the FEP & WSF will only increase this issue.
Rats will move to neighbouring areas as they are attracted to garbage
Baiting programs' -- rat-traps, what else? Get serious.
Baiting programs are insufficient
Mitigation plan is vague and ineffective. Why have these measures not already been implemented?
Again: This won't make things worse - do it - things get worse - sorry! Lather, rinse, repeat
Medium risk threshold for rodents is far too high and not a risk that the original agreement stipulated as being acceptable to the adjacent communities or one that would be visited upon them.
We already have too many rodents.
I don't think it will be enough if sorting measures are removed
This is not necessary if you keep environmental measures in place. You shouldn't have to kill anything. Furthermore rodent populations spread fast.
Baiting is cruel
This will not work to the level needed.
Medium risk too high. 4000+ tons putrid waste direct to landfill will attract disease carrying rodents.
Untreated putrid waste to the landfill (in excess of 4000 t in 2019) will attract rodents to site and adjacent communities.
Decaying material in landfill, more than 4000 tons in 2019, will attract rodents to the area.
Bait is inhumane.
Baiting doesn't rid homes of rodents, especially with an influx of relocated ones. It's a viscous cycle.
Not good enough
Baiting doesn't kill the mating. Enough is enough. We are a tiny peninsula. No where to go. Push this somewhere else where we don't have people stuck with no exit.
Mitigation requires more than one strategy. Baiting cannot be relied upon.
The sorter already manages this issue by preventing the attraction of rodents in the first place.
We have baits and traps where I work and we still have rodent issues and that's at a health centre bait and traps will not be enough for a landfill - rodents will not go for bait in a trap when there's a mountain of possibility in the landfill
With no processing of residential waste through the FEP & WSF, who can predict what measures will have to be taken if a 'truck & dump' program is adopted.
More food more rodents.
I do not believe all rodents will be controlled, especially after the FEP is closed.
Risk of rodents will be increased with elimination of current procedures.
There is a rodent problem now in our community. Has increased over the past five years. So whatever is being scare now sosuitioorle. With the under estimated increase of unchecked waste to the landfill, I can only expect rodent volume to increase.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Delivery of Rodents to the Disposal Area
If No, please indicate why these mitigation measures do not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Statement refers to "delivery of rodents". Exposure of trash will attract rodents. Greater breeding/increased number potential for sreading to outluing areas/housing.
Baiting is an attempt to control rodents will not be effective. Elimination of a food source (i.e. removal of potential food sources) it the only proven method. As a owrker in the Halifax food/restaurant industry I have had to deal with rats and mice in the workplace. Traps and poison baiting DOES NOT WORK. Removal of their food sources like trash food waste is the only proven method.
Does the baiting of rodents actually keep them away or attract them to the bait stations?
Redundant. We should have a regular culling program to eliminate all rodents, rather than trapping and moving.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Dust Generation for Additional Disposal Site Traffic
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Maintain FEP/WSF at Otter Lake
The mitigation measures are not as effective as maintaining the FEP/WSF. This survey is not actually a balanced survey. It only presents the HRM/Staff/Mirror perspective as evidence and none of the concerns of the Community Monitoring Committee or others.
I know how much dust I have in my home just from the increased traffic from a new subdivision. This is not going to work the way you say it will
What happens if traffic increases as a result of the unexpected return of ICI garbage to Otter Lake? Current mitigation efforts could be inadequate.
There should be a somewhat option or unsure rather than just yes or no.
garbage creates more dust especially in untreated state
dust can still travel
If the commitment not close this portion of the facility, additional measures would be need and again if you gave the full information about the impacts like how many additional trucks are you talking about would be helpful.
Roads are still dirty and bad in that area
It is not controlled and will only get worse
I have zero trust in the word of those compiling this survey based on the trust which has been broken due to the proposed broken CONTRACT to close the FEP/WEP
My concern is that I am waistline my time on a questionnaire that should not even be on anyone's radar. I am on question 18 and still have not been asked whether or not I agree with changes being proposed.
Less traffic as per current t operations is better for everyone.
While I commend the measures mentioned to mitigate mud, the concern being discussed here is dust. Vehicles on dry roads will create dust. Not so on wet ones. A good quality, well maintained road using gravel may control both, but that depends on the quality of the gravel (no fines in it).
I believe the commercial haulers will be fine but private individuals aren't equipped to deal with garbage like most experienced companies. YOU KNOW THAT!!!
Calcium maybe for dust control?
naturally-sourced dust suppressant (Tembec) is very misleading - as far as I can tell, it would probably be sodium (or other) lignosulfonate, which comes as a byproduct of pulp production (truly a natural approach with no side effects!). No specific concerns other than misleading description.
You only have visit a similar facility with the exact same mitigation efforts to understand that dust will remain a significant issue.
Honor the contract!
There will be more vehicle trips and therefore more dust.
Dust is a common concern within any landfill establishment and is not easily rectafied.
more trucks = more dust generation
The extra cost of dust suppression and pollution that creates off sets the benefits in my opinion.
You just showed a vehicle kicking up dust...
Trucks and autos still need to get to the dump. Roads also have gravel sides and traffic veers off the road throwing up dust.
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill
Modification of the original design of the FEP/WSF is not in the best interest of the environment, the residents, or the terms of agreement agreed upon when the facility was permitted to open. Removal/deactivation of the FEP/WSF would be a reason for cancelling the agreement and deactivation of the entire waste facility.
Have you even read the msds sheet for this product
don't change a thing.
look at the roads arount the facilities now! they are as much potholes and gravel as they are ashphalt, the dust generated is enormous and your abbatement will be non existant.
I am not worried about the dust now. I am still worried about increased exhaust fumes
What about the debris that the trucks will drop from their truck? The litter ensuing might produce other concerns.
I'm concerned with everything related to th deactivation of the current FEP
When we met with the city prior to the installation of this waste facility, we were given promises regarding capping the cells, sorting waste, no odor, etc. We have Dust now, what you are proposing will make it worse. Is a promise made to residents not binding on future Municipal Governments??
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
Need proper paving & widening shoulders to prevent long vehicles especially from off roading.
This is full of weasel words ("used as necessary") that make no concrete assurances that dust shall not increase. Unacceptable.
It still concerns that it isn't enough.
I don't believe
Once again, more spending to mitigate what you want to take away, more pollution for the people who were promised that the FEP/WSP would be maintained
We don't need more crap to breathe in.
They come in uncovered
Increased dust cannons be contained. Today they say they'll use these measures, in two years there will be a recommendation to stop because it costs money. Anything that is promised will be removed. Same as the trash sorter.
More trucks equal more dust.
The dust is terrible in Timberlea. On my car and in my house if I open windows
The extra money being spent to fix the road to handle extra traffic could simply be used to keep the presorting program in place.g
Operating the preserving is a requirement of the otter lake landfill agreement
What about increased risk of debris and damage to the roadway secondary to increased traffic
Again, we do not need extra traffic creating bottle necks and creating dust. We have enough now with all the construction in our area.
Logicially more truck traffic on gravel roads, regardless of suppression efforts will generate more dust, more tracking of garbage on the roads. Keeping the trucks of these roads is the only way to truly address this issue. More concerning is tracking garbage on these gravel roads and it it ground in --- further attracting undesireable critters.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Dust Generation for Additional Disposal Site Traffic
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Unclear how that would help
More trucks will make more dust.
Not good enough
Particulates can stay in the air for many miles, landing far distances from the landfill. Cars and homes are covered with dust that falls from the air.
Just the fact of any increased traffic by heavy vehicles on our already poorly maintained roads is a concern. HRM does not take care of our roads in timely manners at the best of times.r
No deal
Concerns about being outdoors in my neghborhood breathing stinky poor quality air.
This is not a scientific survey this is a presentation of one side.
This should have been taken care of up one conception of the landfill
Still lots of dust.
More traffic always leads to additional dust and pollution
We can been living in a construction zone at Brunello Estates and any action that would increase dust in this area is unacceptable.
There is still dust even with gravel roads !
Dust, mud and gravel as well as pot holes are already existing concerns. Additional traffic will increase these issues.
Too polluted already..
Actually the raid is being used for racing! No one addresses the problems over there. Please don't make new o e! Think about it.
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
Just don't think it will work
Increased trucking = increased problems. More dust, more garbage on the roads/woods/ditches, more accidents, more wear and tear the list goes on
See previous answers. Who designed these questions? Obviously someone with an agenda
Increased volume equates to increased dust and other issues adding unrecognized costs to operations.
Your idea is bad and you should feel bad
A lot of the truckeswill be smaller and more frequent.
Dust is dust your going to have it
i would want proof
There are a lot of additional residential properties going up in the area which will exacerbate the current traffic issues.
What is Tembec? Air pollution contributed to population illness but you talk about decreasing mud.
Future cutbacks will try to make the case for "no longer being necessary. The record speaks for itself
As someone who has respiratory issues, even the amount of dust kicked up on the Perimeter Access Road would create a challenge and this is just one truck
Any amount of dust concerns me. It is not good for the environment.
The dust, while minamal right now, is still an issue as it also brings the smell
Still see the possibly of increased dust with these measures.
These trucks are dangerous this road is already overly populated
As you can see in the picture above the dust coming off the road and truck what kind of toxins will be in the air you can not guarantee with the removal of the FEP and WSP this will not happen
We seen this everyday this disposal thing not bringing any good to the community
Traffic is already terrible and the city just ignores it. The amount of trash with the existing traffic is unacceptable and the city has done nothing to address it.
.
As necessary is subjective
Don't believe it , lies lies lies
Put in lights if required
Paved roads will not sufficiently stop the dust.
Leave our existing measures in place, we agreed to the landfill because of it
try hanging out your clothes to dry and you will see the dirt and nice smell you get on your freshly washed clothes
What are impacts of adding more Tembec to the road? Dust will increase regardless, and be carried by winds
Already an issue and the expectation of more more traffic will only add to it
You can not know the damage to health from this dust for years. Then it is toooo late.
Dump road needs to be gated at 103 highway to keep cars out after hours has turned into drag race strip every night
improper use of "consistent"
Smoke and mirrors
All these mitigation measures are NOT ENOUGH for the increased activity.
Na
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated
Debris from trucks and dust (tire dust)
Honor your original agreement.
There is already a lot of dust with construction in the area. This will add more. Please honour the agreement
Still dusty as fuck there

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Dust Generation for Additional Disposal Site Traffic
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
With more trucks going of course the dust will increase just honour the agreement please
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
You should not be deactivating
Again, we will increasing the number of staff and equipment to mitigate this risk? In dry weather, granular roads would need to be sprayed multiple times throughout the day.
I don't believe this approach will stem the issue.
I remember Sackville. You comment field would not take my whole comment - I guess you only want short comments? Leave it the way it is. Hopefully that is short enough....?
there will still be dust, bad for air quality
I have attended all of the meetings over the past 10 years and it seems to me that HRM council is not listening. The people have spoken as well as the government. Please respect our communities.
Again, this is NOT a traditional landfill because it is located in the middle of residential communities. Our community was promised by a legal contract to have a world class facility and two components of a system, a FEP and WSF to host this facility.
You don't specify how much this will cost, i.e. "naturally-sourced dust suppressant (Tembec)". Also please define what "naturally-resourced" means? What environmental impact does Tembec have on NS forests?
Many more vehicles is a concern
The dust is always in the air
Dust will always be present and you can consistently see your efforts are not working
Air quality and stir up from increased activity will jot be completely offset by these measures. Community agreed to the site and now govt and s changing the agreement- residents will suffer
I do not trust HRM staff in regard to Otter Lake. Residents want HRM to hoour the agreement and this is the third time in seven years they have tried to remove the FEP & WSF. No trust in Municipal staff or Councillors in this regard.
Just keep the FEP/WSF
Any changes that result in increased activity are cause for concern. What is industrial waste comes back?
We have been promised truck traffic (towing waste material) at the head of the Prospect Road (and the falling, hazardous débris) would be stopped - which we were told over a year ago. It hasn't changed anything as of yet
Bc they all get rocks and mud in their tires driving on the cap or near it. These damage windshields. Less trucks, better.
Large trucks always generate more dust despite the use of suppressing chemicals
Without the FEP & WSF, how can anyone predict what concerns will occur as a result of dust
Dust is virtually not existent now at landfill. However, when more types of disposal are diverted to other locations for eg. sexter construction sud in Goodwood "DUST IS A PROBLEM"! Not hard to see the city is doubling in size in the next 20 years. What is being scare to reduce the hazards increased by diversion to other sites?
Increased traffic! More distrubance! More dust.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Greenhouse Gases
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
There has not been a whole project analysis of impact of GHGs - this question focuses on just one aspect
The mitigation measures are not as effective as maintaining the FEP/WSF. This survey is not actually a balanced survey. It only presents the HRM/Staff/Mirror perspective as evidence and none of the concerns of the Community Monitoring Committee or others.
In the very first paragraph it says "Diverting marterial away from the landfil is the best way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions" yet this proposal is to stop doing some of that work. Again, we have the already established FEP/WSF doing this.
There is a reason you were using FEP/WSP before, has that reason gone away. Use the methane to create electricity. Become a leader we're a capital city of one of the oremier countries in the world and this is the 21st century for goodness sake
Sure you'll save on electricity but what about methane gas generated in a landfill that has become a truck and dump and could easily become the burial ground of ICI, due to unforeseen circumstances.
Still concerned re deactivation
you indicate" not anticipated to greatly increase" but you don't give any idea of how much it will increase and how this could be improved.
More untreated waste means a longer time to fully become inert. If anything the WSF should be used for 42 to 63 days to further treat waste to an inert state
this does not fully educate me on what this process does and the outcome.
more waste equals more gas
It comes down to trust. I have a science background and yet do not believe this statement. Realize you presented a model of the facility for us to accept as local residents. Not its being changed. There is no trust in your words.
What happens if the gases increase because there is more organic material going into the landfill than you anticipated?
The changes for Otter Lake will lead to increased and longer term accumulation of waste materials, leading to a dump like former Lower Sackvile IN THE MIDDLE OF A RESIDENTIAL AREA
Why not use the methane to produce power
No comment
greenhouse gases are not anticiapated to Greatly Increase does not instill confidence.
Talk all you want to is going to get worse
It will only increase emissions and tax payer base
Trading a devil for a witch does not make it right!!!
HRM tries not to honour its commitments to the community. Why would this be any different?
Wouldn't it be better to figure a way to reduce the carbon footprint of the facility by installing green energy generation program in site.
Sorting will help reduce the need for this mitigation. People do not sort their own garbage as well as you seem to think.
One of the most important outcomes of COP26 was a pledge from the EU and the US to reduce methane production. Arguing that eliminating processing of < 150 mm size organic materials "will not greatly increase" greenhouse gas production is disingenuous in that the phrasing attempts to discount a real concern. I suspect there is more public support for improving the facility.
This addresses some of my concerns, but not all. If residents are expected to sort their garbage thoroughly that's good, but having the final measure in place to sort out things that were not caught would be better than leaving it up to residents and then letting anything else have a free pass.
You have not quantified the level of GHGs produced my the additional organic waste to make a comparison with the reduction claim of 1240 tonnes per year. What is the other figure and how was it calculated? If the comparison is favourable why am I one seeing one number?
Please do not tell me this is about saving the environment. This is about eliminating that portion of the power bill for Mirror so they can pocket cash.Once guard rails are removed, we all know that once screening is eliminated, there is a great incentive for all to go to speed and convenience.More methane producing garbage will more than make up for any GHG saved by turning off the electricity
smoke and mirrors
Yes, but I'll believe it when I see it
My concern is with the addition of organics that methane will be produced and the need for a methane collection system and burn off will never necessary. Also methane stinks. Otter Lake is in a inhabited area, any smell will greatly effect the nearby houses
When there is more organic matter going into the landfill, obviously more methane gas will be produced
Install solar panels on top of the already-capped landfill cells, as their daytime electricity generation should be easy to actually eliminate the co2 impact of the FEP/WSF, rather than just hand-waving it away as "mitigat[ing] potential increases as a result of not stabilizing materials". True zero emissions, not net-zero emissions.
If our waste is not sorted at Ottor Lake... who is actually going to do it? Residents are not. Adults are just big children. If not sorted by Ottor Lake, sorting will not happen and all the garbage will go together in a landfill. Worst possible outcome.
When the garbage dump was proposed. It was supposed to be a dry dump. There was supposed to be no organics in it. Therefore you must wonder what is breaking down and causing the methane. There has been many changes to the dump. That was not conveyed to the public And we still continue to change what was proposed to the people around the dump.
GHGs and other gases from the landfill are still an issue. Smell and odour in the Timberlea area is still an issue during certain weather periods. The GHGs created by the FEP/WSF could be better controlled by purchasing green sources of energy from NSP rather than downloading the issue to local residents.
Your questions are leading and not allowing the public to properly address concerns. Organic matter will draw in bears, rats and more. Sorting is needed to ensure the plant functions as the public have paid for it to do.
I don't think you have done sufficient study to support the claim that the reduction in electrical use will offset increase in GHG emission. Further, as the NSP grid becomes greener over the next decade, these offsets will continue to decrease
No amount of preventable greenhouse gases is acceptable. Prevention is our responsibility.
When the wind blows in certain ways, it stinks here
What measures will be put in place to mitigate or eliminate the impending greenhouse gas from the small pieces, add up to alot when concentrated, along with anything still in the landfill because half-life is not instantaneous
Honor the contract
This is lip service to try to spin the issue
Leave things as is.
The information provided states in the first paragraph that diversion or organic materials is the best way to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which is exactly what the front end sorting equipment is doing. Will upgrades to the existing methane collection systems be required to account for the increased organic loading?
Why implement it in the first place then? There was clearly a need. Very disappointed in this decision.
The key word is "greatly" it is still going to increase greenhouse gases. You are going in the wrong direction.
reduction in greenhouse gasses is not the answer, elimination of these types of gases are crutial. We should rethink our position with respect to these areas of concern.
Removal of two front end systems will result in more organics in the landfill resulting in increased methane

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Greenhouse Gases
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I believe the majority of residents in single family homes separate organic waste and dispose of it properly however, those living in apartment buildings most likely do not. Once the front end separation is deactivated organics will be going into the facility. On a site as large as Otter Lake, solar energy should be used to generate all electricity.
But you know there are always failures and omissions in every situation
You need to look into ways the FEP/WSF can work more efficiently and consume less electricity. Not go backwards to eliminating it and thereby creating additional issues.
Anticipation does not address my concerns, though the electrical cost of running the process is an interesting argument that I would find hard to ignore.
Because you are not being truthful and I do not trust what you are stating
This was not in the agreement signed with our communities . You need to stick to the contract as well as your word.
Any leaked gases, especially from materials under 150mm are very hazardous to our planet's health. Any climate change impact we have will affect us for generations to come, and we cannot risk any greenhouse gas emissions at all. Unless you are offsetting via tree planting or another method, this is insufficient and unethical to continue polluting our planet.
It is completely backwards in 2021 to shut down the FEP/WSF any and all measures to reduce greenhouse gasses should be employed, not simply “hoping” to balance it out by reducing electricity use. That is a complete scapegoat
No change as home owners bought houses her understanding the plan was to continue. This area also is an area with little investment from HRM in comparison to other areas but at same time asking us to be ok with these changes . It is not acceptable for some cost savings to occur while affecting a small proportion of Citizens in HRM
The use of technology to help limit methane gas exposure to the world is in concert with limiting what we put into landfill, how does allowing more organic into the site assist in lower methane production
Placing organic waste directly into the landfill untreated is bound to raise the odour problem and will increase the greenhouse gas emissions.
You are twisting the truth here. Bottom line is that this will cause more harm than good.
No matter how hard we try there will always be gas we can't catch. The more we can try to help the better, but unfortunately some still escape
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill
Increased methane and CO2 production in the landfill will necessarily increase if there is no waste stabilisation process of organic waste. This problem will increase if/when ICI waste stop being accepted at other facilities. The CO2 associated with the electricity consumption of the FEP/WSF will decrease as the electricity is getting greener in NS by
These were promised to us from the beginning and were deemed necessary and valid. In order to save money is not a valid reason to throw all these promised measured out the window.
Those wells do not work. No debate about that. There are numerous locations where those wells are present and they still stink from miles away - the reason - organics in the waste stream. Keeping the diversion in the FEP/WSF mitigates the amount of gasses produced so they may be more appropriately handled by the collection system down the road.
You made a promise to the community that the Otter Lake facility could be built there on condition that it would include only inert matter. You are breaking your word. This survey does not feel like consultation - it feels like a dismissal of the fact that the city is breaking its promise.
You have not demonstrated how you are going to increase diversion. What educational measures are you taking? What inspections at the curbside are being taken to discourage people who are discarding organics in their garbage?
While the entire world is being pushed to measure up on environmental issues - you would like us to take a big step backwards
cut the BS. that statement above is for the ignorant.
getting rid of front end processor is stupid---why was it put there in the first place---a saving of 2 million in a 1 billion dollar budget-- mere peanuts--- put Your heads together for better solutions!
May control gases, not smell
you should have put in a not sure option!!
This is certainly interesting, but this means that those living close to the landfill have to tolerate more pollution while others get to pay themselves on the back for reducing emissions. This is not fair and there are better ways to reduce emissions
Use solar electricity to power the FEP/WSF
Not anticipated is not a re-assuring statement here. Keep the facilities as is
All this is subject to proper operation and maintenance, as per the existing agreement how is the public reassured that cost measures related to gas capture will not outweigh the environmental benifits and be removed in coming years. The current agreement has been nullified by the operators why will this not happen again with an engineered measure that requires maintenance
How about sustainable/renewable energy source for the "high power consumption" portion of the operation? Rather than shut it down why not make it more efficient, therefore saving money AND the initial intent of the project as it was designed
Just leave things as they are Andy keep the FSP
We were originally told that there would be no organics in this landfill, now you are not only allowing them in, but you want to add more.
Because if people feel that no one is watching, they have the potential to stop sorting there household waste & we wind up with the site having more rodents, birds & greenhouse gas emissions.
So you are intimating that by using less electricity you will 'offset' the environmental impacts? Nope. I'm not buying that. How short sighted! Methane is itself a valuable byproduct. Instead of focussing on money savings (what this is really about, who are we kidding!) look to ways of harvesting that byproduct as a resource.
Off gas is a serious concern and increasing the amount of matter that is going to create more methane has a long term risk to the environment. We've been a leader for a reason, we need to maintain that leadership position.
Do not want any increase of gas production
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
Our community is growing in housing development expedentially & having this plant in such close proximity, we need max. protection going forward.
In no way could the reduction of electricity used offset the greenhouse gas emissions. NSP is getting away from those sources of power generation.
Methane has a much greater effect on climate change than Carbon dioxide from energy production
Still have plenty gasses and stink
There's still greenhouse gas emissions
You are playing games. You are ignoring the possibility of switching to green energy sources which completely negates your offset argument and results in increased emissions.
I do believe this spike be enough to offset the gases this would generate.
Without the FEP organic material will find its was into the landfill. With more and more condos and apparents being constructed in HRM the level of unsorted garbage is guaranteed to increase. Most apartments have a chute that the garbage hets deposited, no sorting controls exist or limited sorting will lead to increased greenhouse gasses.
Get in bed with NSPower, and get them to pay for the electricity bill- they can afford it
I don’t believe
While magnitude is being focused on above, green house gases will increase. That is an issue to me when we can avoid it.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Greenhouse Gases
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I don't believe these measures will be taken.
Not good enough, HRM's growth requires the maintenance of the FEP/WSP
We (i.e. the communities surrounding Otter Lake) were promised the measures put in place 20 years ago would remain in place. HRM needs to honour that agreement.
If the concern is the electric bill, while not use alternative power. Solar or wind power, this would increase the " green action plan" taken by the municipality
We should be do more to control carbon to help curb global warming.
There is a reason this landfill was set up the way it was. It needs to be running properly to maintain the level of safety and sanitation we currently have.
At least some materials are separated now. Every bit will save the environment.
I am not concern with the Electricity used onsite. This CO2 output will bs reduced significantly as the province reachs it renewal energy goals. The wording of its "not anticipated" to increase. Leaves alot of room for bavk tracking when it does increase.
Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill.
Concerned about smelly winds
Please do not deactivate the FEP/WSF. This is a step that was promised to the community. This is not something that should be removed. Increased organics and not separating them, causing increased methane.
Organic should should not be put in the landfill
Why doesn't the site work to generate it's own power
If the organics are not to be removed as they are now it would create more gases
Again, the current process meets these requirements, why change them
Leave things the way they are...it works! Why does the city want to devalue our homes? Brunello Estates is such a beautiful place to live and now the city wants to ruin it.
The increases organics will probably be more that you supposedly anticipate.
Not significantly increasing is not a mitigation. We should be looking for better ways to address waste - even better than FEP & WSP verses just shutting them down and burying everything - come on HRM you, WE can do better.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
More community education and enforcement is needed to be sure that only proper waste materials are dumped.
Did not provide results of the evaluation or specific estimates of potential increases
The photo shows a large flock of birds, so much for control measures on that topic!
Basic concern is with water . It is a trade off , either we assure water standards, or air standards... is that what the survey is implying?
Not good enough. Moving in the wrong direction
You say WSF can reduce the greenhouse gases, but does it? When will you be deciding not to do that anymore? What then?
Please stop pretending your present mitigation will control any of the the immediate concerns around the FEP/WSF, you do not know what will happen.
Our planet is dying and these measures are not enough...please be more forward thinking
Will be an issue for years. Can't contain it all forever.
Yes, no matter what you do, risk's will still be there - it'll be bad for the environment.
Methane gas will inevitably increase and escape. While there are things you can do to help this, mistakes can happen and the risk is still there.
Not separating waste and not stabilizing materials will mean more stiff dumped into the landing.
Maintenance fails overtime
They will increase!!! No more needs to be said
These changes in my opinion is to save money only and with no concern for the environment any emissions is to much
You are automatically generating more additional methane gas due to the fact the waste isn't being separated and decomposing in the ground.
Organics will have a much greater effect in our landfill than without.
If you stop the sorting, the landfill in my opinion will harm our ground water.This is not how the landfill was intended to be worked
Still have gases going into the air.
More organic material will necessarily enter the landfill producing more methane.
This once again cannot be guaranteed
But there is an increase
Landfill gasses that escape ruin the clean smell of our downwind areas
You have admitted that deactivating the equipment will increase the worse emitter or greenhouse gas. I don't believe the energy savings will mitigate the methan gains.
words like "anticipated " -greenhouse gases are not anticipated ... do not give me a good feeling. I need facts not what is anticipated.
So I do not believe that using less electricty to not stabilize is a great trade off.
KEEP WHAT YOU HAVE. IT IS WORKING.
Why not use the methane to power better sorting rather than less.
Studies today will not show what additional items being let through due to the closure of the processing facilities.
This has nothing to do with the changes you are proposing. Please just stop! The province has directed the city a number of times in this. You are not listening.
BS
We have smelled the Oder on many days, it will get way worse
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
Still think it won't work
People already have enough trouble sorting their garbage and food waste. This end to front end processing will undoubtedly mean that waste that should not go into the landfill will end up in there. The promise was made to keep the font end processing when this landfill was proposed, and again since then. Why don't you stop wasting our money and time and just do what you said you were going to do.
This friggin dump is going to STINK the air so bad. And right next to 3 major subdivisions. And all you can say is we "think" this won't be a problem. What if it is? Where will you be then?

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Greenhouse Gases
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Why don't you find a better way to power your facility? The facility does cut down on the amount of methane produced, but if you are saying that you need to cut back on electricity, then maybe you should put up a windmill or something.
There's no reason to not clean and sort the household garbage brought in.
Yet to be prove effective.
I dont want a dump by my house
We already smell horrendous dump smells depending on wind direction. Lack of frequent FEP and WSF will make it worse.
Electricity is and will be generated with cleaner/greener sources for energy.
Replacing one with another.
The smell from the landfill is awful
The GP do not recycle properly/compost properly which will cause more gasses to accumulate. if you are worried about the expense of the electricity being used you should think about installing wind turbines and or solar to capture renewable power. Further more if government took back the electricity company then we the public would not have to pay out huge bonuses to the Ceo of NSP.
You say it's not anticipated to "greatly increase" methane gas. I disagree and living in the community close to the facility we definitely do not need additional smells coming from the otter lake facility
Thats right, climate change is fake news. Present measures are in place for present processing practices and these are minimum measures to address a huge problem with landfill gases.
we are within 8 kms from the city which is moving outwards ,this is not a place for a landfill that has outlived its use
Don't think it's enough
Stop the bull
All lies
The site was built with these concerns and you seem to think removing some of the safety features will be ok . I don't think you really are concerned about the gasses as much as you should be
I do not swear, but if I did, I would here. The current system is an international model of doing it right. Now you want to go back to doing it wrong. Let's all put coal stoves and furnaces in our houses.
Consider investing in a Biodigester
Electricity doesn't stink ,garbage not treated properly does
How much GHG does it produce with the machine. Also, the grid is slowly being switched to green sources
No, but maybe. If HRM is approved to make these changes I'd like to see monitoring and reporting of emissions.
I'm not sure.
Nova Scotia is koving to a reduced carbon footprint in power generation regardless , so over the life span of the facility, power consumption will represent a reduced greenhouse gas contributor overall
By your own admission, they will go up!! We need to be making things better, not worse. You also don't mention the impact of increased traffic.
Once again, i live here, i know the smell
You have not quantified the amount of gas emission which the removal of the WFS will cause to be compared with the amount saved by decreased electricity costs.
Opposition to the termination of FEP/WSF. Lets keep our world class facility
The amount of money spent on Otterlake from 1998 to date is huge. Over the years cutbacks, cutbacks and more cutbacks have made sure that the original plan is completely unrecognizable... Otterlake has no credibility in protecting the communities and the environment
Not significantly increase carbon dioxide emmisions is still too much.
Any increase in greenhouse gas is unacceptable
The current process with fep is an added step to mitigate organic waste
Not convincing
Both the WSF and FEP are doing exactly what they were intended to within the timeline HRM committed to with the community. If this has changed HRM needs to move to another location.
Because not all residents compost and you will end up with organics and this methane.
In the above paragraph, it is mentioned that it CAN reduce green house emissions and then it goes on to say it DOESN'T ANTICIPATE any further green house emissions. This doesn't guarantee anything!!!!
Not everyone does composting at home. We must ensure their organic waste is diverted from the landfill
[G]reenhouse gases are not anticipated to greatly increase by deactivating the FEP/WSF does not sound like the author is positive and may be wrong.
No, the smell today can be bad now, cant imagine what the future will hold
It will mitigate the increases, but it will not eliminate them.
When the dump was proposed it was supposed to be a dry dump meaning that there was no organics that was going to decompose in cause methane gas. If that was the case why are we burning methane gas from a dump that was supposed to be dry.
Greater processing should take place to remove all green house gas causing materials, regardless of how "significant" it is. Using renewable energy sources would eliminate the CO2 emissions from electrical generation required. It seems all the solutions proposed are the easiest ideas as opposed to the best solution.
This is not good for the residents
The concern identified is the amount of electricity used. Perhaps green energy sources should be installed to offset the cost rather than shutting the system down.
we have an agreement that is working . Keep it.
The. WSF reduced gas in any way it's a win for our Community . It's all about the money not the people who live here
Not implemented
Greenwashing
It feels like we are going backwards with regards to the environment. It is wrong to try to save money by being less responsible with the environment.
You are combing to unrelated matters in your statement. Unacceptable! Why are you manipulating our citizens?
.
You are basing greenhouse gas production from the use of coal-fired electricity in Nova Scotia. This is a separate environmental problem. Speak plainly. HRM is concerned about the cost of electricity.
It appears that this is just a money saving opportunity.
The smell of mostly well contained now. I'm worried it won't be in the future especially hot summers. I also don't feel enough is being done to recycle or reuse waste (even recyclables picked up aren't properly being recycled.)

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Greenhouse Gases
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Really you need to look at Chester Municipality
A lot of people do not use the greenbins and throw everything in the garbage. Could potentially be worse
If concerned about energy use of FEP/WSF, then research alternate sources (solar,etc).
I'm not convinced that this would mitigate the issue.
Hard to believe that monitoring it will be as big an energy user as that requires stopping it
In 2030 electricity will be from 80% renewable sources. The offset you're proposing will therefore be canceled out and emissions will increase
Increased organics will be long term greenhouse gas generation
Past evaluations does not address what will happen in the future.
Your only showing 1 side of the story
FEP/WSF controls are why and the only reason the community agreed to the landfill.
Many households especially apartment dwellers do not sort waste
Stabilizing and sorting the waste is the only way to reduce gases on-site!
Need to decrease current gases not just worry about the lack of an increase
this is something you can't see but Mirror says it all good so I guess we should just believe them just like you told us about the front line would solve all our problems
I disagree that this is enough
ByExisting approach do you mean the attempt to take away FEP/WSF? As it was stated, FEP WSF ado treat the methane issue, removing them increases the impact, so my desire is to not remove them
removal of an energy cost without acknowledging the gains of the energy cost is flimsy. i believe the fep/wsf are net positive benefits to our acclaimed landfill
Not green house gases
There will be increased methane produced. The GHG emissions because of the electricity use of the system will decrease as a greater proportion of our power is sourced from renewables.
Whatever they are doing to keep smell down hasn't been work for the past 20 yrs
Your report indicates that the WSF does treat materials and can reduce greenhouse gas in the landfill. The argument about energy usage is better solved with the generation of clean energy rather than turning the system off.
Where's the proof?
That fact that the FEP and WSF does work and has been working to treat materials and reduce greenhouse gases in the landfill is the reason you should not remove the FEP and WSF.
Your assumption that removal of FEP will not result in increase of greenhouse gas emissions is a huge assumption and not supported by sound evidence.
Keep waste sorting as per agreement
Worried this won't be enough. Air quality and climate change are very important.
not proven method to reduce costs
do not fully understand
the entire justification is silly
Again not true
10-12% of waste received at the landfill is organic, compostable material. Eliminating the FEP/WSF will allow these materials to enter the landfill unchecked.
I'm sorry but your wish for arguments against what you are doing are obviously an effort to obstruct our REAL concerns
Where are you going to monitor that there is no increase of food waste to the landfill resulting in increased gas production?
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated
Do not understand how this works
People still mix their garage
We should be doing more than what MAY be necessary to mitigate the impact
Terms used to address how much it will increase emission of greenhouse gasses is too vague. What is considered 'not significant'? It still increases the negative impact
Honor your original agreement.
While I appreciate this would reduce the electricity usage the odors created from the dump will most likely increase causing a direct impact to property prices in the area. When the site first opened there were many days that the smells were not pleasant when you were outside in your yard.
The amount of methane generation will possibly remain constant for many years yet. There is a percentage of the population that will be adding organic material for a few generations yet . Electricity will get greener . The electricity saved will not balance out the methane generated if electricity becomes less carbon intensive
As citizens we are being given increased taxes regarding greenhouse gases, the municipalities should be more responsible not trying to pass the risk off on citizens.
Nova Scotia Power is rapidly moving towards eliminating coal from their power generation and increasing their reliance on renewable sources. Shutting down FEP and WSF as a means to reduce GHG is a terrible excuse for a plan to combat climate change.
Not confident this will mitigate the issue
This will over all affect the environment and cause global warming to happen even faster
We need to do better for our environment not take measures that cause our efforts to go backwards. Please honour the agreement
Of course everyone is concerned about greenhouse gases, honor the agreement
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
There are many days in the summer when you can detect an odor coming from the landfill. The proposed course of action will only enhance this issue.
You should not be deactivating
More mething will becreated and spread throughtout the site. I am not concerned about using electricity to handle the problem. After all we have enough wind turbines that this shouldn't be a problem.
If you are wondering about the increase of dust because of an increase of truck traffic, the increase truck traffic increases green house gas emissions
The energy source that powers the FEP/WSF facilities can (and will) eventually improve over the years to use more renewable energy sources, thus it will gradually decrease in emissions, but the removal of the facilities will be a permanant increase in emissions, so even if it's a net benefit now, it may not be down the line as our source of electricity becomes more green

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Greenhouse Gases
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Increasing organic will generate more gas
These measures almost never work as designed
more organics, more negitive issues. Disposal area was not designed for Additional organics
We were promised at the inception of this facility, that odour would not be an issue. Yet when I drove past yesterday, the stink was strong. HRM has lot credibility with me on this topic.
By removing the sorting step in the waste management process, you introduce an unknown amount of organic waste into the system. It would be preferable to find a greener source of electricity than removing the sorting process altogether.
This is the big one. Didn't HRM declare a climate emerg? Does that only apply in situations where you can raise taxes? Worrying about climate change and burying organic material are not compatible ideas. Pick one.
Require more knowledge on this subject, I can only see an increase in the gasses if this closure moves forward.
partially
"Greenhouse gases are not anticipated to greatly increase". So they WILL increase.
Landfill should never be retired
Somewhat.
I believe stopping any additional gasses is mor important than the use of electricity that has already produced gasses.
How much waste is being collected by WSF in comparison to the amount of greenhouse gas emission it would save by not having FEP?WSF?
Our measures now keep the dump from smelling. the dump already smells bad, can't imagine how bad it will be without out it.
I can smell this anytime driving past
The potential introduction of organic material could increase green house gas emissions, and reduction in recovery of recyclable materials could also generally increase greenhouse gas emissions. Colloid those emissions is a good stop gap measure but does not replace elimination of those emissions.
Same
My concern is when the community agreed to allowing the landfill in the area this was not part of the agreement
I have extreme skepticism about the mass dump and bury being a solution to "save" us from greenhouse gases by saving electricity usage. Can't the site be used to house wind turbine generators that will power the existing FEP/WSF.
We require the WSF is required to decompose and stabilize material. This system is required to control greenhouse gas.
Contaminated pollution will leach into near by watersheds. You've not addressed this concern adequately.
There has not been enough work done. The wsf treats it so leave it be. The citizens of Halifax are generally lazy and do not compost as they should and are not held accountable for their actions , by removing this processor you are potentially resting more green house gasses
The community agreed to use of the wsf for these reasons and others and the city should respect the terms of the original agreement.
The FEP removes excess product from the facility ,to me that is a plus and a promise from the opening day
Burying organic material has been proven to be detrimental to the environment.
The whole country is going in the direction of reducing methane gas. This will increase substantially the amount of methane gas.
While the reducing greenhouse gasses is always a positive action has the idea of reusing the greenhouse gas emissions as a source of energy been considered?
It's purely not good for the environment
That doesn't sound like enough to eliminate that need to use it ?
I dont think it will work
I would require more information/evidence to alleviate my concerns in this regard.
Offsetting is not eliminating the issue, it's a lateral move and not a solution.
It was not the agreement
I am skeptical of the breezy "based on previously-completed evaluations." Show me the data. Tell me who did these evaluations, and what they were instructed to look at. I trust the Otter Lake Community Monitoring Committee to evaluate things like this - if you want to convince me otherwise, show me the data.
Id the FEP & WSF are not working properly HRM should fix and improve them. We now ship all commercial and apartment building waste out of HRM to neighbouring county. THIS IS WRONG!!! we should eal with our own waste in HRM. With increased population we will have increased waste. Improve the FEP & WSF, make them better, DO NOT REMOVE!
There WILL be smell
This estimate is nothing more than a (granted) informed, but still a best guess. Incidentally, what happens to the collected gases, such as methane?
Insufficient mitigation
We estimated this but it's actually worse - sorry! I can see that coming a mile away
Even with these measures the odor comes across to blt with the right winds. Hate to smell an increase in the future
Simply stating that there will be an increased use of electricity without establishing alternatives for energy production on site, is not addressing my concerns. Adoption of renewable energy resources should be part of this plan. Seeking to deter opposition, based on an implied increase in energy use is an irresponsible approach.
I do not trust it will improve it. Anticipated and potential increases are still too risky for me.
There is no accounting for maintenance of idle assets or calculation of start up costs to idled equipment that is aged.
There has been no accounting for electrical usage in the inactive state.
The FEP was part of this design that this community agreed to. We've fought it's dismantling multiple times. Keep it in place and honour the commitment.
diverted green cart material will still create greenhouse gases wherever it's sent or processed.
Given the agreement Canada has entered re reduction by 30% by 2030, will this meet that requirement.
Current practice calls for all residential waste to be inspected, bags, especially dark bags, so that contents can be inspected. All illegal material is removed including organic material. This survey doesn't indicate any actual electrical cost savings. It also doesn't say with proof, what status of a cell will be in a truck & dump program.
More organics more gas.
This doesn't solve the issues of waste collection

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Greenhouse Gases
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
The municipality should switch to environmentally sustainable sources of electrical power generation, e.g. hydro, soloar, wind, geothermal
You say not to expect a significant increase in gases. You don't say how much gas contributing material is separated by way of FEp/WSF. When shut down, it is only common sense to anticipate an increase in gas producing material. After all, there are a lot of blackbags with mixed waste getting to landfill NOW. With the increase in apartment and condo living you can expect MORE. If these are the under estimated 8-to-10 loads per day, you will have a bigger probelm. THE SAVING IN ELECTRICITY WILL NOT WARRANT.
Organic waste still needs disposal or treatment - regardless of method, poses still presented. Electricity saving is likely negligible.
Offgas production in a landfill is to be expected. With the loss of the WSF you will be increasing the volume of has production and thereby mitigate any progress towards a cleaner environment.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Keep FEP/WSF
The mitigation measures are not as effective as maintaining the FEP/WSF. This survey is not actually a balanced survey. It only presents the HRM/Staff/Mirror perspective as evidence and none of the concerns of the Community Monitoring Committee or others.
The difference is that by sepearting using the FEP/WSF means that most of the our causing items are contained in a single area vice spead over a landfill. Odour can be controlled more effectively if it is know when the odour causing material is.
Because you can't be trusted. You commit to something and then when keep changing things and moving goalposts. Nothing you say can be trusted as being in the best interests of Halifax citizens anymore. It's not just money
Why depend on mitigating measures when current prevention is working fine with the FEP/WSF?
Odours have long been an issue at this landfill and this new proposal is surely to enhance that issue
Not convinced that existing approach will continue working
How can anyone really know what the odour problem may be as at the present time most, if not all organic garbage, does not go into the cell. I am pretty sure that any odour generated by the decaying organics will be increased greatly and depending on wind direction will impact nearby homes and businesses.
More untreated waste and raw organics will create more stench
Get real. It smells at times now, it will get worse. Remember Lwr Sackville?
as per previous question, not enough info here to determine if this is viable.
odurs will still travel
The current smell that comes from the facility is horrendous in the summer! More measures need to be in place than now
Dont believe you, trust issue again.
You finally recognize here that there is an increase in oututs...if you kept the sorting this wouldn't be an issue....now you are getting closer to the concern when this was built...it will attract vermin and birds...
The changes for Otter Lake will lead to increased and longer term accumulation of waste materials, leading to a dump like former Lower Sackvile IN THE MIDDLE OF A RESIDENTIAL AREA
The Otter Lake facility already smells bad, with measures in place, especially on humid summer days (which is most of them now, with climate change). Rotting organic material STINKS. Leaving more in the landfill will just make this existing problem worse.
Treated properly there would be no odor
Have you ever been near the Irving on Prospect road on a hot summer day the smell is gross with the right winds these smells could travel a long distance.
The existing approach is clear, understood and works. Why change something that is not broken?
I can smell the dump now so it will only get worse with this new plan
It's obvious that increase in food waste in the disposal area will increase odors. I'm not sure that the logic in the explanation above is sound.
These odours would have been addressed in the original Otter Lake design! If not, shame on you!
The people sitting in the fancy offices will not be the ones that are dealing with the smell.
Best way to deal with odours is the WSF. Should leave it operational to ensure long term minimization of odours vs mitigation of odours that will now occur.
More inappropriate items in landfill, more odor. It just might take longer as it processes but fear it will eventually surpass current odor levels.
If this mitigation is not going to stop if the sorting stops, why is this part of the survey? Your survey is very poorly written. My concern is that there will not be sorting completed.
Odours were one of the concerns raised originally by the people living in the area.
For the same reasons in previous answers. Less control will result in more negatives including smell.
more smoke and mirrors
Because this is a whole lotta words for "yes it will stink more"
Current WSF system to my best knowledge pumps all offgas through a carbon filter to help eliminate odour before rely to the atmosphere
This does not mitigate an increase in gas production.
If we are trying to reduce the burning of methane gases, I don't see how just burning the gas which would be produced in anyway reduces the environmental impact of organic matter that is not being treated properly to minimize methane gas production
I don't know enough to know, but don't want this to be like the burnside composte place you can smell for miles
Use the current generation of odour as a marketting opportunity. "Our landfill smells (because it is literally, actually world class!)"
Landfill monitoring consistent with the current approach for the management of odours is commendable. Notwithstanding this approach, you are dealing with a significantly different entity. The proximity to residential and retail facilities creates an unfortunate series of events that will lead to foul air pollution and odour.
Garbage stinks and nothing you do will stop that.
steps are taken already to reduce odors and it is not sufficient - this will only make things worse
I worried that people are getting complacent about sorting. If organics increase, what is the process to restart the processor. I fear if the processor stops it will be permanent.
big odor problems now not being addressed
Odour is a problem in Timberlea and work should focus on addressing this as opposed to seeking savings. HRM continues to increase population close to the landfill, while making decisions based on solutions from consultants that are not focused on protecting reside and relying on proposals that 'may' have the 'potential' to improve issues.
Even though the open area is minimized, increasing the amount of organics will increase the amount of odours. With increasing weather events, including strong winds, it is more likely odour will reach nearby communities.
Sorting is felt to be the best course of action to limit odours produced by waste
Lirs
If you do not sort and ensure you know what is put in the landfill, there will be odour problems. I drove by the Sackville landfill for years and the smell was disgusting. Do not do that to our city and impact the tourism drive to Peggys Cove. Use common sense please.
Odour mitigation is not odour elimination. On hot summer days, the current situation results in malodorous conditions. We cannot allow this as 'normal' or acceptable.
it stinks here
Gas / odor collection cannot guarantee all will be collected
With the land be disturbed at times albeit traffic, erosion...how would the odour be prevented then?
Stated earlier, 10% of waste are organics. 10% is a big number, organics smell.
Honor the contract!

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
You can smell the landfill already.
Leave it alone it works
The mitigation methods discussed above provide no information about how the current processes onsite will be changed to account for the additional organic materials to be landfilled. Will the existing landfill gas collection systems need to be upgraded to account for the increased organic components entering the landfill?
It's another article citing propaganda.
The review still shows there could be potential for increased odours, we won't know until it is too late.
I do not believe your comments about increased odour
No issues have been identified but there will be an increase in odour. We say NO to the proposed changes to the Otter Lake Waste Processing and Disposal Survey!
Odour mitigation procedures need to be put in place AS WELL AS keeping and even improving the FEP/WSF.
If the FEP/WSF was implemented to avoid odours, and is accomplishing that objective, trying to tell us that the process may make it worse sounds like a bad argument.
Trust
Methane gasses
removal of fep and wsf
Burying garbage will not reduce smells or gas created by decomposing garbage.
No change should occur
The current ordour's being omitted at the site presently are very unpleasant and with wind blowing in any given direction it is moved to towards living area. The belief that someone will be policing the amount of organic going into the site is equal to the reason FEP was required.
Dumping organic waste that is decaying with out treatment is going to generate additional odours. There is already a smell from this facility and not treating the decaying food will only increase that smell and attract animals who may get sick and die from the toxins of rotten food.
My understanding from the CMC is these measures will not work without the FEP & WSF.
Right now you can smell a bad odor depending on which way the wind blow and this will make it worse
With the increase that you'll see in odours coming from the recyclables that aren't being sorted properly with the removal of the FEP/WSF, there's no way that you can keep the odours down.
Stinks now, will increase not decrease!
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill
It stinks too much now In the Sommer time
On what real data is Dillon's assertion based exactly? I am not sure I see how heat treatment would kickstart the microbiological decomposition process. At any rate the "amount of odour/gas" produced is not related with the speed of the process but with the amount of organic material present in the waste which will increase
Again, my preference is to eleminate as much as possible from the landfill
Same answer as green house gas question. Please refer back to that question
Current steps that are part of the original agreement that allowed the facility to operate in that location are being eliminated
Those wells do not work. No debate about that. There are numerous locations where those wells are present and they still stink from miles away - the reason - organics in the waste stream. Keeping the diversion in the FEP/WSF mitigates the amount of gasses produced so they may be more appropriately handled by the collection system down the road.
How are you planning to contain the size of the landfill if you do away with front-end sorting?
If not stabilized, the rotting organics will stink.
This measure has been proposed and taken on across the world to disastrous effect and impact. The narrative of this survey is again selling to me - this is not a survey
This is not good enough
gas flaring also has negative effects on humans.
keep operating the FEP/WSF
This landfill site was promised to be closed years ago. It has already gotten bigger and now it is getting stinkier. What was once a great facility recognized world wide will now be a regular dump
It will still stink
more BS as stated above.
We DO NOT want another Sackville incident!!!
It already smells, I can't see how adding more rotten waste will make it any better even with measures above.
the enviroment and decopositon goals should be weighed against the human disruption, not all one and none of the other, i dont want more odor but the sorting/proccessing and decomosition are important long term ecological considerations. we should not sacrifice the environment for better smell.
Again, relying on humans to do things that take extra time and energy is not always a good plan. I don't trust that it will be done as planned.
If these measures are already in place then why does it smell so bad? It smells like terribly soul milk or rotting food on a regular basis so whatever you are doing is not working.
not sure
There are odours now especially in the summer. The measures noted above will not be enough to fix odour problems.
The long term effects of the de activation of the FSP/WSF is not really addressed here.
Are you actually serious....this should be on the news...what a joke.
The existing measures remove more organic material so increased concentrations of organic increase the potential of odours gas emissions
Seriously? You're trying to say that the current system generates more odours than would be generated if the FEP/WSF is deactivated? I find that hard to believe. Just keep the system in place as contracted and promised!
The odours currently are not controlled. Additional waste will increase the odour.
While not often, we have experienced odours from the landfill. Even once is one time too many.
If no one is there to kickstart the process what is the potential of the odors hanging for longer periods with it occurring naturally as at older landfill sites.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
4000 tons decay waste not accessible
4000 t of decaying waste not acceptable
4000 tons decaying waste in landfill without FEP/WSF
4000 tons decaying waste in lad fill without FEP/WSF
Said it yourselves. The process of pre-treatment 'kick starts' the decomp process and the odours are minimized. Enough said. I suggest that you come down to the area on a day when 'something' isn't working right. I guarantee you will lose your lunch with the stench. No thanks.
When we met with the city prior to the installation of this waste facility, we were given promises regarding capping the cells, sorting waste, no odor, etc. We have Odors now, what you are proposing will make it worse. Is a promise made to residents not binding on future Municipal Governments??
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
There is always going to be an odour issue.
With ever increasing processing to acomadate growing community, I fear increasing amt. of unfavorable odor/debris/pollutants will mar our air quality, roadside scenes and our growing tourist interest via this route to Peggys Cove etc.
It is already incredibly stinky in the area surrounding the landfill, especially in the summer. More food waste in the landfill will increase odours.
As with so many other counter measures here, these are vague counter measures that defy common sense: “as small as possible”, “proactive monitoring”, etc. These are provide zero assurance there won’t be odor issues. In fact that these were the best light the mitigations could be cast in makes me certain there will be. Again, this is not acceptable.
Smell will certainly be much, much worse.
As it currently stands we can smell the landfill many days of the year. This will make it worse
Smells terrible now amd nothing is done ! Can’t imagine when this change is made how bad it will be
These claims cannot be substantiated
It will still generate doors, and the landfill will still be remain fairly large but stagnant.
It stinks bad enough already
I grew up in Halifax when the old dump was in the north end. The smell was gross and our community doesn’t need this here
No FEP will lead to organics products increasing the odors.
All these questions ask- are you ok with how it’s done now- yes. will you be ok to destroy our environment- NO!!!
You can periodically smell that awful sweet smell of the wind blows a certain way
Don’t believe
The spray don’t work and it makes prospect road also smell bad
I remember what the smell was like years ago . I don’t think the measures will be followed through with.
We need to maintain what we have at Otter Lake as it has proven to work. Why would we lower the standard that has been world class for a few savings that HRM might waste on something less proven ?
If the FEP/WSF is deactivated, raw, organic material will enter the landfill, which will create odour.
I do. It feel there will be sufficient labour available to manger this risk.
The odours from this facility and one other in the area are brutal at times. If the organic waste is increased, I’m am sure the odours will be worse. Example- lower Sackville landfill. Nope.. not in my back yard!!
I don’t believe what is said given that many landfills smell. Eg the one in Fredericton and along hwy. 101
I remember the smell of this landfill growing up and driving pass on the highway! It was disgusting.
The landfill smells as it is, working properly. Odors will increase ultimately if the plant doesn’t work properly
This management process was never supposed to be an option.
Today there are(on occasion) odours from this site. By not restricting what goes into the site, current measures will not be sufficient.
I have occasionally noticed strong odours emanating from the site.
I strong agree the FEP should stay operational as per the agreement orginally agreed to when opening the site If the site. If the site used to operate 2 FEP with no odours. How would operating one increase the odours. Again using no science only words like may increase.
Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill.
Concerned about increasing smells as in other landfills
Please do not deactivate the FEP/WSF. There have been odours in the area over the years. Removing the FEP/WSF will lead to increased odours that the community should not have to live with. We were promised this step and HRM should honour this commitment.
See previous comments about composting facility smells.
The importation of the FEP/WEs is a requirement of the otter lake landfill agreement
Do you live within 5 kms of the landfill ? If not you have no idea of the odors. We need this landfill to last as long as possible
There is no way the addition of organic waste will not create odor
You CANNOT a guarantee that the odor will decrease, but right now it’s good. Why would you want to mess with that?
I don't believe it will not cause more odor
Drive by on a hot day,or any other day there is an odor
First, kick starting the process might be a good thing if we followed up with the right processes after - which clearly are not burying it. So getting rid of FEP &WSF seems like going backwards - why are we not talking about making this process better - not just throwing up our hands and saying ... ok lets bury it all. Shame.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
It already smells bad on some days. We don’t need to increase the frequency of those days.
You said you would not be adding any new measures to control additional odours
If you live down wind of the Landfill it is obvious that odour management requires more work. Se[redacted] letter of November 8, 2021

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Unforseen odours will occur
hy are you even considering taking it away??? The way the garbage is treated now mitigates odours because the organic matter isn't thrown directly into the landfill.
Not good enough
It stinks now.
You say no off-site impacts have been been identified. Do you hold your breath when driving past the landfill? You can smell it miles away from it. Maybe you should live in the Goodwood area for the summer next year. You will change your mind quickly.
I am uncomfortable with the proposed changes and do not trust that the suggested odors will not intensify.
I don't believe it
Bullshit.
You want to add a significant organic and uncontrolled material to the facility. You do not have any idea what mitigation processes you will need based on consultants.
It is easy to say that there will be all these measures in place and there may be at first but I do not trust it will continue forever...there must be public access to records to ensure this has been done each and every day
So you are saying the smells will be diminished, I find that hard to believe
If you deactivate the front end processor, waste stream management and stabilization, you will be betraying the original contract betraying public trust.
No deal
Can't mitigate all. Smells will increase. If not right away, at some point.
Because even when the FEP is in effect we still get odours - so if that's gone we're going to get way more.
Covering it daily will not completely eliminate the odours - the risk of odours in the air is still present.
The stabilization process makes it faster for the materials to be decomposed, removing this steps means the landfill will fill up quicker and the smells last longer
Maintain present operations. Any risk to increasing the odour should be enough for the city to end consideration of changes as proposed.
Presently every morning and most evenings on route 333 there is a pervasive sour milk odor. I don't see how this will mitigate this.
why would you remove the "kick start" to the odour problem? Every piece of equipment should remain to help this process.
Mothballing the FEP/WSF also removes the 15 day turning of waste and the generation of low grade compost. The 15 day composting process would mitigate the concerns.
Is this new method any better?Really? There was to be no odor from the current system and come take a wiff on a hot day. You want to reduce odor? Start looking and developing a new site for land foll, its past due being in our back yard!
Measures have not been put in place to make this a dry landfill as was first intended. If it is not a dry landfill odours will be a problem. The smell is already bad as I drive by during the summer.
Keep the proper set up in place to protect communities
This will be hard to believe that there will be no additional odoir
I do not believe that this landfill will not have increased odors.
I cannot imagine that changing this would yield the same level of odour instead of more. It is not logical. The smell of this landfill directly impacts many residents in the area and switching up the current process, regardless of good intentions to minimize the smell, will most likely still increase the odour of the landfill.
More gas will effect the ozone !
Putrescent garbage stinks.
What happens if you are wrong
What is currently in place is effective so I don't understand wy we change something that is industry leading? The potential for increased odors is enough for me to worry about its impacts on property values
Any increased odor is unacceptable in a growing community. The bottom line is this project was initially approved with the safeguards of the equipment in place. The community would never have agreed to it oversize. How pleasant it will be for people enjoying a friendly game of golf engulfed in noxious gas.
I am not seeing that the mechanism mentioned are likely as certain as indicated.
Not seperating organic waste and neutralizing it before it ends up in the landfill will create more odor - especially with increased volume.
WHAT YOU HAVE IS WORKING. KEEP IT.
Let's start looking for a new landfill site. Our communities will suffer environmentally.
There are smells now. I do not believe that the existing mitigation is enough for the garbage there now.
If you lived here you would know. They are doing excellent today. Please don't jeopardize what we have!
Again more lip service. Stick to your original agreement with the area
Additional odors is a significant impact to quality of life at our homes
Feels like we're taking a step backwards from technology waste management is an important part of our way forward
We had a contract with the acceptance of having a facility in our community where the promises were set. Now you want to change them. Maybe bring it to another community for acceptance
The only acceptable way to manage odor best is sorting bags individually. Not acceptable. We have an international reputation that will be destroyed.
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
Doesn't matter it will still stink
No guarantee of mitigation measures
Currently, with the front end processing in place, the stench is almost unbearable some days. Removing that front end processing will exponentially increased the smells from the landfill. If you think it won't be a problem, perhaps you can move the landfill to Tower Road in Halifax and see how the south enders like it.
I lived close...but not as close as this dump...to the Sackville landfill and it consistently stunk. Now think about this: we can't go on our deck because the air stinks too much. We can't hold at Brunello because the air stinks too much. Resale prices drop...because the air stinks. But you won't be here to deal with it. Is it fine to say MY analysis shows the air will have a major stench?
I'm a planner, and I don't trust this. When the FEP/WSF was put in place it was said that it was going to reduce odours and in the original reports and plans it says this, so how are you saying the opposite now?
Again, the obvious increase in garbage will add to operational costs which are not recognized - and budgets will tighten and mitigation cease
You said when it was built it wouldnt turn into a dump. KEEP YOUR PROMISE FOR ONCE!
Odour cannot be decrease your with less frequent attention. If it is corrected frequently it can be kept to a minimum.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
You indicate the system will be maintained. It will have to be expanded to accommodate the additional gas.
with additional rotting waste material comes additional odours This is simply unacceptable
Smell in the community is not pleasant and lowers property values.
no matter what you do it's going to reek
As it is now on a hot humid day we get a rotten smell in the air so I can only see that getting worse...
I don't agree I think that if you make these changes we will definitely have a lot more odour coming from the facility.
As it is now there were times when the older can be offensive. Can you imagine if FTP and WSF is removed what will happen?
I have had the pleasure of those odours while driving home, so your efforts are not 100% effective. If you cant control the odours completely now, they will occur more often and get more offensive in the future.
land fill has reached its top
Landfills generate odor there's no way to stop it. The area is highly populated housing values will decrease, breathing issues increase
When this facility was built we were given assurances and these are lies. Why would we believe you now?
a landfill stinks no way around that
The smell is already bad
Again you are relying on the public to follow guide lines of separation of organic s from their trash
IF we did not need this system in the first place, why spend all that money on it? We were sold a bill of goods.
odors will increase
Sackville was told this same BS and we smelled how that turned out
You admit that there will be odour.
I can't understand how there would not be additional foul odour; isn't that one of the purposes of the processing plant in the beginning?
It will not be enough to mitigate the odour.
Even with the existing processor in place today we can smell door from the landfill. Proactive monitoring for site odours is not a solution. Relying on residents to sort garbage properly is not a solution.
The system currently works to reduce odors. The current system represents the " mitigation " that was proposed when the facility was designed.
It already stinks on some days now.
Residents do their best to sort organics but FEP is also needed
Nicely written nonsense which might convince the public that Otterlake is still the "example for the rest of the world to follow" (quote from 1998 councillors comments promoting the landfill)
The front-end processor and waste stabilizer should be maintained to ensure ongoing efficacy of the landfill.
I already can smell Otter Lake from my home when the wind blows the right direction.
The odor of an open cell cannot be compared to a closed one.
Monitoring doesn't resolve the problem of odour
It doesn't identify if closing the wsf/fep will reduce odours or increase only that of odour issues may be increased.
closure of the FEP and WSF and relying on residents to properly sort is a downgrade from the current system.
The Dillon Review suggests that operation of the FEP/WSF "may increase" the potential for odour issues. This implies they are unsure if that's the case and they won't know for sure until the processes are shut down. That concerns me.
The approach doesn't identify a strategy in the case that the WSF creates more odor than anticipated by the Closure Review. Currently on its bad days, especially when the wind comes from the west, it's truly awful.
I would like to see more specific modelling. Where can that be found?
My opinion is based on experience of residents who have lived in close proximity to such facilities.
None of this addresses the increase flow of garbage trucks on the roads to and from the site or their accompanying stench
Any type of odor especially "sulfide" is not a good thing. If this area gets lots of wind????????????????
On a good day, you can hardly smell the dump. All those brand new $700,000 houses will be subjected to the smell, as well as though getting groceries and golfing. People will actively avoid the area
There is already an odour so this will likely increase the odour.
We already have the compost facility creating smell on the Prospect Road. Whenever I complain to 311, their response after an investigation is someone accidentally left a door open
FEP/WSF was not properly deployed, this issue is not addressed.
Ordours are already prevelant. Otter Lake can be smelt throughout Goodwood. Sometimes it is so bad at the Irving Gas Stop that it takes your breath away. This will make matters worse.
There is already a smell today, mitigation will not assist with this issue
Again, it's supposed to be a dry dump.
The dump creates a foul smell in the low lying area along 9 mile river, worse on humid days. Driving through it is unpleasant already and can only be made worse by reducing sorting
It seems the study conducted has identified this as an issue. As opposed to simply trying to mitigate this, take the steps to proactively prevent it.
This place already smells so bad
access is fine
The odours right now can be overpowering. Removing the front end sorting will result in more smell. Leaving the systems in place that work just now makes a lot more sense rather than trying to mitigate these problems with more solutions.
I think more options should be explored when it comes to odour management.
We were very aware of doors before and even now there is a whiff of dump on some days. I hope the city will be prepared to reimburse homeowners in the area when we can't sell at appropriate value as no one wants to live next to a stinky dump.
when it first opened the odor was terrible. They fixed it and now you want to go back.
Still you cannot guarantee the odorous smell will not be a problem
You can't eliminate the smell in the summer. We are told you shouldn't smell it now and since it's been open the sour smell has been prevalent driving through the area. This can't possibly improve
You cannot control the odour even with these measures
Not enough

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Still having a bad day everytime passing by this prospect area where the disposal can't control the odor
This is a world class facility. I have lived here long enough to remember what it was like before. No way we should at this time of increased environmental concerns be taking such a backward step.
It already stinks in that area, so this is just going to make things more stinky!
Again unsure if this will help when it's already a current problem that's not being taken care of
more waste more odour at site
You seem to have an answer for everything except why it was voted on to negate the agreement
Again it is about improving the existing system rather than getting rid of it. Our taxes are the highest in the country and the city skirts their civic responsibility.
.
I don't believe these measures will be effective
concerned that mitigation measures will turn out to be more costly than projected savings
On warm summer days depending on wind we can already smell the dump.
There are times when the stench from the present landfill system is unbearable. If the intent is to use other methods of mitigating these odours, they should already be in use to test their efficency.
Dump should be closed . Been here long enough
See previous answer. Often smells do travel to the timbelra/lakeside area already. I don't know how Brunello will thrive when the smell decreases property value.
There are different ways to do this
How reliable is Dillon's report?
I work [redacted] and smell the dump literally all of the time. It's disgusting but thankfully it's a business park and not a residential area. I'd be upset if I couldn't leave my house without smelling garbage
I don't believe that the success touted of HRM's source separated waste diversion is as successful as they believe.
There are no existing off-site odors and without a long term study of deactivating the system I wouldn't be comfortable that no new odors will be generated
Does not appear to be scientific/research supporting this claim
I'm not convinced that the proposed approach would be enough.
My experience is the smells are not contained
Increased organic material = increased odours
Assumes sortation by public is sufficient and that odours can be controlled. Hasn't been proven to work elsewhere
You want to have a larger open pit
Because when I drive by the site every day I can smell it. It is not being effectively managed now.
Not removing the Front-End Processor and Waste Stabilization facility would be a better solution.
There is no way the smell will not worsen if existing measures are removed. Even after that is proven it will be too late and we will not get it back. Leave it alone. FEP/WSF controls are why and the only reason the community agreed to the landfill.
Odors will not be mitigated
By not sorting the waste you will increase gases and stunk up our community!
This landfill is beyond its life now, don't believe things will be kept under control forever
Current site and process already stinks to the point of tears in my eyes some days
come smell my nice clean clothes
I disagree. We have noticed smells increasing as things are now, even without these proposed changes.
I believe that deactivation will in fact create more odours
improperly sorted compost, additional pests, "culling" of additional pests, will surely bring more odours
Wouldn't the kick started process then move faster than a non kick started process? Which would mean it would happen and end faster. Shorter duration means less gas being omitted, correct?
There are already odours at certain times of the year. I believe that this will get worse.
Don't
I work [redacted] I smell the sweet odour routinely from the plant. I don't buy that these strategies will work. Who will compensate me if my property value decreases as result of the foul odour coming from the facility?
I remember Sackville
Clearly the odor mitigation measures already in place need an upgrade. Driving on hwy 333 during windy days the smell of garbage is overwhelming. Your current measures are not sufficient so no change to them does not alleviate my concerns.
Where's the proof?
The odor in the summer can be unbearable at times already..
So far no one as any complaints of odours, so it makes sense to me that the FEP and WSF are working . It seem to me if something is successful and working properly you should not get rid of it just to save money.
Keep bladders and sorting in place
Nobody wants to smell a dump if they live nearby. Or even driving by...
not proven method for reducing order
The vast increase in organic matter naturally will increase the smell. Wind direction would amplify the effect as well in close by areas. Common sense would indicate that much more would be necessary to be done in if the sorting stops.
How can there be no risk of increased odours when the waste stream will no longer be sorted.
the current odour is already to strong
I am concerned that odours will increase.
improper use of "consistent"
Not true
This landfill already generates terrible odors that we smell on our commute through Goodwood on prospect road, depending on which direction the wind is blowing. I do not want to be subject to more or stronger odors as claimed by the community monitoring community if both the FEP and WSF are removed.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
The entire community surrounding the landfill has a strong odour, depending on temp/weather conditions. I am concerned that the smell will now be constant. No one wants to smell a garbage dump when sitting on their patio.
See my comment on the previous item about greenhouse gas
These will not work
Daily landfill cover? Where is this cover coming from and won't this fill up the area more quickly? I'd be very surprised that you could cover daily!!! Can that be in writing?
There is still raw garbage that will be exposed.
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated
No issues now. So leave it.
All efforts should be made. If council is so confident in this approach I expect that the city will offer a home buyback program at market value to address any negative impact experienced by home owners.
What options and assurances are there if the odour does become worse?
I walk the neighbouring wilderness area everyday and I haven't been able to breath next to some landfills. The odours will be an issue
Honor your original agreement.
It's inevitable that adding more compostables will only increase likelihood of smell, though they say current Compost site is well mitigated it smells constantly for one excuse or another
Already addressed in the last question
FEP helps remove organic material from waste which helps reduce odour. Please do not deactivate FEP.
Still putting pollutants into the air and will be smelled by residents in the area
Please honour the agreement
Do this for prospect road
There is already a smell in the area doubtful that's this will help at all, honor the agreement set up
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
Without a doubt this is the most concerning aspect of this proposal. I believe this course of action will only increase the odor issue. Not only is this extremely unpleasant but will drive down house prices within the area.
We have experienced unpleasant odour from the landfill in the past and I am not convinced that the stated mitigations will effectively deal with the odours.
Ever since it opened we had odour issues in the Timberlea area and since moving to exit 5, we can still drive by and smell it.
You should not be deactivating
If this site is not monitored there will definitely be more methane producing products put in the garbage.
It doesn't smell good their now when I drive on the Prospect Road. With the increased possibility of food waste being with the garbage, the smell can only get worse
This is based on an assumption. We won't know until the facilities are shut down. I realize this is a bit of a catch 22, but it still does not address my concerns that it probably won't increase odours. Currently the odours are not a problem, so best case scenario it continues to not be a problem. Worst case it increases odours. I would need to see more evidence that it will not create more odours
It's almost hard to believe that our tax dollars were used to spin people into thinking that there will be no ramifications from these changes.
The study is severely limited in respect to on-site implications only. Those of us with it the 3-5 km area certainly notice current door issues. Currently those of us within the 3-5 km radius do notice significant odours.
Again, we will be paying for additional staff and equipment to mitigate this risk!
Increased organic will produce more offensive odour
Door is still present most warm days
Here's an idea, just stick with the original agreement.
Never 100 % problem free
In previous temporary shut downs odor was not able to be controlled
This does not have the same effect as the FEP and WSF
more organics, more gasses. More gasses, more odors
This wasn't supposed to have been an issue. HRM has lost credibility.
odours at the REGroup collection facility in goodwood have been increasing each year, so this does not address my concern that they wont here either
Using words like microbiological stabilization process sounds very scientific but ultimately mean nothing to the public. The will the landfill cover be on the new garbage 24/7? Monitoring for odours is fine but what will you do if it does smell. What are the steps you would take. I don't want my property value going down because the garbage smell comes into our community every day at lunch.
If the current system releases gasses quicker because the process is jumpstart Ed by microbes, it also means the process will be over more quickly. I feel this question is misleading by nature.
This is the big one. Didn't HRM declare a climate emerg? Does that only apply in situations where you can raise taxes? Worrying about climate change and burying organic material are not compatible ideas. Pick one.
We get bad smell in our areas from time to time that can only come from a landfill. It seems naive to think that it might not get worse once the sorting process is removed.
Again I can only in-vision an increase with this closure.
I can smell odors along 333 near Irving Stn
We live close to the site on the Prospect Rd. There are DEFINITELY odors noted at the site. There is no question this would be the same for Otter Lake.
Just like Mill cove and eastern passage wwtp arnt supposed to stink? The measures you guys put in place do not always work. If I was a resident out there this would be my main concern
It smells NOW! Some days it just wafts through greenwood heights, timberlea village etc. It is disgusting. It also can be smelt in propsect. If it isn't fixed NOW it can only get worse.
More information required
the dump smells horrible. imagine driving home after work and smelling something absolutely rancid. now imagine living next to it. imagine being a tourist going to Peggys Cove, certainly a stain on our community.
I still find there are often bad odors around the site area.
The current approach to management of odours in inadequate. Not processing the waste and allowing the organic matter to leach into the ground will no doubt increase odours.
You can say all you like. On a hot summer day I can smell it on the prospect rd.
My concern is when the community agreed to allowing the landfill in the area this was not part of the agreement
When the wind is in the right direction we can already get an odour. I am not convinced it would not worsen with the removal of the FEP/WSF

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
There will still be odors
We were told the present system was the best choice for our area, now we are told we really don't need it?
The Dillion report was commissioned by HRM and their report was inconclusive. Science is not always perfect and their assessments are based on ASSUMPTIONS that are not proven. The current system has worked for 23 years. PLEASE DO NO CHANGE IT.
Spend some time at the areas down wind from there on a warm afternoon, you haven't fixed that problem and admit it could increase as an issue
You are still not addressing my overall concerns that a removal of the existing sorting process entail.
Again I live close to the site and the smell is sometimes unbearable
The wsf provides better odour management than a system without it. The facility on the Prospect Road is monitored for odour and is often unbearable during certain times of the year. Removing time tested measures for odour management is a bad decision. Regardless, the community has not agreed to remove these measures.
Let's not step back in time by doing it the old way . The old way was not ideal for any reason
Not happy with any increase in landfill
There are currently no issues with the WSF so one would think that process is effective .If it is removed I would expect it's replacement is going to produce more odors .
As noted in a previous answer the otterlake committee who is extremely knowledgeable is against the removal of the FEP/WSF- I [redacted] I want the council to leave these 2 items at the landfill for the health and safety of our community - as was promised. I expect an update with regards to this manner. Thanks
Because I don't believe it will work.
I dont trust the response
The odours will be worse
More garbage, more stink.
There are currently days when the odor emitted from the facility is sickening enough to turn one's stomach, adding additional fuel so to speak will certainly not help!
Past experience has shown the smell. It won't change
It already smells
The changes at the landfill will create more odour
This is one of my largest concerns. It will most likely be ongoing and will definitely impact quality of life and property values.
The community was ensured that there would be no negative effects to surrounding areas. Once again we have environmental racism happening in Nova Scotia with a landfill placed immediately next to a historical Black community.
It was not the agreement
Odours control will continue? You havent controlled it yet and shutting the FEP doesnt deal with the issue
This will decrease enjoyment of outdoors in our community, golf course and decrease our property values . This was never agreed to. Govt is tarnishing a great history of a successful waste management system with these changes. Completely unacceptable
After admitting that closure of the WEP/FEP will likely lead to additional odours, you say that you will continue CURRENT mitigating practices. These practices are not going to mitigate increased odours unless you ramp them up considerably, which will increase the costs. Better to keep the very successful current approach.
Rodents will still borrow underneath ground because the more bad order the more they like it
I do not believe HRM staff. If you live in the local community you can smell the landfil and this WILL increase if the FEP & WSF are removed. Plus Prospect also gets the putrid smell of the compost facility too! Gross!
Again there already is odour issues for which HRM has not addressed
I don't believe the measures will address all the odor
Best efforts' can control odours only to a certain extent. Have you driven by Goodwood lately?
Insufficient measures
This facility has not been able to control smells as it is now. No faith in mitigation plan.
Again, the promise of no new odours until there are and then - sorry!
At present with the FEP/WSF safeguards in place there are minimal or acceptable levels of odour resulting. Removal of the FEP/WSF processes has been acknowledged as resulting in more odour producing organic materials being deposited in the landfill by a factor of tons. This has the potential to produce an unacceptable level of odours , a level noxious to the adjacent communities .
Promises and statements have been made before about odours and not met.
Goodwood always stinks in the summer
This will not work to the level needed.
Just because a risk is not identified does not mean it will not happen. I have difficulty believing 4000+ tons of waste directly to kabdfill Will not cause odours.
4000 tons of putrid waste going directly to landfill causes odour.
With 10% of throughput being decaying material that is not being processed, not confident these measures will be effective.
It already smells extremely bad along the 333 at certain times of year. I realize the Compost facility has been the culprit but we do not any additional chance of increased odour
Just one whiff of the compost facility on evergreen road and failure by the city to quell or control it has me worried about this site also.
It is virtually impossible to rid the area of landfill odour.
It already stinks to the high heavens. More stink is unacceptable. Stop devaluing our properties.
Do the flares produce pollution?
Currently there are smells that come from this site, with more organic materials making their way into the site the smell will increase
How can any environmental inspection company state that no harmful ODOURS will increase when they have no idea what's hidden in the DARK BAGS. Very misleading assumptions . This duty does not state how many complaints Otter Lake Landfill have received since opening its gate. Most complaints of odour actually originate from the nearby COMPOST FACILITY on Prospect Road.
I have very little faith in your ability to monitor and mitigate odour. It's been an ongoing issue.
More organics more odour. More rats, more birds. More BAD
Again, this has been an issue for years and doesn't seem to ever be solved
Once the FEP is closed no one knows what is in the waste. i.e. hazardous waste

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Additional Generation of Odours
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
The question is designed to be incomprehensible to the average person. We fervently oppose any changes to Otter Lake.
Don't have background to evaluate production of odours.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Groundwater Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Keep FEP/WSF
The mitigation measures are not as effective as maintaining the FEP/WSF. This survey is not actually a balanced survey. It only presents the HRM/Staff/Mirror perspective as evidence and none of the concerns of the Community Monitoring Committee or others.
By removing the FEP/WSF you are removing the ability to divert toxic materials such as batteries from the landfill. The best way to prevent a leachate incident is to divert as is the case with organic material and greenhouse gas emmisions. In this way FEP/WSF contributes to meeting and exceeding the stringent requirements for groundwater protection. Does the city want annother Harrietsfield issue?
In the short run there probably won't be a problem, but that doesn't mean one will not develop over time.
Promises were made to our communities, HRM keeps breaking these. Which is next?
Just because nothing has been identified now does not mean it will not show up in the future
The site is built to past requirements , so if the operation changes, will the existing system handle the additional exposure.
Is there anything in the proposal to explain what happens with very large rainfall events occur, as we recently had. From what I remember in the original agreement regarding the establishment of the Otter Lake Facility a large amount of time, effort and discussion took place of the location of the Facility and existing streams and rivers leading down to St. Margarets Bay.
Earth movement or other even can breach a cell. More untreated waste can potentially have an escape and more run off 100/200 year storm events with climate change.
Just don't trust you being able to handle greater volumes of compostible material. Once the ground water is contaminated that's it.
more garbage more risk
There is delectable contaminants in downstream water already. A larger landfill will increase this amount. You promised not to do this and are reneging on this.
i THINK YOU ARE GOING TO END UP WITH ALOT MORE HOLDING PONDS WHICH JUST COMPOUNDS THE ISSUE...
The changes for Otter Lake will lead to increased and longer term accumulation of waste materials, leading to a dump like former Lower Sackvile IN THE MIDDLE OF A RESIDENTIAL AREA
The Prospect communities already have bad groundwater. Everyone needs an expensive private water treatment system in their homes. Given what happened in Harrietsfield, I have NO confidence that groundwater protection is a priority at either the provincial or municipal levels.
You CANNOT possible stop leaking 100%
Because many are starting to not believe a word we are being told.
The original agreement addressed these issues.
Again, more inappropriate items, greater concentration in leachate. With increasing severe storms, much harder to contain. If it escapes, damage is down and waterways near there flow downstream to many other homes and areas.
Increasing amounts of organics in the landfill will result in increasing levels of water contamination. This can result in changes being needed to the wastewater processing requirements, resulting in increased costs and affecting the economics of the de-commissioning plan being proposed.
untreated organic material deposited directly into the land fill is going to change the current dynamics of the facility.
Groundwater will be negatively impacted if sorting is not completed. Sorting by residents (especially in apartments/condos/businesses) is not sufficient.
I still think the final sorting is important.
(If what you're saying is true. Past experience does not encourage trust...)
I do believe there is an elevated risk because of reduced security but I truly don't know much about the water table in the area
seriously?
Since more leachate will be produced when there is more organic matter going into the landfill, then the amount of material that needs to be treated will increase. The treatment of a higher volume of leachate at a treatment facility will cost more money and need energy and resources to be used to deal with the treatment process. y
I don't believe that the risk of contamination is eliminated.
What is the holding pond becomes flooded with new changes to climate ie heavy sustained rains
If get rid of front loader then anything toxic can go in dump. No more checks and balances
Earlier sections explictly admitted that removing the FEP will result in more trash blowing around on- and off-site. This material could impact groundwater, and is not accounted for by monitoring wells or liners or caps (unless further considered in some document not made public).
The topography of the area leads me to continue to have concerns as does the proximity to residential areas.
Most people live on wells out here. Garbage waste already is a major concern for residents. Have you seen the side of Prospect Rd? All of this garbage plus the additional garbage that won't be disposed or sorted properly will indeed end up in one of the lakes in our area making it into groundwater and wells.
Look no further than how you fucked the dog on the RDM site for water contamination.
Nothing is foolproof. Contamination will occur at some point.
Concerns somewhat addressed - are extradordinary weather events accounted for?
Not sure any changes in groundwater will be flagged
no organics in landfill...ever should be allowed
Lies
If you do not monitor what is put in the landfill, hazardous chemicals may be part of the landfill in future. That is not acceptable.
The leachate is a last line of defense. The facility should be using a multi barrier approach beginning with diversion of organic materials to minimize the generation of leachate. Once it is being generated in the ground it will be difficult to enhance the leachate collection system if it is no longer up to the task.
You cannot tell me that this does not leak or experience unfortunate incidence where protocols are breached. The community does not trust your imposed safety measures.
still potential for leakage into ground water
Honor the contract!
Will the quantity and strength of leachate change due to the proposed deactivation of the front end sorting equipment? If so, are the existing leachate collection and treatment systems able to manage that increase?
What about the current issue of blowing debris into the communities water ways? You cannot isolate these problems in a silo.
This comes from a signed agreement. It should not be rescinded.
With change to climate change, precipitation could increase dramatically, we should not be putting ourselves in a situation where we have to clean up environmental disasters.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Groundwater Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Existing liners WILL deteriorate and eventually leach into faulted rock and contaminate groundwater
We agreed to the Otter Lake Wastefacility when no one else would have it. You need to honour every safe guard that was promised. We all know the landfill should have been placed in a different location, nowhere close to such a populated area. Once the ground water is affected it will be too late...or take years to rectify.
please see some of my previous comments
Trust
That groundwater monitoring cell is a rusty piece of square steel tubing with a metal box ratchet strapped to it and a whirligig taped to the top. Do you seriously expect me to have faith in that?
removal of wsf and fep could affect this process
Once there is a pollutant in the soil there is no way to control where or how much moves into neighbourhoods.
The area that holds this site is a very complex ecosystem that supplies water to many communities not drawing from municipal systems. Failure to detect leakage could affect clients for kms around the site, proper values will plunge if water is not potable
We already have problems with our water so I'm very nervous about the water quality being affected.
a temporary holding pond can fill up faster these days with increased rainfall
Once a breach happens it is too late.
Still doesn't address the issue of poor sorting causing issues.
We have seen what global climate change has done to many places in Canada and the world, causing flooding and landslides. With that in mind, holding tanks and liners are no guarantee that leachate will not escape into the ground water.
Same answer as stated about the gas
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill
Any increase of untreated organic waste in the landfill has the potential to lead to increased groundwater contamination. Extreme weather events including catastrophic rain events (e.g. BC) are forecasted to occur more in the futur and could overcome the present system. The only protection is to landfill only inert material
Water in this area is not good quality to start with. Lots of people in this area can not drink their water already. Don't mess with those of us who can.
The current agreement that allowed this facility to operate in this location is being broken and therefore the contract with the community is being violated
As you introduce more organics to the fields, you are simply providing a reason for animals to congregate and search out food sources. They in turn destroy equipment that was meant to monitor and prevent leaks into the groundwater.
Groundwater is already impacted on site that the water at the office isn't drinkable, increased organics won't make the water quality better.
But won't an end to the FEP mean that "high-flow" capacities will be reached much more quickly?
I'm still concerned with the generation of leachate.
I live downstream - I could list a dozens reasons why this does not address my concerns in the least. And, here it is again "with respect to the deactivation" - surveys do NOT tell me why I should be satisfied with a measure - you're telling me to be ok with this. I am not!
your plan will result in groundwater issues that will affect well water in surrounding areas
keep operating the FEP/WSF
There is a river system directly adjacent to the landfill areas which already suffers from invasive species. The native fish don't need additional stresses from polution to compete against as well.
look at your example picture here! monitoring station held together with electrical tape and ratchetstraps, the people in charge should be ashamed. what about deterioration of the liners/piping? look at other landfills that have contaminated their communities, it will happen again with time.
I am glad there are systems in place however, we have seen in the past other communities such as Harrietsfield have their water table completely polluted by a HRM approved landfill site.
I feel that this approach works well with the current system because we are being sure to sort the garbage at the landfill. This way nothing overly harmful get put in the landfill. Of we are not sorting, the trash going in will most include more harmful chemicals that do not belong in the landfill. We cannot only rely on households to sort their garbage. This landfill is very close to our lakes.
Without front end sorting more inappropriate or harmful things can end up in the landfill and produce more harmful leachate. Nothing is foolproof and leaks of the leachate into groundwater can happen.
Not enough proof this will work. Sorry but the picture above of that rickety monitoring system does not put me at ease
Once you removed the FSP/WSF how can you be sure that the double liner system will remain intact and functional?
My concern with the lack of the presort is relying on citizens to sort correctly to prevent sending environmentally damaging materials to Otter lake is asking for issues. The public will exploit the opportunity to toss anything at Otter Lake as there will be no 1st line of defence in removal of items. Why wait in a hazardous materials line anymore if you can just toss it in the black bag.
The deactivation of the FEP/WSF will cause no problems in regard to groundwater quality until it is deactivated and starts to cause a problem, right?
We all live on well water.
I said yes to the above BUT that's dependant on how stringently the rules and monitoring are being followed. Based on the past, I don't trust it.
Slippery slope folks. Is the province going to pay to put everyone on city water (YUCK!) if something goes wrong? Once you detect a problem it's too late.
Monitoring for issues isn't the only solution. Working proactively to keep the water safe has to be the highest priority. It's next to a lake which could then carry contaminates into the local ground water. This should be a major concern for all parties involved.
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
You cannot possibly control water run off. It will find it's own path and contamination is always a hazard. I cannot afford to have the groundwater aquifer compromised.
Unsorted garbage can lead to contamination from many sources.
Landfill is very near the 9 Mile river system and other lakes
It's too late once the ground water is contaminated in the surrounding communities. It's not worth the risk.
A river runs right next to landfill, which drains into the bay I live on. The landfill was allowed by the community with the stipulations that these FEP etc would be in place to protect resources like this.
Still always be leaks and less and less monitoring
These claims cannot be substantiated
My family and I swim at a lake in our neighbourhood and so I am concerned about any possible water issues that arise from the landfill.
Petroleum products waste oils not caught at the FEP will end up in the leachant pools. Any systemis never 100 % effective. Severe wx amongst other factors can damage infrastructure .
My water already taste funny since they started construction of Lovett lake- now have to buy bottles of water
You will not maintain

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Groundwater Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
There are many promises, and many promises not kept. We cannot afford to jeopardize our most precious resource, water. The industrial area on Mills Drive in Goodwood is one example. I worked there and the contamination is horrible, nothing is done to prevent it despite what officials say.
Listen here, bureaucrats, I did not go all the way [redacted] only to come home and have you incompetents screw up my well water
The FEP/WSF ensures no hazardous materials go into the landfill. If the FEP/WSF is deactivated, hazardous materials will be dumped in the landfill which will impact ground water. HRM needs to honour its agreement made 20 years ago.
I do not accept the assertions that no risk to groundwater is identified. How can landfilling more organics and other waste not have any potential impact on ground water. Lots of fancy words that say almost nothing in an attempt to distract and confuse.
Liners can fail easily and impact a significant number of people in the area.
Undoubtedly water will be affected
We all know this is not the solution.
There is again no mention of unrestricted products now entering the landfill and their potential impacts.
The FEP/WSF being in operation was a guarentee to communities, like Hatchet Lake Brookside, that the potential for leachate issues that would contaminate our drinking water downstream of Otter Lake would not manifest. Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill.
Look a Harrietsfield water issues, don't want that here! We are all on well water as was Harrietsfield and now they are fighting for city water!
Please do not deactivate the FEP/WSF. Removal of this step may impact the groundwater. This was promised to the community and you are breaking that promise.
Organic should should not be put into the landfill
It will have no impact on protecting ground water that's not the concern. The concern is will it negatively impact groundwater quality.
I'm not sure why the city wants to change the current process
We have several lakes, ponds and creaks in the area. Why is the city wanting to put this area at risk?
So you place it in the ground no matter what method is used it will eventually enter the water system. The consultant will give the answers you want but not the residents side. I now my job was to hire consultants.
The more garbage that goes in the ground the higher the risk is to ground water. With no separation - very bad things end up in the ground. We need to continue to monitor and separate so only what is intended goes into the cells. Saying we will keep the cells small - sure but it you dump everything there will be more cells and more of everything that is bad.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
No additional measures being implemented
Ground water issues are always a concern, monitoring is only part of the solution. Impacting the water quality of Nine Mile River is always a concern. See [redacted] letter of November 8, 2021
Why Install the FEP/WSf system in the first place. Was this location meant to be a "research" experiment?
Many ways for crap to settle into water
hy are you even considering taking it away???
Not good enough
Water is bad now.
It's technically a dump , however well monitored, it in the middle of " how many lakes " ! Putting it in this spot was a very bad decision and not wanted ! so hard to trust it will be safe for all those intricate water systems !
If the runoff is already present with these features in place it can only get worse when they are removed. The water travels a very long distance, right into Shad Bay so without preventive measures it will travel even further, polluting wells, lakes, rivers and the sea ruining all types of fishing and boating for everyone.
It has impacted peoples wells in the past and what is to say this will not happen again.
More needs to be done !
The Woodens River Watershed is a valuable and natural resource that was protected as part of the social contract 25 years ago. Deactivating the FEP/WSF will immediately place the entire watershed at risk. As a stakeholder I will not allow this to happen.
It is easy to say that these things will be put into place but as someone who lives with a dug well who would be affected by this sort of thing it is very scary. There must be public access to ensure this is being done
I am worried the proposed changes will result in a change to what gets sent to Otter Lake. Once that happens, we are conducting a brand new experiment re waste management. I do not want to play with our current success in this regard.
Isn't there a concern with what is going in rather than what is coming out?
Clean water to my wells is more important than anything
Accident happen and it only takes one accident to ruin the water.
The effect on groundwater takes place over a long period of time
Seepage can affect surrounding lakes.
Again, there are efforts to help mitigate any of the issues, but the risk is still present.
I want to belive that sorting the waste prevent some batteries and other toxic materials from ending up in the landfill. If you remove this step, the potential to proving toxic items from ending in the landfill is gone
The city can't in good conscious think doing less is not without risk. To me, its like leaving an unattended baby in a car... What could possibly go wrong? City representatives need to be GREAT in taking care of our community. We've already given so much by having a dump in our backyards. Shame on this proposal!
Quoting requirements when HRM is proposing backing away from requirements previously agreed to by the community is no way to instill trust or confidence that HRM and it's contractors will adhere to any other requirements.
If household garbage isn't sorted there will be more harzardous waste put in the landfill.
We are all on wells here. Its a matter of time until land water is affected. We see it in 1st Nation communities. The rules get relaxed and time passes, people get sick. Move the landfill, its time before an accident happens that affects lives!
I think we should be increasing sorting, and not taking any chance or making any changes to the original plan when the dump was set up.
You are next to the Western Common wilderness area! Hello! Shut it down and move to a new community!!
I am rely on well water if it is compromised in any way if your system fails who will look after our issues we do not have access to city water!!
The leachate mitigation was designed to service the amount of waste for its original design. That design does not include the additional waste being proposed.
This is not good enough. This is a change that, again, impacts the residents of this community and these measures have worked for years and the community has been satisfied with the measures. Why do we now need to revert to something that worries and concerns many residents in this area? It is very concerning that this continues to be brought up.
I live down stream of the landfill and use a ground water well.What will the our ground water be like 25 years from now .
Not following the original agreement.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Groundwater Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
You seem to be presuming non separated garbage will have no effect on the water. I don't think you can say that.
Its too late when leaching gets into our water tables!
Would there not be increased volume of waste and therefore increased surface area and leachate from the untreated waste.
I think there are greater chances of breakdown and issues with groundwater. This was ALWAYS a concern before the construction of the landfill. Need to see how these changes will be easily mitigated.
I believe groundwater quality is a separate issue when it comes to landfills. Used to live near another such site in [redacted] "Long term" issue is a concern.
There is always an impact to groundwater when increased amounts of raw waste (unsorted/untreated) are dumped into the ground
This facility sites at the head of a water shed that feeds a number of rivers and lakes in the Prospect Communities. All of these communities are on well systems. Increased volume with less processing is concerning.
This will not work. Groundwater in the area is already affected and does not need something else contaminating the water.
More organic matter and toxic waste will end up in the "dump".
This is a beautiful area of the province. Like Blue Mountain. Close to the city. I think it would be best to close the faculty. Work at ensuring containment. And, not adding anything new.
The entire city should be concerned
bedrock was fractured, so run off and toxic fluids could drain off the landfill into these fissures and cracks and possibly contaminate the groundwater. They did not have time or resources to evaluate the subsurface water flow, therefore the potential deleterious effects of leakage into the aquifer remain unknown
The promise was to do certain things and maintain them. All you do now every couple years is try to change the deal you made with the community. This is unacceptable.
I'm actually not believing anything - this is not transparent or truthful. Extremely biased
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
Leaching will still happen
Without sorting the black bag garbage items such as batteries and paint will be going into the landfill.Lazy people do not sort their garbage and the existing process removes all the potential hazards when their bags go to the processing plant. This prevents leachate going into the water table and then into the wells. Keep the existing process. It seems to be working.
We pay taxes that include things like sewer/water/sidewalks.....we get none of those. We have to dig wells at our own expense, and hope that all of the rich developers won't build so many houses that our wells go dry or get polluted. Now you want to remove the protections that were put in place so that there is an ever increased risk for groundwater contamination. .
Jesus. See my previous comments about a loaded survey. This is unreal!!
This existing process should not be changed.
I do not believe the approach will be effective. Quality water is priceless - the risk is too high especially in this area that has significant river and lake areas
Just leave it alone
This not a guarantee. The water system in the area travels to Shad Bay.
monitoring will not stop spills and the risk is increased with direct dumping to the landfill
That monitoring well looks like something that Joe Blow jerry rigged up and I would not trust any information it was providing
its a garbage dump, why bother monitoring if its not a problem, besides, residents on wells, dont really matter. Isnt there a water shed near by?
There's so many sources of water in area that you are risking as well as habitats for animals etc
Next
theres far to many water sources in area pollution risks high
Like you said no foreseen impact what if there is and something you missed in the study I'm not convinced
I no longer have faith in the governing body of Halifax Regional Municipality. Their loyalty is to the god called profit and not to its constituents.
Ground water quality will always be a great concern
Hope this works
No faith in the system as a 100 percent guarentee ,when looking to cut and save money things like thisss end up suffering wih growth
Seems like the water in the area already requires treatment for household use. How will this be made better?
I live on a downstream lake so I continue to be concerned.
Having monitoring stations only tell you after the fact
No studies have been done to ensure water will not be affected. Lets keep our world class facility going
What is happening is EXACTLY what the surrounding communities feared in 1998. Most councillors have moved on and the landfill is being deconstructed into being just a dump. Goes to show you never to trust politicians
No effects identified....yet I would imagine.
The leakage from the sites ince detected in monitoring wells is too little too late, once detected, it is already in the groundwater.
Still think chemicals will leach into groundwater
Proximity to natural streams and lakes makes this entire process uncomfortable to me. I would appreciate seeing the procedure and modelling that Dillon Consulting used to come to the conclusion that deactivating the FEP/WSF was favourable.
While it's stated, "the landfill disposal area is kept as small as possible" the removal of the FEP and WSF will guarantee the area's will grow and it will grow exponentially as urban development continues
How do you know that with the deactivation that there won't be any ground water problems!!!!!! Has this been even tried??????
Nothing should impact water supply
We live by a lake that you can like link to Otter Lake. This changes could very well impact our drinking water as well as our recreational activities
This is bullshit. Goodwood will end up just like Harrietsfield
I believe that the extra stress on the system will cause ongoing problems and will eventually cause the system to fail earlier.
We dont know what will end-up in the field by removing these facilities. Anything like hospital,industrial or commericial waste can end up by removing these processing units which can contaminate the ground water.
This doesn't address the holding pond that overflows during heavy rain and goes into the river.
The proximity to the waterways, runoff, rats, raccoon, leptospirosis
While safety measures are in place, there is always the possibility that these can fail. Better to proactively eliminate/process the items that can cause the issues as opposed to simply containing or treating runoff.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Groundwater Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
This will not help
If there is more leachate, the potential exists that the holding area will be overwhelmed. The greater amount of leachate will enter the aquifer and impact ground water for a large distance around the landfill.
I think the communities near this ground water should receive an incentive for this impact
Are you serious ? This surgery is ridiculous.
when the leachate starts it will take a long time to correct it. Our water will be ruined. Please leave good enough alone.
With more waste in the ground covered over it will only increase the toxins there is no guarantee it will not leak
water table
With the lakes and river around this community this facility ruined the environment around it
Increased leachate - overload
Noone is looking to see what is dumped
Once it's contaminated, there is no going back!
FEP and WSF are needed to assure water safety
We are all on wells
I am concerned that reduced screening on the front end may allow more hazardous material to slip into the landfill, and that over time this could pose a threat to Nine Mile River and its lake system. Surely the liners can't work perfectly forever.
Not sure would be the option I'd choose.
Deactivating the system will have an effect. You arguments are not based on science.
Absolutely shameful that HRM is even considering this "change".
same concern as previous questions
Accidents happen, have we not learned?
Information states that this works by keeping the area as small as possible. Increasing the amount of waste sent there does not "keep it as small as possible".
I'm concerned about everything . Dump shouldn't be in my neighbourhood
This sounds like it is being looked after, I hope this system remains working. We have beautiful local trails and water ways I would like to keep clean and safe for people and wildlife
not enough info provided
I am worried about the increase runoff going through the lakes , rivers and finally to the ocean. This plan is going backwards not forwards. it will further increase water pollution and global warming
I'm not convinced this would help.
Impacts from increased leachate
Insufficient for incremental usage
Contaminated pollution may easily leach into the nearby watershed.
hasn't there already been problems? do we trust?
Leave it alone!!!!!! FEP/WSF controls are why and the only reason the community agreed to the landfill.
The site will need to expand with the growing population and will result in polluted groundwater and nearby wells
This is not enough, we need to sort and stabilize the waste.
We were told by experts that the cells are at capacity and more pressure will cause them to crack and leach, promises are being broken to this community and it's disgraceful
Disaster waiting to happen
there are many lakes in the area witch run to salt water> maybe you should put this in the southend of Halifax and see what the Upper class say. O ya they pay more taxes the us so they don't have to worry about it ever being put near them
I don't agree that this will be enough
i think we should be doing everything possible to preserve our natural and beautiful environment. any half measure to save a few bucks is typical bs. stop destroying our environment for $.
I am concerned with pharmaceuticals entering water supplies
Again, what mitigation measures are to protect homeowners who live in proximity to the plant?
lifetime of liner, control systems?
The current state of groundwater was not identified therefore how can the current measures be imagined as appropriate when the report does not conclude if they are currently satisfactory
The proximity to Nine Mile River has always been of concern. Leaking membrane cannot be repaured.
This is the primary concern of myself and my family. I would suggest you will not know the impact of the change for many years when properties, wildlife and residents suffer from irreversible harm
Again the FEP and WSF are working properly and doing the job they are suppose to. If you change this you will not know the results of your changes for years and by then it could cause health issue from the water. This is working and should be left alone.
It addresses my concerns only as pertains to the current operations which include FEP, sorting and Community Monitoring. I do not trust your process is any of these components is removed or changed.
Keep present agreement in place water issues have been identified
A large portion of nearby homes are fed by wells. This solution at not address the impacts this will have on drinking water from those wells.
leaks happen all the time enviromental concern for sure
With additional unsorted garbage going into the landfill, extreme water/weather events like hurricanes and Nor'easters could have a huge impact on the surrounding areas. The risk is not worth it. Especially when a commitment was made to the community when the landfill was established.
Is it anticipated that increased potency of leachate will result from the deactivation of front end sorting?
What is the lifespan of the liners?
Monitor all you want. What are you going to do with people's wells when they are ruined
You say there will be no impact, but haven't quantified the basis for your statement
Na
Years and years down the road, this will be an issue. Garbage takes decades/centuries to break down will we be catching this leachate next century?

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Groundwater Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
There will be garbage that will be blown around.
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated
I am not an expert nor an idiot.Way to confusing
What could go wrong?
I don't trust it. Have no hood reason now, it just doesn't sit right with me.
Honor your original agreement.
Allowing anything to go into Cells without inspection only increases odds that something that can negatively affect groundwater will get through
See the extra organic added to the leachate adds extra stress to the waste water plant it will be trucked to . Why mitigate when we can prevent
Thank you for trusting the members of our community to not improperly dispose of high risk items without the sorting staff being able to ensure there was nothing that should not be there.
Whoever's idea it was to build a dump on a watershed should be flogged. FEP and WSF help ensure the quality of waste thereby reducing potential contaminants to the groundwater which eventually migrates around to all of our wells! Please do not deactivate these services.
Please honour the agreement
Everything goes bad
Of course I am a concerned resident I live in the area and these issues will always be of concern and the municipality will always have an answer
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
You should not be deactivating
I have had a concern about the landfill before it was even setup based on conversations with renowned geologists
This will lead to increased sampling/monitoring by a consultant. Again, I'm not seeing the cost savings!!
Increased organics will potentially affect groundwater
Large number of lakes and clay soil in the area is cause for concern
Always room for accidents, then what? To late then.
This is not as effective as the FEP and WSF. This is not worth the risk of our communities health and safety
more organic material, greater the risk.
Again, HRM's word has lost credibility with me.
What third reports do we have to back up this claim. What percentage of leachet is not contained and goes into the ground? If we don't have the answers to these questions, how can we make a decision. This survey is bias simply because it comes from the government who is trying to save money. There is nothing wrong with that but we automatically can not trust what is said
I am worried that the current system is not adapted to handling increased contamination caused by the proposed changes.
No effects have been identified ??? Of course not, you did the study and you want "no impacts". Burying more organic material will result in an impact - that's how it works....? Your position is nonsensical.
There is no doubt in my mind that most people will throw away their old batteries in the garbage instead of bringing them to a recycling facility. Electronic garbage are very common and most people won't bother to take the time to do that.
Only with respect to its increase.
and water issues are a concern as we are on a well
Would you like to live close to the site and drink the water in the area?
You name Me a landfill that doesn't have issues over time after those liners start to die. We can't even guarantee that those will be installed correctly. You guys screw stuff up like this all the time. You go to the lowest bidder who may not be the best one to do it and stuff gets messed up and it just gets installed anyway speaking from personal experience on this one guys
Less processing of waste means more contaminates in the water, which will cause the lectures to be stranger. Liners are liable to rip, equipment will fail. Its better to remove as much contaminates at the front line, rather than rely on equipment to catch them later.
the dump should be decommissioned. any chance of contamination should be unacceptable. pollute another community.
This concern is always something that concerns me.
With increased volumes of organic matter being disposed and leaching into a storage tank and potentially stored temporarily in a holding pond, the risk of overflow increases. I have not been provided with information that the current leachate pumping system has capacity for increased volume associated with unprocessed waste.
Lack of sorting could lead to increased disposal volumes, and increased leachate production. Relying on an outside agency to manage treatment of the leachate does not remove HRM's responsibility to minimize leachate production.
The original landfill agreement had the cells lined with membrane on bottom and top so they are sealed cells therefor not affected the ground water because they are contained. So the existing system works great
What is the expected lifespan of the leachate and liner system?
Composite lines can and do fail. HRM's compositing facility is (also in our community) is currently polluting the nearby watersheds and has been for over six months. HRM seems to have a total disregard for the environment.
Leaks
These stringent requirements didn't help Harriet's Field for nearly a generation
What does this statement mean? "As such the landfill disposal area is kept as small as possible (e.g., less than 30 m in width)" - are you saying that the landfill disposal will never exceed 30 m?
If the particles are not treated then the amount of Lea hate will have more microbes in it requiring smaller cells and more frequent testing
Residents on well systems deserve protection from possible water contamination of any kind. Residents should not be exposed to any potential increase in risk. The original agreement must be respected.
There have been no extreme levels of leachate because the two systems are working. This application is to save HRM money, not to keep the residents' well water safe.
One small accident could be a serious risk to drinking water and water bodies
Many residents have wells worry about water quality
How can not processing garbage result in less leachate? The garbage is going to take longer to decompose so more opportunity to produce leachate and more of it.
These pieces of equipment weee deemed necessary and promised to be utilized for the health and safety of our communities - so removal is unacceptable
It will still get into our water
I can't believe how close this site is to lakes and waterways.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Groundwater Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
We need to mitigate, not guess, hope or pray there won't be an impact
These measures are taken for current measures at the landfill but without the sorting everything will end up in the landfill causing more issues
Look back at all the meetings and impacts to rivers and waterways before landfill was built. Our communities Omar's tired of being a dumping ground for HRMs waste. It's another community's turn.
Gross. Unacceptable
HRM staff are not to be believed. There is too much risk of our groundwater having issues. Removal of FEP & WSF will lead to more putrid rubbish going into Otter Lake.
You say there are safeguards in place but yet HRM is trying to eliminate critical safeguards (front-end processor) and Waste Stabilization Facility)
I went to the last set of public meetings and the experts told us the cells were only built to carry so much weight and back then we had already reached the limit. Those cells will leach into the environment. Our community was promised this site would be closed before snow and the area would be restored to parkland!!!
This is, of course, the big concern. We're on wells in this area the groundwater network is interconnected, and any problem in that are would become an expensive catastrophe very quickly. In even a perfect situation groundwater is always a concern.
Further investigation and research should be carried out to determine exact impacts.
I do not feel you have provided enough information on this and I am unable to ask questions. There are so many lakes in the surrounding areas and I have deep concern.
If something does happen, the impact to residents will be financially staggering for most.
Landfills fail. We agreed to 35 years. No extension was honestly and transparently put to the community. Instead it was planned for expansion and extension. Honour the commitment and decommission this site in 2024. I live downstream on a well like everyone else here. 25 years is what we agreed to. I'm not willing to risk it for longer.
Accidents happen.
This was already an issue when DOE did testing a few years back on sediment in lake water samples resulting from HRM actions. We are on wells. Is HRM going to install city water?? Sewer?? Talk to me then.
This must be monitored regularly.
With the possibility of dangerous waste entering the site there will be water impacts
How can any professional environmental company give an opinion that no on or off site impacts due to the ground water quality wheel be the same as currently indicated when they don't know what's going into the cell under the truck and dump program.
After 25 years you're to be "deactivated" and closed for good
I do not trust your onsite monitoring and testing and believe you will not be stringent in testing. This facility is convenient for you and keeping it operational villolayes your promise to community
Doesn't seem comprehensive enough
I do not trust that the company managing this site does what is required, nor do I think the regulations re monitoring and enforcement are sufficient.
Groundwater has already been affected by the pumping of water from the site directly into Nine Mile River.
The double composite liner has already been added to IW Hieghth some years ago. The landfill has already surpassed the date at which a new landfill was supposed to be found. What I see coming is an overflow due to the definate increase in volume ask Mr Dillon what happended in Toronto 45 years ago when all those surrounding area's were amalgomated in to the big city. FEP/WSG become even more important as a city grows!
No liner/leachate system is foolproof. History shows multiple failtures - many places more exposure - greater risk.
My concerns are a possible failure of your containment facility and the poisoning of the local water table. With very few exceptions the people who current live (and those that may potentially live as the city expands) in the area are serviced by individual wells. The elimination of the WSF will undoubtably result in toxic substances entering the landfill. Once the ground water table is contaminated, they will be not way to rectify the problem.
As long as these things are kept up regularly and always.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Surface Water Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Keep FEP/WSF
The mitigation measures are not as effective as maintaining the FEP/WSF. This survey is not actually a balanced survey. It only presents the HRM/Staff/Mirror perspective as evidence and none of the concerns of the Community Monitoring Committee or others.
Once again the diversion by the FEP/WSF of both toxic materials and organic matter is the best way to avoid issues with run off. Run off from excessive organic matter can cause Eutrophication of waterways.
Again, I doubt there will be a problem in the short run, but one could develop in the future.
See previous comments
As we have seen in BC, we could be subject to unusually high amounts of rain in the future. If more organics get into the land fill, would the existing water handling system be sufficient. I don't think we can expect this won't happen here.
What are the measures, if any, to be put in place to accomodate the possibility, which with recent very heavy rainfall events are almost certain to occur, in the area of the cells. This area has very little surface absorbatent material over bedrock allowing for a large possibility of large runoffs overwhelming the cells.
With climate change an ever-increasing 100 year storm events like BC can pose extreme risk to extra runoff
Sheer volume , you won't be able to handle it.
more risk
If you want to change the design significantly then put it to a vote again for the local residents. Provide pros and cons and let us decide. Otherwise be a dictator and do as you will. Forget these platitudes.
THIS IS SO ONE SIDED...I AM GETTING TIRED OF TYPING THE SAME THINGS OVER AND OVER...
The changes for Otter Lake will lead to increased and longer term accumulation of waste materials, leading to a dump like former Lower Sackvile IN THE MIDDLE OF A RESIDENTIAL AREA
see my answer above
Tests are only a guide line
Can be dangerous for animals , plants and humans
Just because they haven't been identified doesn't mean they won't increase. I fully believe after reading it that the study and proposal re one sided and flawed
Again, mistrust on every level. We are being fed 'facts' re. Every aspect of the facility to avoid acknowledging that an attempt to break a binding CONTRACT is afoot!
Same as above
See my comments under #23. More severe storms, greater run-off but just now with higher concentrations of harmful chemicles.
If the FEP/WSF facilities are shut down, then increased frequency of sampling should be considered for at least the first year in order to ensure that there is no increase in surface water contaminants. I have no idea as to what the frequency is now, so cannot offer comment on the adequacy of what is done today.
untreated organic material deposited directly into the land fill is going to change the current dynamics of the facility.
Testing is all well and good. Unfortunately, damage from people not sorting will happen before results will be received. We must keep the sorting at the landfill. This is the last opportunity to protect our land, water, and related animals.
Was there a baseline study of the ecology of the Nine Mile River prior to the landfill and if "yes" how has it changed?
The sampling/testing is helpful but what about times of flooding or heavy rains when the water could pass to other areas before testing has been carried out?
smoke and mirrors
With climate change affecting the amount of severe rainfall events being experienced, the current and proposed systems would be over whelmed in such an event and the contaminated water would then be carried into the streams and lakes int he area, as well as into the water table which then can affect the water quality which many people in the area tap into with deep well pumps.
Additionally after each storm event, all erosion control measures are inspected, and, if found to be damaged, are repaired or replaced as soon as possible. BY THEN IT'S TOO LATE!
leave front end loader
Removal of Front End Processing will decrease waste separation, thus increasing landfill volume. With increased volume comes increased surface area, and thus more erosional impacts when (not if) engineering controls fail from a storm event.
You only have to visit one of the surface lakes to witness the impact. Deviation from the current system will exacerbate the issue.
Again, not sorting is going to lead to additional garbage not being disposed of properly and again ending up in one of the many lakes, streams, wells and eventually the ocean. People will dump if their garbage needs are not met. That is a growing growing problem for HRM
RDM site, see previous remark.
Nothing is foolproof. Water will be contaminated.
Same as 19
What will be done if change is detected. What is the impact of runoff from extreme weather
its a dump, dont make it worse adding organics
If you do not know what goes into the landfill, you cannot ensure you have all processes needed for safe water.
We continue to experience heavier rainfalls and storms. I am not confident that these measures have taken into consideration our climate crisis implications.
Again still potential for leakage
Honor the contract!
What about the additional risk of blowing debris?
We are talking about in advance of the cap. How much did you pay for this report?
We cannot control the weather so let's not put ourselves in a position where we could have an environmental disaster just to save money. We need to invest in protecting our environment no matter what it costs.
Reduced front end processing will surely result in increased contamination of both surface and groundwater supplies
This is not acceptable especially with your proposed changes to the fron end processing.
Again, monitoring will catch things after the fact: "... after each storm event, all erosion control measures are inspected, and, if found to be damaged, are repaired or replaced as soon as possible." And then when problems become evident after the fact, they MAY be addressed "As soon as possible" - does not give me any confidence whatsoever. Stick with minimizing possible damage before it happens!
I think someone is not telling us the complete story.
why risk removing fep and wsf. money saving noy worth the risk to our city'water supply
Same answer as previous question. There is no way to control where water goes and how much pollution is contained in it.
what is the plan for extreme weather events and over flowing the system. Each year we see more dramatic changes and what safeguards are in place to mitigate.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Surface Water Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
erosion inspections should be completed more often
Testing surface water is too late. Once found , that means it is already a problem and has run off into other areas. As previously stated, climate change and unpredictable weather impacts will breach your measures.
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill
Same concerns as above. Catastrophic rain events will increasingly take place, and could overcome the current system in place. A small portion of the landfill is not capped as it accepts waste and if this waste contains an increased proportion of untreated organic waste, polluted run off could happen in a catatstrophic rain event. I live near the Nine Mile river estuary.
The new proposal breaks the conditions of the contract with the community.... sidestepping part of the process that helps protect the environment in order to cut costs
Testing only tells you the water is contaminated. Inspection and Separation of waste keeps it out of the landfill in the first place
Animals destroy equipment that was meant to monitor and prevent leaks into the surrounding streams and rivers. An ecosystem is a very delicate balance and any amount of runoff can have tragic and long lasting effects on those systems and all systems downstream of those areas.
See previous answer
Frankly, if you are willing to break the original community agreement about how the site would function, how can we believe any assurances that it will be run responsibly going forward?
I'm still concerned with impacts to surface water.
See previous response
What if the ground is impacted what about the families impacted.
components have been in a lengthy state of disrepair before, nine mile river is contaminated due to the practices here, why would i think it would get better? the chain lakes and backup city water supply are less than 15 km away towards the ocean.
Again, I worry that people get lazy, money gets tight and the measures put in place are not followed as described. It can look good on paper but how is it enforced?
More harmful things will end up in the landfill and impact the surface water. Surface water testing parameters are limited and do not test for every potential contaminate of concern.
WOW, only 400 character answers eh?! I've already had to paraphrase everything up to this. Just nonsense!
Please see my previous comment.
Our community all lives on well water!!!
I marked yes but this is dependant upon IF monitoring is done sufficiently and acted upon.
More untreated waste = more contaminants.
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
Testing and monitoring is great except it is not proactive.
More of the same vague and evasive language ("repaired or replaced as soon as possible" — gives zero assurance this will be done or any way to hold accountable).
.
More contaminated water for the wildlife to drink.
AS I already said, the landfill is next to a river that empties into the bay I live on. We don't need mitigation efforts if the contract that enabled the landfill to be built is honored, which HRM is not intending to do.
See my response to the previous question - same as groundwater.
Governor's Lake will be affected
Severe wx which is increasing in intensity combined with increased number will pose a risk to water not being contained in heavy rainfall events.
They is nothing stopping you from not doing this. Put this in your back yard
Again please refer to previous answer
Same as before
The FEP/WSF prevents hazardous materials from entering the landfill. If the FEP/WSF is deactivated, hazardous materials as well as raw, organic material will enter the landfill unfiltered, which eventually will affect surface water. HRM MUST honour the terms of the 1999 contractual agreement with the Halifax Wastewater Resource Society.
The proposed approach might be consistent with the existing approach but how can it have no impact with more material going in? These descriptions are dismissive of concerns and make untenable extrapolations and inferences without any good evidence. This amounts to simply hoping there will be no impacts to surface water and that is not good enough. We swim and boat in the local surface water.
Trash will leech into our surrounding water bodies
Talk is cheap!
Again everything assumes only current waste mix will continue to be dumped.
The FEP/WSF being in operation was a guarentee to communities, like Hatchet Lake Brookside, that the potential for leachate issues that would contaminate our drinking water downstream of Otter Lake would not manifest. Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill.
Please do not deactivate the FEP/WSF.
Organic should should not be put into the landfill
This area is literally surrounded by lakes. Every measure must be taken to ensure their safety
Just doesn't seem right that the city can do this to our area. We have beautiful trails, parks, lakes in our area. Why would you put those things at risk?
It is good that we currently take care of the surface water this way. The issue is not what we are currently doing - but what we intend to put into the cells (unseparated) and how that might effect the surface water - what are you going to do when unseparated material compromises the water - what are you going to do with that!
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
More waste needs more methods to control it.
Unclear how this will help
The landfill is situated between two watersheds; the Nine Mile River Watershed and the Prospect River Watershed, the risk of contamination is always there. See [redacted] letter of November 8, 2021
With de-activation, No off-site studies on water quality will be deemed necessary?
More garbage less precautions water more threatened
hy are you even considering taking it away???

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Surface Water Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Not good enough
Water is bad now.
Wild animals, birds and pets drink from puddles and streams. Eventually surface water seeps into the ground making it's way into wells.
Bird shit
IDENTIFIED? They have note been identified as the deactivation FEP/WSF has not begun. If it has, once again you have broken a community contract and are liable for misrepresenting this decision.
Without regular public access to see that these measures are in fact being taken it is hard to believe
Please read my previous concerns. I do not want to risk breaking a system that is working very well.
I don't believe anything hrm tells me I pay to much tax and I watch you install terrible play structures that waste money and kids hates
Concerned still about how the runoff could affect the lakes.
I'm still concerned that the runoff will effect our rivers and lakes. We are downhill of the facility and the risk of it affecting our waters is a factor.
Where is the countering point of view in this survey. This methodology is corrupt.
If household hazardous waste does not get sorted, it can get in the surface water. It's too late when the river and any surrounding bodies of water become contaminated
I have heard the water quality of Indian Lake was reduced and swimming is no longer safe. The measures are not adequate.
There is weird algae growing in Indian lake. It was not there before the land fill?
Never doing enough to protect our waterways move to a new location
What action will you take if your current system fails
Fact that you are not separating the waste will have an increased impact on the surface water.
Still not adhering to original agreement.
with additional organics directly in the landfill, I believe that the potential to pollute surface water is increased. Nine Mile River is already polluted, and additional pollution is not acceptable
there is no mitigation here for the additional volume of waste that will fill the cells faster
Although honest efforts can be claimed regarding surface water. Regulations are not strong enough in this province. I live near the river below Brunello estates. They followed all such "regulation" yet the river here is essentially "dead".
There will be a much higher percentage of deteriorated surface water quality with the addition of more unsorted/untreated waste in the landfill
Changing the process of disposal to increase volume and reduce processing without changing the approach to water quality testing is irresponsible.
Already untreated water concerns inr the Nine Mile River..
Sackville! Why would we trust you know. Leave it alone. Close it!
Stick to your original agreement
Is there currently any monitoring of run off or groundwater? What happens to the runoff of toxic waste and chemical breakdown?
Your selling a false narrative. We agreed to have the facility for a set time frame and for a set system. Keep your co tract woth the community.
Don't believe a word that is printed in your information - So biased
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
Water will eventually get contaminated
You committed to having front end processing. That front end keeps the landfill safe. Do what you promised you would do and stop trying to poison our homes, wildlife, nature, and neighborhoods.
It is all going to be fine according to you. Until it is not. And then who's problem will it be? Pretty sure you will be nowhere to be found
It will not be sufficient
Same as the previous question. Too many rivers and lakes will be impacted.
How come i was never contacted by a representative?
This does not address the future. Only past and present.
monitoring will not stop spills and the risk is increased with direct landfill dumping
Lakes and rivers all flow somewhere!
Present monitoring has proven existing processing works? Dont change the present processing and monitoring will continue to benchmark how effective present processing works.
To much risk no trust monitored properly and proposals safe enough
Next
dont trust it will be safe
Everything to make it sound okay isn't okay .
I think this is about saving money for the city ,what happens if the budget for monitoring is cut
Too late once the damage is done. Climate change is the best example I can think of.
Surface water quality is always of a concern
It's still very dependant on climate conditions and ability to keep up with maintenance.
Opposed to deactivating the FEP/WSF which has protected this specific item
Absolutely do not trust the operators and the politicians in charge. Look at what they have done to deconstruct this "state of the art" landfill!!!!!. Folks down the nine mile river have always feared with time the promises would be forgotten and they would have to worry about wells and polluted rivers
My experience with monitoring is not positive, fails with budget cutbacks
While no on or off-site impacts due to surface water quality have been identified with the proposed deactivation, it does translate to a willingness of the community to chance the risk considering that everyone is using a well for their drinking water.
This water runs into the Nine Mile River and there won't be any problems. Not sold on this!!!!
See previous answer
I believe that the extra stress on the system will cause ongoing problems.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Surface Water Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
We dont know what will end up in our water system by removing these systems.
Maybe they should inspect the pipes and groundwater erosion measures before a storm and not after the storm. It's a little too late then it's already gone into into the river
What happens is the water becomes contaminated in the future? Current testing is based on the current processing in place but could there be issues following the closure of processing facilities?
More garbage and organics will result in more chemicals leaching into the ground water.
This must be carefully monitored to protect people and wildlife
as I said when it ruins the water it will take time to correct and our well water will be effected. We will have to wait to have this fixed.
It all start from the beginning with the process we have in place with the FSP and the WSF taking out as munch of the unwanted material as possible this is the only way to make sure we have clean water
This will not good at all
Ignores the fact that so much is preemptively removed through the FEP/WSF
Noone I looking to see what is being dumped
Don't believe it
I have concerns that less front end screening of garbage could allow more hazardous waste to slip into the landfill and that it could eventually contaminate Nine Mile River and its downstream lakes.
Not sure
Monitoring will not prevent anything. It is a reactive process. Unacceptable.
.
See previous answer. I do hope this continues however fear that once contaminated, not much can be done to clean/restore water ways
Read response in NO 24 as it is inclusive with this point.
I'm not convinced this would help.
Leachate can percolate up to surface water
There are lot of lakes around this area that may be impacted.
trust
FEP/WSF controls are why and the only reason the community agreed to the landfill. Leave it in place
Once safeguards such as FEP and WSF are removed the risk to waterways will be threatened and testing will be after the fact
I don't believe the information being given to us, and stopping the sorting will only make things eorse
nice pictures, how do we know where they were taken some where the test would be passable
Runoff predominantly from cap..." And the rest?
Again the thought of becoming the next toxic water supply in hrm is a very real concern. As with the last question, I am not convinced the impact on the environment will be know for many years and after the damage has been done
Again you will not know results of changing things for years and it might be to late. Leave alone.
Current mitigation is only working with existing processes, including FEP, which is a strong deterrent to placing inappropriate materials in household waste. Human nature will result in significant increase in organic materials in the waste stream.
So if bladders work why would use stop?
leaks /spills happen when things are being monitored no garantee
Extreme rain events like hurricanes and nor'easters could have a huge impact on the areas surrounding the landfill site, the above approach only monitors groundwater and if an issue is found no mitigating environmental restoration is proposed. Hoping an event won't happen isn't a great strategy here.
This mitigation discussion is focused on erosion control measures which are not at all related to the front end sorting of waste. Please provide surface water mitigation measures that speak to any impacts specific to the deactivation of the equipment
This should not be entering the lakes and rivers that are used for recreational purposes such as fishing & swimming! Some of the most expensive home paying the highest of taxes are impacted
improper use of "consistent"
I SIMPLY DO NOT BELIEVE YOUR PROPAGANDA "ANSWERS" TO YOUR OWN QUESTIONS
Same as groundwater concern. Talk is cheap.
As listed above.
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated
How many times a month is this carried out?What happens to the employees doing the work?
See earlier comment
Still worried as I fish the 9 mile river.
Honor your original agreement
Again the more prevalent substances are the more likely they are to get to places they shouldn't be
Please see my previous answer
Same concerns as in my last comment.
Please honour the agreement
I've been there
You have to look ahead in years to come and how the ecosystem will be impacted,
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
You should not be deactivating
Same as previous.
Increased organics will affect surface water quality
Same answer as number 23
As before.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Impact to Surface Water Quality
If No, please indicate why the existing approach does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
As a resident on the Nine Mile River for over [redacted] years I have personally witnessed a definite decline in resident fish populations. This has also been coupled with enormous algae growth in the whole river system .
Looks good on paper, only!!
These measures are not worth the risk of our community and our community's peace of mind.
more organics, more risk
Our water supplies are so close by. And I don't like the idea of "management" ponds.
Where are the third party reports to back these claims of no impacts. How do we know there will be no impacts since this has not yet been implemented?
No effects have been identified ??? Of course not, you did the study and you want "no impacts". Burying more organic material will result in an impact - that's how it works....? Your position is nonsensical.
Same worries as the previous question.
To some extent but not completely .
In large storms which are being more frequent with climate change your systems will fail and then service water will be contaminated. Monitoring service holder is great and important however it does not stop contaminants from getting in there and then what do we do when they are?
I don't think that the water should be pumped directly to the river
I object to the dump
Even with the existing measures taken I have fished the nine mile river the river has changed greatly in its vegetation since the landfill was installed so I would not like to see it get worse.
Still concerned
Ensuring there are NO negative issues with surface water will ONLY happen if ONLY ACCEPTABLE waste is in the Otter Lake Landfill and this requires the FEP and WSF . Unfortunately, HRM has NO alternative system to the FEP and WSF to ensure only acceptable waste enters the Otter Lake Landfill .
More information is needed concerning this statement: "Regular monitoring of site surface water". How often? And how is the general public informed of these tests? What transpires should there be contaminants found in the surface water? You only discuss how the process works when everything is fine.
Are the lakes surrounding the site tested frequently??
I don't agree that you can fully predict the effectiveness of your proposed plan, and it was not agreed to in the first place.
Again the FEP and WSF systems are working, we have had no contamination. This is an attempt by HRM to save money not to protect the residents well water. We already have 3 sorting material facilities in our community. Do not mess with something that is working.
Wells
Again garbage is sitting around longer and is less processed before it is added to the landfill site .Seems it will produce more nasty run off .
It's too late when the water turns bad
See previous comment
If this water gets contamination. Then it's too late
I dont think it will work
It's not the agreement
Regular water testing? Entails what protocol?monthly...weekly?? Bi monthly...yearly???
Gross. Unacceptable
No increased threats predicted. What about if the unpredictable happens and our surface water is negatively impacted. Not worth the risk.
Again, HRM is trying to save money by reducing protections
See previous comment
See previous response. So far, we've been lucky but the increasing acidification of our local waterways is enough to deal with. We don't need any more potential threats.
Monthly inspections are not enough. Not enough information provided. I would like to know potential events and events that have happened. As a community surrounding this facility we agreed to it if you maintain it as it is, not deactivate it.
Somewhat, but if there is an issue what will be done?
The change in process from one of prevention to mitigation after the fact puts all of the burden on the communities surrounding Otter Lake. This is a violation of the promise made to host communities in 1999.
Testing is fine and essential but contamination mitigation does not reverse damage done. Close the landfill in 2024
Same as in question 27
Again with the possibility of harmful waste entering the landfill there will be water impacts
Surface water will always be a concern at otter Lake landfill as long as there is no inspection of residential waste as proposed by the survey.
My trust in the integrity of your testing and transparency is gone. Beth McGee reported run off and nothing was fone
Seems to only fix issues, doesn't seem to address the root cause
again i do not trust the current level of monitoring or protections are being followed
Definitely does not address our concerns. I became physically ill after being told that this has been happening since day one. The environmental damage this has done to Nine Mile River and Shad Bay is visible to the naked eye. Very large balls of green foam can be seen whenever pumping takes place and the rocks and boulders in river are covered in green slime. Especially when water levels are low in the river as they are in summer. What about the mollusks (mussels) in Shad Bay we haven't been allowed to eat.
Our weather patterns are changing, when it rains it comes in great volume. What use to be snow, with a slow meltdown, is now rain (global warming) 30 years ago when the landfill was designed, I've lived in a difficult environment. Now with increased unchecked garbage, landfill outdated, you can only expect surface runoff to reach farther than ever.
Again - while we may attempt to control potential events, unlikely that we'll succeed.
My fear is that chemicals, paints, acids, toxic and animal waste, to name a few will end up contaminatine the ground water during periods of extreme precipitation. Many of these possible contaminates are now being through the sorting process. Once they escape from the landfill, the effect on local ground water, vegetation and animlas will be irreversible.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Keep FEP/WSF - removing it carries too much risk and breaches provincial legislation passed in 2016
The information provided is only excuses and obfuscation for proposing to betray the community agreement for the sake of money. Shame! Shame! Shame!
If the FEP/WSF is removed there will be more unacceptable materials entering the landfill even if it is not to the degree it would have been in the 90's which doesn't meet the spirit of the agreement. Additional this will remove a metric for how much unsuitable material is entering the landfill which means that it can't be concluded you are meeting the Agreement any longer.
Stop breaking promises and stop ignoring the spirit of agreements to do it and standing on the letter of the agreement and arguing semantics.
This justification is supposition and closure of the FEP/WSF is not at all in keeping with the spirit or intent of the agreement..
I have no knowledge of landfills, those on the CMC do. They do not recommend the strategy that HRM is taking. This committee protects the interests of the surrounding communities and HRM are sidelining them. I trust the volunteers of the committee to represent my interests and fail to understand why HRM is not listening to their recommendations.
A promise to the community has allready been broken by keeping it open past 2023/5. Breaching the contract by removing FEP/WSF adds to the fire we can never trust government with a promise. New members on council do not honour the promises of the past. Typical politics
Read the agreement properly instead of trying to lie to and cheat us.
The current in place policy should continue to be adhered to.
stick to the original agreement and stop putting money first !!!!!!!!!!
An agreement was made in regards to pur communities concerns. It should be kept in place to protect the concerns of residents and businesses.
You are telling us that you are complying but not letting us vote on whether we believe your words. Dictatorship works that way.
You made a commitment and the community has told you several times NO...it is now a trust issue!
The Otter Lake Facility was "sold" to residents by then Councillor Reg Rankin, and was accepted on the understanding that we would NEVER have a Sackville Dump situation. This new plan negates the original commitment, at a time when nearby development is expanding rapidly, and the problems that will be caused by the planned changes are UNACCEPTABLE
Why should any community going forward trust that negotiations are happening in good faith after what has happened here? Since that agreement was signed successive city councils have regularly tried to overturn it. Aside from the betrayal of the existing agreement, good luck establishing other agreements in other communities given how this situation has unfolded over the years.
These days its better to do more for the environment, in this case its at least the status quo apposed to your amendment to do less for our community.
I don't think enough people do their job in separating garbage and with the amount of population increase and amount of apartment buildings where there is little separation of waste we cannot get rid of the front end processor and the waste stabilization facility
Now that we have the Rats, we are being abandoned..and they are everywhere! Shame!!!
Why are they do have any agreements about anything if the government is just going to do what they want at the end of the day. You can't trust the government obviously. This is an example of going back on your word on an agreement that's really not how we should be living our lives or how things should be managed
Yes, times have changed but not to the extent they could. Remove 100% of black bags to ensure we are truly putting in upward of 100% inert materials. From a household of 4, the black bag is only used when lazy; strictly remove it and proceed.
Change the rules as you go forget about the people who have to live with it
This agreement was put in place for a reason. It is my understanding that this initiative has been voted on in the past multiple times and rejected. This seems like an attempt to save money by the municipality at the cost of local residence comfort and quality of life. This is irresponsible.
Stick to the original agreement and methods used to date
Any changes to the agreement need to be voiced in a public forum in this community. With the aforementioned CMC and HRM representatives.
This is all legal wrangling to try and not honour the promise made to the communities, as well as not honour the existing contract. Shame on all of you,
Acceptable waste is defined as having gone through the FEP / WSF. And now landfill has double life cycle. Should honour agreement
Unacceptable waste will increase in the landfill if not filtered out by FEP facility. Not everyone follows the green cart and recycling rules so without filtering, non-acceptable waste will increase. You can pack a lot of unacceptable waste into one dark bag nothing to pull it out of stream if in a clear bag if you get rid of FEP.
FEP is a significant part of why this is best in class facility. As population of Halifax increases and more people are moving into apartment, many apartment buildings do not have a green cart program. The FEP helps with this.
I do not see any analysis that quantifies the claim of 'little if any benefit' from continued operation of the FEP/WSF. There are no measures shown, nor any benchmarking against landfills operated by municipalities that do not have pre-treatment of waste. More information/data is required.
Contract paragraph1.01, (i), (ii). 'Acceptable Waste' shall be landfilled. Acceptable Waste is defined as "Inert Materials"; "Stable Materials" (i.e. biostabilized though the FEP/WSF); and "Residual Materials"
You are trying to shortcut safety mechanisms. If there is so little waste, employ the minimum staff as is safe at the FEP/WSF site. What is the cost of that? Numbers of waste mean nothing on their own. The critical information is the cost required to run FEP/WSF compared to the waste. If you were honest with us, you would give us proper cost and risk information to allow for an informed response.
published articles over the years have documented "Goodwood-Beechville site dropped from list as unsuitable", "community monitoring of landfill under assault", "extension of the life of the landfill" and now, "elimination of front-end processing". Any wonder that we are suspicious?
The spirit in which the agreement was intended still matters, no matter what technicalities the municipality wants to quote to invalidate our concerns. The "education" segment of this survey is very sanctimonious in tone. There must be a better way to allay concerns than to just tell concerned citizens, "actually, you're wrong."
I ain't reading that, a survey is not the place to be regurgitating rhetoric at me.
Frankly, past experience has shown that 'town hall' can't be trusted, and further 'cost-cutting' measures will continue as long as the council members themselves are unaffected.
From what I read above this still goes against the agreement. It will need to be modified and accepted by community residents to proceed then.
You have an agreement: a solid waste design that was a critical component of the agreement. Now you want to change it, to reduce it and make it less effective. The model currently in use for that last two decades has worked. Residents of the area accepted the current landfill based on those conditions WITHOUT complaint. Now change. To save someone (the company) money. Read increase profit. WSP?!
turncoats
You said it yourself–most of the waste–that doesn't sound like all waste is residual materials. Unless it's all waste, then it needs to be sorted. Do better
Otter Lake was brought into the community as a state of art waste processing and disposal facility and the community agreed to have it as such. This change essentially turns a world class facility into a dump. Halifax already has enough old school dumps
The agreement was never meant to deal with "most of the waste" but was intended to deal with the residue of the waste that was not inert. That was the agreement and the only reason it was accepted by the committee was with this provision to remove organic material at the site before it went to the landfill.
We were promised that there would be no food waste in the landfill. PERIOD.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I am concerned about over capacity and how many cells will be required year after year and the length of time the facility will be in operation
If do not honour original deal, Halifax council words and promises mean nothing.
Volumes are acceptable only because HRM lacks source separation of organics in multiunit residential, and recently ICI garbage is exported out of HRM to areas where landfill materials are not well separated. Re: GHG emissions prior to collection system activation, I'd activate for a bioreactor to properly collect and burn the methane produced by shredded residual materials before landfilling.
Any agreement, even an unjust agreement, can be adhered to with a hard and absolute interpretation.It is not the correct approach. Just because an agreement in law, in theory, cannot be challenged does not preclude it from being overturned should a Court decide that it is now unacceptable in a contemporary setting.What was a legal and social norm in 99 may not be a legal and social norm in 2022
The government always finds a way out of accountability
I agree with the successful implementation of the green cart program in that almost all food waste is properly diverted beforehand. In my opinion the most important part is the manual process of separating the garbage streams before dumping.
If front end processing is removed more people will just dump organically in the regular gatbage
Stop looking for loopholes.
If the orginal agreement is ignored, what assurances that these additional mitigation measures listed in this document won't be ignored in the future? Credibility is lost already.
The stopping of the processor seems like a step backward. If there are organically in the waste - it is not acceptable waste
you have been denied shutting down front end processor many times, honor you commitment to community or move the dump
This is a community agreement and the spirit of that agreement should be honoured instead of playing games with words. The citizen members of the committee did not have the support of teams of city lawyers, politicians and policy experts like HRM when the agreement was signed.
The agreement says only stabilized biosolids shall be landfilled. These changes go against the agreement.
Fear of people not sorting their garbage items properly, so in proper materials could be at the landfill
Not all materials are correctly sorted at the original source of waste. This many green cart items are realized within the garbage
Your questions continue to be leading so this survey was designed to be biased and that is not a fair approach which concerns me as a citizen.
Even if the FSE is not specifically mentioned in the agreement, these changes seem to violate the spirit of the agreement.
Mistrust is high with government backtracking on community commitments. You cannot tell me that so few people do not divert their green cart waste that we can remove the diversion. Unfortunately.
bs
This was / is a binding agreement signed in good faith by all
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill
My understanding is that the proposal does not honour the committment made to the community
Just honor the contract! This is not a survey!
Government propaganda.
The language in the agreement is there to prevent organic waste streams from entering the landfill, the terms "acceptable waste, inert and stabilized materials" are included. The sorting equipment forms part of the protections in place to prevent organic or un-stabilized material from entering the landfill. Removing the equipment does not honor the spirit of the agreement with the community.
Back tracking with specifics is by no means how you should be supporting a communities wishes in the pursuit of saving a mismanaged budget.
The agreement included a front end processor. This is not a survey. This is again propaganda.
You are only changing things to save money, we should be putting more money in to protect our environment. We cannot rely on members of the community to do their part
Honor the original community engaged agreement. Your proposal is why nobody trusts government.
The Otter Lake facility was state of the art in 1999 and has many other landfills modeled after it in other areas. It was agreed upon by the communities surrounding it because of all of the procautions put in place from the beginning including FEP and WFS.
Not everyone sorts their garbage as it should.You know it, we all know it. We will not accept changes to the current agreement
You are assuming that most people sort their waste properly in accordance with recommendations/rules. I know for a fact that many don't. The FEP/WSF doesn't need to be eliminated, it needs to be improved on re: electricity useage and efficiency etc. Please don't go backwards!
Until the solid waste program is enforced for all residents without exception I do not trust that the community will be responsible enough to reduce incoming organic materials alone.
It's not what was agreed to, you are trying to change the agreement.
The HRM has tried to reneig on this agreement for the last time . Read what the Honorable Walter Fitzgerald wrote the last time this was tried . The Province of NS will stop this once and for all . Stay true to your words in 1999 , inert trash ... just wow !
this agreement does not provide permission to tamper with fep and wsf
As I stated before. A lot has changed between 1999 and now, we need every measure now more than ever. I know for a fact that we are the only house out of 6 on our private lane that utilizes our green cart, relying on residents to comply and sort their garbage is not enough.
People invested large sums of money in homes and communities based on the agreements in place. This will negatively impact those investments in my opinion
If you purchased property with the understanding of no changes at a landfill was to occur and then a proposal was planned otherwise any home owner would agree that it is not acceptable . Why not look for a new location then and stop impacting a small region further . This is unacceptable
When this facility was constructed there was to be no runoff, no birds, no smells and organics would be removed. This did not happen and how do we reset the guidelines to ensure a more vigorous monitor program
HRM is trying to get out of its obligations to save money. This is very scary for people who live close by.
the FEP/WSF is a key component of ensuring only 'Acceptable Waste' is landfilled
The system was downgraded from the initial expectations and at the very least as they have already been told in 2013 and 2018 residents want the two step operation that separates the organic waste from the residential garbage to stay in place.
It does not address the fact the agreement is not being honoured
You're just trying to find loopholes with this excuse. If you ignore studies and pick and choose what you want and ignore the community, how are you listening to people?
If you see what people throw out with their garbage (not green bin or recyclable materials), you can see that much of it is biological. Not everyone separates properly. Even if you do, there is still biological material in regular garbage that does not qualify under the current recycling program. Bottom line, HRM made a deal with residents and is breaking a promise.
1
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
An ironclad commitment of minimal untreated organic waste in the landfill was key to community support. It may well be that the agreement did not specifically mention FEP/WSF but this was the underlying understanding at the time. The agreement did not state either that "HRM reserves the right to modify the way the landfill functions if it feels that it can save a few bucks and get away with it"
it would seem from the report that the primary concern which required maintaining the operation of the FEPWSF was the stream coming from ICI generators. These generators can now dispose of their waste outside of HRM due to a change in regulations, not because they are no longer present in HRM
You need to honor the original agreement or was it a lie from the beginning????
EVERY measure should be made to SAFE GUARD the environment in the surrounding community.... without cutting corners or costs. the MORE STEPS in place, the better. If you have to err, err on the side of caution
Apartment buildings and other dumpster renters don't follow the same rules that stuff needs processing
The local residents begrudgingly agreed to the facility so long as it met a strict set of guidelines and oversight committee. The FEP/WSF was a major part of that agreement. Failure to operate it would invalidate the agreement.
And yet the Otter Lake Community Monitoring Committee disputes all your characterizations in this survey.
The agreement stated "Stable Materials". The FEP/WSF is what was being used to stabilize the materials. If you remove these components, the material is not stable, and does therefore not meet the terms of the agreement.
What you're saying is that, "because we are so good at sorting waste on the home front (we've gotten better, yes), that the need for this agreement and the safeguards it's provides us are no longer needed. Not true. The system is needed because we as residents continue to be flawed with waste streaming - we improved on a catastrophe
Should honour it oeriod
The original presentation was the unit would function without change until its scheduled closing. Residents in the area only accepted it because a time limit was promised. Originally there was a great deal of opposition because of a previous city dump in the area. The current unit has reached its life expectancy. The city procrastinated in finding an alternate location at the residents expense.
keep operating the FEP/WSF
It is very obvious that the will be more food waste entering the landfill after the shutdown then is entering the landfill now. It was part of the original agreement. You can already smell the dump from across the highway now. Any addition smell would be unacceptable. If you think the landfill does smell, move it to a processing facility in Burnside.
Why can an agreement made for a reason
leave the facilities there. don't let Dexter const. control the dialogue here.
The employees of the landfill know what is at large here---please LISTEN to them!
another chip off the block, like every proposed action here, you say we have made good chages in or collection programs so now we can removed the checks and balances that ensure proper sorting, the responsiblity now lies on individuals? i work [redacted] and we sort nothing. everything in the same bag, biohasardous, plastic, medications, liquids all in one bag.
Unacceptable waste gets through
Most of is not enough
It is hard to accept that materials are biostable when the stench is so bad. This does not make sense to me.
They should honour what was in the original agreement that enabled them to put it there in the first place
I am worried about an increase in residual materials
Most of the material is considered inert or residual material but that doesn't mean all material is.
Abandoning this project is not the approach wanted by residents. The community feels the FEP/WSF needs to stay to continue the good quality of life of the community around the plant.
You can't guarantee that there won't be any consequences that might compromise the value of property of nearby residents. Back off! Leave the current system in place.
All the community is asking for is to continue operating this successfully as is.
The nullification of an agreement with the communities in this sensitive areas is of utmost importance to building trust and confidence. Given not honouring the agreement, that sense of trust is lost and the project is destined then to be recognized as a failure from day 1. The consultation process and openness of this project is not deemed best practice
Sounds and seems more like hunting for loopholes to me, again, not enough room to write any kind of intelligent response
This is not how things were explained to the community when the agreement was made. And seriously, could you make this survey any mor complicated and difficult to fill out?
Despite all of the technical speak here, what we were told back then was that NO organics would be going into this landfill. It's completely unacceptable to be considering this idea to allow more of this into the landfill. Just another promise being broken on this subject.
I don't think that population growth has been properly taken into account as to how much waste is currently produced.
Some people don't do a great job of using green carts properly, thinking if I don't use my green cart it won't make a difference. at the landfill, it's only 1 green cart not being used. Just look how long this virus is hanging around & how well people are taking heed of precautions in place to stop spread.
FEP/WSF need to operate for life of landfill. Honor 1999 agreement
FEP/WSF need to operate for life of landfill/honour agreement
1999 agreement in place as long as landfill operates
1999 agreement inplace as long as the landfill operates
The agreement does not specifically mandate that the FEP/WSF be operated at Otter Lake... wow. Cheap shot. In the 22 years since this agreement was signed you should have learned enough to be better than that. By operating the facility as you have I would argue that you set a standard of expectations within that agreement.
You can legalize the agreement any way you like. I was at the meetings and we were given assurances! Any future agreements by HRM mean nothing!
This format for entering comments is ridiculous. The survey would not accept my last comments as "not in correct format" and gave me NO opportunity to change or edit. HRM does not seem to want real feedback here. What a joke. Bottom line Flow Control should NOT have been removed & crested loss of revenue & ship HRM waste to other jurisdictions!!!
Stick to the Community Agreement. Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
My biggest concern is that my own city councillor is more interested in agreeing with council than with protecting our community and the promises made to us. Shame on you, Patty Cuttell.
Regardless of whether the agreement specially mandated FEP/WSF, it's clear that given it was done that it was deemed part of fulfilling the "Acceptable Waste" aspect of the original agreement. Nitpicking at this level comes across as a dishonest attempt to bypass the original spirit of the agreement.
In a perfect world where everyone composts their food waste and properly separates their garbage, the sorting would not be necessary. But we don't live in that perfect world.
Then update the agreement so that you are still in compliance.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
A promise made to the community should only allowed to be amended if improving something for the community or not at all. This is a copp out.
HRM needs to honour the goddamn deal they made with our community in 1999. We pay almost $5000 a year in taxes in hatchet lake and we get next to nothing for it. No city water, no sewer, no bus service or etc. Go find another place to save money, I'm sure with the amount of wasted money that is spent daily in the HRM you shouldn't have to look far to find it.
This is legal weaselry
They didn't honour the fact this landfill was supposed to be closed after 35 yrs now they are extending it and now taking away more safeguards so why would they job or this agreement when they didn't honour the original one !
Sneaky and underhanded
I think you're just trying to find money anywhere you can.
Community was not proactively engaged. So you are not honouring the agreement and trying to push through your agenda.
The city is changing the agreement to suit their needs.
Not was originally part of the contract, shame on HRM for going back on the contract. Once the thrust is broken it is very difficult to regain that trust. Look at Africville an example of past wrongs only to be addressed later to remediate at a much higher cost financially and community trust.
Lies lies lies
I would like a tour of the facilities to see. It feels too convenient that we've done such a great job we don't need this anymore. Also, were dependent upon home owner to proper sort the garbage and food waste they put on the curb.
The agreement in place should be fulfilled. No reason to discontinue with what was proposed/promised. We won't let this go quietly
Otter Lake must stay in operation, anything otherwise is a lie. HRM is growing, technological waste is changing, apartments don't really sort their organics, no none of the concerns are addressed as well as we can do with the FEP/WSP
HRM is only interested in saving money. The community agreed to house the landfill with specific measures in place, i.e. the FEP/WSF, to protect the community from the hazards of having a landfill in our midst. HRM must respect the community and the citizens that live here and honour their commitment promised in the 1999 contractual agreement. Failure to do so should be illegal.
There are medium risks associated with the deactivation that cannot at this time be reduced to low . For this reason it is not the right time, coupled with the fact that labour and equipment is scarce in this current environment.
Municipal needs to keep the present contract and follow it , for the peace of mind of a clean and safe communities we live in.
It is working fine, why change it?
Complete government double speak. Operationalizing the agreement meant putting front end diversion in place. Of course the community will feel the commitment is violated without it. The volumes of material diverted at the front end may have gone down but they arn't eliminated. It's still thousands of tons will enter that a commitment was given to prevent.
This is 10000000000% not fair and not right. The landfill was placed in my community despite the community's resistance. We were told a certain plan and timeframe and now the gorvenment is going back on it. They will go back on all the other promises to fix the issues that are coming up from this plan
Close this site completely! We all see how you bend the rules.
What weasely words
Contact says processing must be on site
Any benefit to protecting the environment is worth the effort, no matter how "little".
If monitoring is removed, I believe compliance will decrease.
The loss of jobs will make a huge impact on the community and surrounding areas
The use of subtle semantic changes alter it larger than implied. It's not staying within the original agreement.
Likely this FEP is old tech and not current. If waste is being deposited, 1 ton or 1000 tons if should be run through a FEP as if always has. If updating the FEP to current isnt in the cards. Upkeep to the inplace should be maintained. The goal shouldn't be to meet the minimum standards set by the province.
The surrounding community wants the FEP/WSF to remain in operation, especially now that the landfill will be in use for longer than the original agreement. Organics do not belond in the landfill and should not be buried in the landfill.
This was the original deal, it is time to move the facility if you want to alter what is working!
Please do not deactivate the FEP/WSF. This is HRM's way of breaking a commitment to the community and now this seems to be just a way to save money without listening to the community.
The FEP/WES operation is a requirement of the otter lake landfill agreement
We will end up with unstable garbage in our landfill.. we need to keep up our hard work to save the planet ... we also cannot afford to lose jobs in these unpredictable times
By not sorting the waste and removing the organic I believe this will cause more rodents and greenhouse gases
Sounds like the committee is attempting to dishonor the spirit of the original agreement by way of a loosely worded term. Unacceptable
I'm concerned that people will NOT recycle properly and we will end up with garbage going into the landfill that shouldn't be there.
The smell of the drop off area can be horrific. The waste is not inert!
I wak around our neighbourhood and look at the garbage bags - we are still not doing what we should be doing. So their maybe a reduction in garbage- but it is no where near good enough. I was behind a garbage truck downtown - they picked up greenbins and garbage bins and dumped them in the same truck - so no my eyes tell me there is still to much compositable material in garbage.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
There are a lot more people moving to the community and also being built in closer proximity to the landfill. Not very appealing to live in the area if it's going to have this heaping pile of extra stinky garbage and critters running around.
People do not sort their garbage properly and more food waste will end up in the landfill
HRM has never lived up too any agreement regarding this site, Council secretly extended the life of the site, nothing more needs to be said, they cannot be trusted!
Composition of waste and quantity has changed, since 1990 Please show convincing evidence on HOW this has changed. Dont just expect the HRM public to swallow these words without EVIDENCE.
Keep to original agreement
hy are you even considering taking it away??? HRM made a promise to keep these measures in place! They were state of the art at the time they were installed and over the past two decades, you can see how much of a difference they have made compared to landfills in Nova Scotia that don't have these measures in place, for example the Guysborough dump.
Not good enough. If what is going on now works. Why are we changing it?
If our process is working so we'll now, why change it. Do what was agreed upon!!!!
You are already changing the agreement! snd it's more about money than safety

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
If these procedures are part of the original agreement they should stay in place. Honour your commitment to the residents and businesses in the vicinity of the landfill to keep odors and leachate under control or out of the picture all together. If this place is so "fresh and clean" why did you not put it on the Commons?
the comments cover food wastes , but there is still concern with other wastes that should not enter the land fill
The agreement is outdated and should be renegotiated with the affected areas.
Do not think we will not fight to keep this from happening
Mess with the FEP/WSF and the Community agreement and "your heads will be on a pike". This Community will not tolerate your mismanaged approach to cost savings.
Not honoring agreements is never a good thing and does not bode well for the future
Pardon me if this comes across as rude, but my main issue with the proposed changes is that they fall under the heading of "bait and switch." My secondary concern is that we do not know what will be the outcome of the changes. If HRM does indeed value any one citizen's opinion, mine is this: honour the original agreement; keep the FEP and the WSF.
No faith in the city's diversion program
You are liers and have continued to lie and change bylaws to pad your coffers and waste OUR money. Prospect has not been given our recreational taxes to help our volunteers maintain our assetts!!!
Many more people moving to HRM. This will be needed to way it is.
Yes, you are breaking the agreement.
HRM has a history of going back on its mandates and agreements - this is one more example of that.
Even if the food waste removal is not as necessary as in 1999. I bet there is more electronics disposal than in 99, so I think thd sorting should continued to be done and be focus on what's the most harmful items that should be prevented from ending in the landfill
Not every detail could be added. Its the heart of the operation. Its obvious to any informed person! This a shameful proposal!
When HRM sets out to locate another facility in another community the precedent of dishonor will have been set, making it impossible for other communities to trust or accommodate.
Any and every additional effort should be made to ensure that garbage is sorted properly and the FEB/WSF helps ensure that.
Composting does not occur without the pre-processing.
There are still numerous houses that do not recycle or compost.
The original agreement was for 20years! Now extended to 2024? No one is listening to the community or following the agreement. Develop a new site, that was part of the agreement too.
The sorting facility makes sense. Removing it puts more things in the dump that shouldn't be there. Slippery slope. And I don't trust government at all.
I see this as a way to save money and that it will not be started again if needed
It fails to take into account what is coming from apartments buildings in Halifax, Dartmouth and Sacville. These sites contribute a huge amount of wet smelly waste and the measures originally discussed to make the landfill dry, we're never implemented effectively. And this area has been plagued by the terrible smell on route to Halifax since.
Broken promises! Move to a new community
Who will sort the unacceptable waste from the acceptable waste?
This proposal is to save money and we all know that if this goes through the chances if it reverting back if it fails will not happen I have no faith in our political parties it all about money if they lived close to the dump, smell and traffic this subject would never have happened
Thisagreement that was agreed upon in 1999 and should still be binding and remain in place. There was a lot of time and effort put into this agreement by all stakeholders and the decisions should remain in place today. How can you trust future agreements if it can be changed so easily? You are going to lose public trust by breaking this agreement. The cost savings do not warrant the risk.
Just because the measures may be up to a different standard now than the 90s, the FEP/WSF enhance the waste protocols at otter lake and make them a better site than other HRM landfills. Why do we need to go back and change an agreement made in the 90s when it is not doing any harm and has satisfied the community that the landfill impacts the most?
Stay the course of what was proposed to the people of affect communities.
See original agreement.
I do not trust the municipality to provide accurate information. I am much more inclined to trust the CMC. They are concerned with this change and I share their concern
Why does the monitoring committee not agree?
Many residents of the nearby area disagree
Landfill & composting site off the Prospect Rd were sold to the residents as one thing, and now you want to change it to another. Prospect compost site now handles all of HRM's compost, Dart site was closed. Residents didn't agree to this. Now you want to change landfill terms & are asking us to trust the consultant's report. impact. How much waste must one community accept.
You made an agreement with the community and I believe you want out because of the cost not concern of the people in this neighborhoods that pay huge property taxes.
There is no guarantee that home owners will continue to divert food waste from the landfill and the cost to restart this system will be enormous to the taxpayers .
Here is where you begin to lose trust of the community. When you start making changes to what was proposed to gain the agreement I am worried that you will also make changes to number of cells and cell heights and life span. 10% seems like a lot of additional waste when the cells are already filling up quickly.
We have grown as a community and no collection system is fully effective to divert.
Although my family works diligently at separating our waste. I can say they I work for a large corporation with a large number of employees in the HRM area. Perhaps half of my co-workers take recycling seriously.
I would need to see statistics on the decrease in food waste numbers, and find this hard to believe as the population of this area has grown exponentially over the past 22 years.
To break an agreement to save a measly 2 million dollars is shameful. If the company will go broke if the changes are not approved then I suggest HRM and /or the Province share the 2 million dorrar costs to maintain the current system.
If the nature of waste had changed that much, then a new facility should be considered to accommodate that. Honor the agreement the community signed up for.
What you have in place is working. DO NOT change.
More people means more garbage. People do not sort!
The original agreement talked about closing the landfill, when is that going to happen. I do not believe anything that is said about honouring the agreement because of the landfill not closing as promised.
Agreement was for 20 years. This ended in 2019!
Stop changing the agreement to make your profits larger
People may throw out materials that still need stabilization
I would like to statistics that show how much inert material vs organics are actually arriving at the landfill before trusting the above statement

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I want them to honour the original agreement
Because your playing games with words. The commu ity expected it to stay and it should. We have had our share of smells and rodents since this arrived, not your trying to work around the promise. We won't stand by quietly and let you roll over us again.
Unacceptable - "acceptable waste" can only be identified is bags are open. Hospital waste and instruments have been found frequently and do not belong in this landfill
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
We as tax payers do not want a landfill in our backyard
It was never the intent within the community no matter how a legal team worded a document
The green cart program doesn't even apply to apartment buildings. Most people make a good effort to recycle and do the green carts but a lot of stuff still goes to the landfill. The front end processing was put in place for a reason, not just for fun. Please honor your agreement and keep this in place.
What is the compliance level of sorting waste? And how long before you try to tell us that even organic waste will be fine too? Honour the agreement that YOU signed
As previously outlined. Please leave the current processing system in place.
This is still a broken promise.
I trust the original understanding
They made a promise they SHOULD KEEP IT. If you go through with this they'll eventually turn it into a full on dump
The definition of honouring any agreement is subjective. Come to visit and and see the rat bait boxes and smell the air on a cold still night or sultry hot summer evening and then someone can provide proof of honouring any agreement.
This system has been recognized worldwide as a great process so why would it be changed at all?
The issue here is purely financial. The system needs to be operated as it was originally designed.
That is a biased and convenient interpretation of the agreement on the part of government. It does not honour the intent of the agreement in good faith.
Do not trust HRM to honor the agreement
Any attempt to process the waste less than is currently happening is a concern
I think this is a lot of bull. You are not honouring the agreement at all!
I feel the original agreement should be honoured.
Commercial waste and apartment waste are still being dumped
Why is it necessary to remove components that is protecting our community? For those who are making these decisions if you lived in this community we do still feel the same way if so perhaps maybe we can move this facility to your community. I mean no disrespect but I am sadly disappointed in those elected officials who are supposed to be supporting our community where are you now?
We said stuff to the kind folks that greeted us when we first discovered this place along time ago. We do not want this dump in our community, move it to Dartmouth.
Community was told it would never be a landfill. Govt no up holding that promise.
Broke. Promoses
it was never going to be landfill
The original agreement should be preserved and again your relying on the public to follow all rules not going to happen as there are some people that don't know where their trash goes or really cares
Fancy words, lots of tap dancing.
Maintain the agreement. Anytime changes are made to a facility such as this there is a risk of additional problems
Please do what's best for everyone involved
Opening up a can of worms and I have zero trust in the people running all this and our government.
This clearly violates the spirit of the agreement. Arguing a technicality is insulting.
Honour the agreement. That was the deal.
My concern is the part the operator is playing in this change. If Mirror is able to force this change because they want to protect their own profits, and are using a consultant report they commissioned then maybe it's time to find a new operator. This is a facility that's paid for by our taxes and residents should be determining what goes on there and whether a corporation can force this change.
Regardless of the letter of the agreement, the spirit of the agreement is what needs to be respected. The facility has lived up to the spirit of the agreement until now. These changes feel like a change to that "spirit" in the name of minor financial savings .
Your agreement should be honoured. Period!!!
This is not a reasonable way to interpret this language. The term "acceptable waste" was defined and it does not reflect a scenario where unstabilized putrescible waste was considered acceptable at this landfill. Stating it is otherwise is disingenuous.
Many condos and apartments continue to have marginal composting. The FEP/WSF needs to continue
PROBE predicted this would happen. Bureaucrats called them NIMBY's. Shameful
If it wants to have any credibility at all, HRM needs to live up to the agreements it makes.
My husband worked fo[redacted]Trust me I want nothing to do with putrescible waste that hasn't been stabilized.
The original plan also included an incinerator. The only thing that was supposedto go into the cells was ash. The site was also supposed to ne deactivated years ago. .
If the current system has been effective, I am reluctant to see it change
Should not be able to break previous agreements. Sets a bad precedent
the facilty has been operating for many years with minimal issues to the community. These changes are a downgrade and that can no other affect than a negative to the community. This a not a positive change whatsoever for the community.
I don't have confidence that residents will continue to sort their waste well enough to ensure that inert and stable materials will continue to make up most of the waste stream to the site. I believe there is still potential for significant quantities of mixed waste to make its way to the site.s to
This goes against the intent of the agreement, even if not stated specifically in the wording.
Agreement not being honoured leading to lack of trust. Effect on my family indirect, we are drive boys vs nearby residents. Disappointed in chane
The community entered into an agreement with HRM in good faith with the expectation that the city would honour its agreement. It has been trying to find a loophole for the past decade despite being repeatedly told by the community that we will not change the agreement.
Still will be receiving organics from non compliant businesses and residents. .
If there was an original agreement, there should have been some public meetings with the different communities to discuss this further. If seems just as usual the HRM makes their decision without any public input.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
We were supposed to close this facility a number of years ago as per the agreement but it remains open. Now you want to remove a safeguard to protect our community?
A politician told me that with this world class process, a golf course and homes could be developed on the land once it was closed. Don't change the process It is money driven
Continued use of "weasel words" looks like something is being hidden. No data on effect of properly implemented FEP/WSF. If this agreement is going to be broken, what others will be broken?
People throw food in the one black bag/bin allowed. I have seen restaurants take the sorted garbage and put it all in the same dumpster.
This whole project is horseshit. This will have a negative impact on my community and my family. HRM is moving forward with this to save $2 million, but you've spent hundreds of millions on fucking bike lanes and bus lanes that absoutely no one uses. Just look at Bayer's Rd. The bus spends about 4 minutes on Bayer's Rd every 60 minutes. The rest of the time it is empty. This is absolute horseshit.
Between the RAT problem and smell, this will become a bigger issue
As the FEP/WSF are working they should remain active. The suggested savings are unknown and there are costs to place the facilities in a stand by state. There is no way to demonstrate the cost would outweigh the benefit. Further, as tax/rate payers we support the 1999 agreement.
I believe that this change would cause more than minor quantities of putrescible waste to go directly into the landfill and that contravenes the agreement.
By removing these systems, the safeguards which we have to remove the hospital/commercial or Industrial waste will be eliminated which seems to be like not honoring the original agreement.
There were promises that there would not be issues affecting the community regarding smell. That has been a problem since the dump was built along with the increase in rats
Instead of relying solely of public to sort waste, greater processing should be in place so the standard of "acceptable waste" becomes even higher. Everything that is proposed currently is a step in the wrong direction.
This should not be approved
A huge amount of taxpayer money was spent at the start and at consultations throughout. Shouldn't the money be put into green energy and supporting current systems rather than removing current measures and trying to come up with new mitigation strategies? This whole process seems to be politically motivated rather than the best practices.
This is a sleazy back door attempt at backing out of an agreement that costs too much in the city's opinion. It is unethical and in this day and age an absolute disgusting backwards step in environmental protection.
If uou are planning on people to sort better to keep our waters safe, people are not reliable and some lazy and some just don't care. We know the people working at the site are doing a terrific job doing this.
No matter how you spin it the FSP /WS the people in the surrounding areas of Otter lake
Stick to original plan
The spirit of the term acceptable waste meant treated waste when the agreement was made.
the agreement was made with this community to allow the landfill the be constructed here in return HRM would maintain a FEP/WSF. its as simple as that. Live up to your word.
This need to be in other part of the municipality not in the route where tourists going
Simplistic. Lots of other benefits from keeping FEP/WSF. Just look at all the other dangerous and toxic waste they uncover in this process
If the agreement says Stable Materials are allowed and you are removing the part of the facility that stabalizes that material then to me that says you are not honoring the agreement.
FEP/WSF were implemented in the first place as best practice eliminating to save money is wrong
If you can spend millions on Cogswell interchange this is pennies comparatively
Amendment to the original Community agreement will lead to other future amendments, thus resulting in the relaxation of the stringent policies put in place to operate the Otter Lake Waste facility.
"Does not need to be biostabilized" how confident are you that statement is accurate?
You are not living up to your commitments to our community and through this survey manipulating our resolve for a sustainable future. Live up to your commitments.
Let the existing system continue to do its work without changing it.
It was the industry leading state-of-the-art approach to waste collection and should remain as such
The original agreement for HRM to place a dump at Otter Lake met the Province's requirements. The City of Halifax continues to try to amend the agreement as a cost saving strategy.
The "Community Agreement" is being ignored. There is a due process with those responsible for overseeing this agreement . The Halifax Waste Resource Society is now trying to get around that original agreement to gt their own way.
Bra use I know so many people that do not use the green for their food waste!
It says what the agreement it but not what your plan to change said agreement would be. This answers nothing of my concerns.
Continue to sort and inspect what is going in the dump, Inspect the material so you know what is there. if the waste is not being sorted residents and the contractors with not be as diligent as they are now.
While the agreement may not specifically mandate operating the FEP/WSF, that seems like it was in the spirit of the agreement. Closing it is not being fair to the area residents.
Seems like a loophole
- the explanation above seems like a "word-smith" way out of the original agreement
There is insufficient transparency and types of wastes and claimed success for food waste diversion via Green cart program.
This completely relies on successful sorting. I am not convinced that we no longer need the FEP/WSF and it's shitty that the municipality is taking them away against the advice of experts and against the wants of the community.
The word MOST
Deal is not being honoured
Organic waste is not inert and should be separated
The agreement was only accepted if the front-end processor was operational
The City should not removed the FEP and WSF.
Community was lied to.
You cannot trust the public to set their waste properly.
FEP/WSF controls are why and the only reason the community agreed to the landfill. Leave it in place
What about diapers, medical waste disposed of in household garbage as well as those people in small apartments who can't or won't separate their garbage?
The FEP and WSF should be upgraded or replaced with something better; but never should they be retired. Regardless of what is pointed out in the original agreement, it would be in bad faith to the spirit of the agreement and to the surrounding communities to effect these changes
HRM doesn't care about our community they only care about reducing cost. We need to deal with our waste and protect our environment. Not try to cut corners and save a buck!
This community is being lied to and the other councillors will go along with it because they don't want it in their backyard. The timberlea area has seen nothing in return for hosting this landfill, except broken promises
Just a bunch of words

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
A contract is a contract you sold us on this and now want to change it so you can pay for your raises in your pay
I don't agree that we as a community living this close to this should have to have these changes now .
Reliability in government is important to me. The measures agreed to represent a commitment between the city and communities outlying the landfill. If government were to be allowed to back on deals, where is the trust?
why is it this survey is written in a way to persuade the participants that a particular decision is favourable? there's no substitute to honouring the original agreement. it's clear $ is a motivating factor here and the environment and nearby residents will pay the price
The CMC has nothing to gain from it staying as it currently is. HRM stands to save 2 million dollars. I am inclined to believe the facts presented by CMC over the 'studies' you said you've done. Little environmental benefit is better than none. We need all of the little helps any where we can.
Most of the waste is inert - so not all of it.
Most food waste' sounds pretty vague. Why mess with a working system to save a few dollars.
Stop manipulating words. The community did not sign on for this when the plant was originally proposed.
Don't see how the arguments relate to honouring an agreement. If you wish to change the terms of an agreement it would seem necessary to get the agreement of all parties. I do not believe this to be the case.
Systemic racism is blatantly evident by ignoring the social contract with the Black and poor communities nearby.
I don't agree with this interpretation. Why stop this now? Who is benefitting?
Again, this system is working and will continue to work will if people and government will let it. Their is no good reason to change things and there has been no problems with it the way it is.
Because I, and most rural citizens, do not trust a governing body that tries to change a long-standing agreement. The desire to not honour the agreement as at it has functioned since this landfill was reluctantly accepted by these communities betrays each and every one of us. It shows our reluctance and mistrust of municipal government is absolutely justified.
Bull fucking shit keep agreement in place province has guaranteed no change to operating process or go find another location
I feel like this is being sneaky and by-passing the original intent with careful wording.
the agreement was established for a reason ..no enough information has been presented to the public for this change to take place ....
Hoping people sort their garbage correctly is not a good strategy.... lots of poorly sorted garbage still makes it to the site. How can a community in Nova Scotia or elsewhere ever trust the government to honour their commitments in the future if the government breaches the trust and the intent of the agreement this time.
The landfill was designed to be operated using the FEP/WSF equipment and the municipality committed to the community that the facility operating the facility as designed. You're now changing the design, by removing equipment meant to prevent unwanted waste streams from entering the facility. This goes against the intent and spirit of previous commitments.
I don't believe the Agreement is being honoured
I am concerned that the bottom line (financially) comes before the safety of the community.
Garbage bags won't be checked
most is half plus 1, not even close to "all"
Not true
The city needs to uphold their end of the agreement. No one wants a dump in their own backyard, so if we must live with it, the city needs to continue to protect the surrounding community. This is a 'bait & switch' scenario and the residents will bear the impacts of this decision.
However, the IWRMS was clear that the material to be disposed had to meet several important conditions before it was deemed acceptable for disposal. The material must not include: recyclable material hazardous waste organic material that has not been stabilized.
You are trying to find loopholes. Also households are still allowed to have one "privacy" bag of garbage so those bags likely contain food waste that is not being diverted to compost.
Love the word "Most". "Most" of the waste is considered "inert". How do you propose to monitor that it continues to be the case if there is no FEP to ferret out the non-inert waste? As I understand it will be a free for all with no checks and balances. Have at 'er boys, dump away!
N
Why is the facility continuing to operate, wasn't it only for 20 years. Take your garbage to a new community!!!!
It to me would be a broken contract.
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated. There are some things you can't put in the green bin anymore.
Review and up update agreement with neighbours
It is arguing semantics. Does this amendment truly reflect the spirit of the original document? This is not bargaining in good faith.
Sounds like you are saying "well there probably won't be much unacceptable waste so it doesn't really matter 6 to one, half a dozen to another"
There was an understanding that environmental safeguards would be in place. When the landfill was opened, it was state-of-the-art. Officials from all over the world wanted to see this facility. Now we are told it doesn't work. Think about that for a while
This addresses some concerns, but the point isn't to only remain compliant to the original agreement, but also to ensure there is action in good faith of the intended nature of the agreement.
The life of this facility should be closed by 2024 as originally agreed. The community does not want it here.
Having been around for the original enforcing of the Landfill on the Timberlea/Prospect Community it was clearly stated that the Landfill will always have access to the FEP and WSF, that at least was stated by many HRM Concillors and Staff, this assurance did minorly calm those living near the Landfill, if this promise is broken it's breaking word and contract and should be fought from all angles
Not fully if the materials are not sorted as they are currently more unacceptable waste will end up in the cells.
I was present at the community consultations. The insinuation was that the MOST amount of organic material possible was going to be kept out of the landfill . A two tier system , source separation and an FEP was to accomplish this . The spirit of the promise is not being honoured
Who determined what is acceptable? People vote for ones they can trust.
I believe to honor the spirit of the agreement requires oerforming due diligence to ensure that waste is as safe as possible. I do not believe this can be achieved with the deactivation of the FEP and WSF.
The community believes the agreement does mean theFEP/WSF is in operation. Please honour that social contract. Do not deactivate
Dexter and the municipal group dump the most
HONOR THE AGREEMENT THAT WAS SIGNED WITH RESIDENTS OF THE AREA. HONOUR THE AGREEMENT PERIOD!
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Why have an agreement if it is going to continuously be modified?
Don't trust them not being held accountable
You are going back on an agreement be proposing this deactivation. Honor the commitment that was made. This is yet another example of poor management at HRM. Taxpayers money would be better spent by removing inept bureaucrats and hiring competent people.
How do you know it it is acceptable without sorting it as was agreed by the Municipality and the residents impacted by the existence of Otter Lake.
I think that green carts do not capture all of the food waste - especially from restaurants, and without FEP/WSF, food waste will get in the land fill
Relying on the public to do their part is always a dangerous assumption
This was sold to the community under the idea of a FEP/WSF. Now the city is trying to lawyer the people who said yes in good faith.
The conclusion reached is actually an assumption based upon the statement the residual material being minor. I have not seen any supporting data that supports the conclusion from a statistical analysis perspective
HRM needs to start a siting process for a new landfill
Stop trying to make it seem like this is ok. It's not ok. There is an agreement in place that should be maintained. Clearly HRM councils word counts for nothing and the way they are trying to sneak this through makes me all the angrier.
honour your agreement!
That is a joke!! Not realistic.
The original agreement was to end the usage of facility by 2024, now safety measures are being removed and the use has been extended breaking the original agreement with the community with little to zero compensation being delivered from even the original agreement to do so.
Most of the waste is not good enough and this is not guaranteed. Our environment and safety is worth 2 million dollars.
This mitigation process was outlined in agreement and was what was understood by the community. The fact remains that food waste still enters the system through black bag composition. Enough over time will increase the need to continue operations of the system.
comment is not being honored as discrimination
I don't believe HRM's statement that most putrescible waste has been diverted. There are strong odours from the site.
There is no mention above of hospital, industrial and commercial waste above. If so it wasn't clear. If it's not mentioned, this is a red flag. This survey is pretty bias and misleading, or at the very least, confusing and provides minimal information for decision making. I will be sharing this with my networks to push for more transparency.
I would be much more comfortable if the Monitoring Committee was on board with these changes. Their role is to « monitor » and I trust that they are knowledgeable in these matters. If they don't agree, I don't either.
If what you say above it true, then propose changes instead of 100% screwing of the community. If the monitoring committee is against what you are proposing, then it's a bad idea. Work with them to come up with a joint proposal supported by both. Everyone would then buy into it as it would clearly be balanced (as opposed to dictated)
Sorting is a safeguard to making sure all wastes are at the right place. This change is solely for the sake of saving money and we are the ones who will have to pay the price when it fails. And it does, good luck for the next time your try to make an agreement with another community.
Is it then that my understanding is that food waste ie green cart will not be placed directly into the landfill.
because untreated organics will be put in landfill
This whole survey is extremely frustrating. The proposed changes are not in keeping with the original agreement. Period. I again ask-would those proposing the changes live in the area? How many do?
A lot of people have purchased in this area for prices that are extremely inflated right now. This is all been done within the last 2 years and I guarantee a lot of them do not know about the expansion of this landfill. There's an agreement with the community the agreement should be honored otherwise why do we bother doing them
The agreement was that we would have the world class system. You can't change the rules now because it is inconvenient for you. Shameful.
I believe shutting these down will result in too much unnecessary materials going into the faculty
More information required. How much "Stable Materials" is still arriving in comparison to financial and environmental costs? Based on current tonnages and risk of increased waste how compliant would HRM be without FEP/WSF?
Council wanting to change this agreement
Although the composting/green been program is successful,There are still mandy "old school" residents in HRM who do not compost. Therefore the FEP should stay in place. I understand removing the FEP& WSF will save money, however no price can be put on the environmen, its health and the health of everything that lives in it!
in favour of keeping the system we have in accordance with the CMC. If you don't want to abide by the agreement, move the dump elsewhere because we don't want all of HRMs garbage polluting and stinking up our community.
"Most" of the waste? Not all of the waste. Previous interventions made by the city to reduce organic material with green bins and clear bags have led to significant improvements. Why is ok to stop now? Continue to process until organic material is reduced even further.
Listen to the monitoring Committee. They have been around longer than I have as well as most of you on council.
I don't agree if that was the proposal from the beginning, no one would have agreed to not having FEP/WSF in place in the original proposal. It was was put In place as a tool and to ensure there would be less pollutiion and harm done to the community and ecosystems. Now money and politics is more important than sacrificing a agreement and environment.
Given the community monitoring committee went to the trouble to send a flyer to share their concerns, and given they understand the issue more than us, we do not support this change nor trust any decisions are being made for the community and not the bottom line
This breaks the agreement
Our citizens in the adjacent areas were promised that there would be no preventable issues from this landfill, I do not want another site like the decommissioned Sackville Landfill site
HRM HAS NO ALTERNATIVE TO ENSURE ONLY ACCEPTABLE WASE ENTERS THE LANDFILL. PLEASE HONOUR THE AGREEMENT. HRM HAS A LEGAL AND MORAL OBLIGATION TO OUR COMMUNITY!
The agreement is with the community, if the community has not agreed to alter that agreement, it's a breach of the agreement
Clearly the fep and the wsf have had positive effects on the success of this project. It is wonderful that residents have stepped up and we hope they continue to do their part. If demand is less as a result then I would expect the costs of the fep would be gradually reducing, there should be no reason to eliminate these worthwhile services
HRM has been growing at a very fast rate. All those people create massive amounts of waste. It makes no sense to disband something that costs $$$$ when our waste production will be growing very quickly.
Stick to the promise or move it to someone else's backyard.
Spirit of agreement

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Honouring the Original Community Agreement
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
The report that was commissioned was inconclusive so how can you claim that removing the FEP/WSF will have no impact? Saving 2 million dollars can be more important than caring for the community and /or the environment.I am very cynical about the motivation behind this proposed change .Owls Head has not been protected.How is this any different ?
This is not accurate.
I do not see any benefits to changing the agreement other than cost. Removing the separation takes away the ability to monitor what is going into the landfill. This smacks of corruption
Cut backs are never a good thing
I do not trust your response
Agreement not met
The community took on this landfill bases on signed commitments, if you go back on your word, your word is not worth anything.
It wasn't acceptable then, it is not acceptable now
I feel like this isn't statistically true. There's no way you're going to be able to reduce your load by cutting corners and reducing things. What you have now isn't working ..
I would like to know how much waste is currently being put through the Fep
This interpretation is splitting hairs and is not in the spirit of what was intended by the agreement.
Saying that the original agreement "does not specifically mention" is a sneaky way of getting around breaking the agreement.
What about it's the right thing g to do not the most cost effective.
1999? It's almost 2022...and significant changes in environmental issues are present...the agreement and the council and appointment to the CMC is old
These changes represent the govt going backnon a deal with the community. Its time to move the aite somewhere else. This is completely unacceptable!
Honour the agreement. Especially, listen to the monitoring committee.
Bullshit! Honour the agreement. Improve the systems. DO NOT REMOVE!!!
HRM is trying to back out of an agreement with the community and is refusing to recognize legitimate concerns
Promises have been broken. We have taken our turn now it is time for another community to take it on. Waiting for the promised parkland
I have now tried twice to answer this question and been told my response is 'invalid'. If you didn't want my answer why did you waste my time by asking me?
All semantics
This facility has exceeded its original agreed lifespan and due to the ongoing issues and attempts by HRM to undermine the communities wishes, it should be shut down and a new facility constructed elsewhere.
Your information does not address how the Society feels about this change. You're only presenting one side of the issue - I remain concerned.
The key phrase is " based on current tonnages " . At present the tonnages are reduced as HRM is sending institutional and apartment buildings waste to facilities outside of HRM . What happens if those facilities refuse to accept HRM waste.
The original agreement was put in place for a reason. It seems that nothing has changed. Leave it as it was agreed.
Food waist will still end up there and hrm needs to stick to the original agreement and do everything in its power when the environment is concerned.
Hold a public information session. A survey with "canned" responses is not enough!
landfill is already long past its agreed lifespan date - as many protections as possible must remain
I do not believe that FEP/WSF was not included in the agreement. Regardless, the agreement was minimal impact to the community.
This is a violation of the 1999 Agrement and a betrayal of HRM's commitment to host communities. The agreement clearly stipulates that only 'acceptable waste' as defined May be landfilled for the life of the landfill. Some process to achieve the definition of acceptable waste must be in place.
This is a misrepresentation of of the terms of the agreement. 4000 tons of unacceptable waste was processed in 2019 through FEP/WSF.
The commitment was 25 years. Decommission in 2024. Find another community to house this. Keep breaking agreements and this will be even more challenging. We've agreed to 25 years. Decommission in 2024
Agreement was for landfill to operate for a 25-year period only.
There needs to be a greater debate
The community relies on these agreements. What is the point in signing one, for an agreed amount of time, what is the point in creating future agreements if the government is going to change in before the expiry.
The agreement meant this was only ever agreed to bc you quacks said it would be 25yrs. Now you disrespect us and are trying to force this on us for longer.
This site was supposed to be a 25 year agreement and that is long surpassed also the measures in place have been working as best they can, PEOPLE will not sort properly they already don't, some people don't sort at all
Without inspection of all residential waste at the tipping floor, who knows what will be in the black bags. Sorting of residential waste is imperative to stabilize a cell under current directions from HRM's Staff. We don't need to fix something that's not broken
We went through this already. You spent tens of thousands to do a community engagement process and you heard clearly the community did not want the agreement dishonoured. This is typical beaurocracy and the community is tired of being under serviced by the municipality.
You already broke the promise to close in 2023. Stop breaking promises and honour the agreement.
This commitment is not being honoured
Pumping so called clean water from the stormwater management ponds has been a well kept secret. This is a discrace. The entire CMC should be turfed on their ears.
Organic bioactive material in this landfill is a regresive primative and unacceptable method of waste processing.
Basing your views on current tonnage is not responsible. There will be increased tonnage as you stated. The soeed of growth in HRM should only determine that the FEP/WSF need to be improved to handle more. I know for a fact that separation by the resident is not always done. This means at the FEP/WSF, the food waste, chemicals, metals, etc. still need to be separated. By shutting down the FEP/WSF we will be facing a toxic site in 20 years to come such as the Sackville landfill witch has to payout surrounding residents for contamination. More separation! Not lies!
Cherry picking to weasel out of an agreement.
Although the Green Bin Program is effective, a great deal of food waste still ends up in the trash. Have you conducted a survey of exactly how much of the waste arriving at the site is indeed waste that should have been "Green Bin'd" but wasn't, and if so would you be willing make that information public?
What happens if things change and more waste is making its way to the landfill which shouldn't be there is the situation going to keep being monitored?

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Inability to Reactivate the FEP/WSF
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
HRM is conceding the risk by keeping this as an option through reactivation, so might as well as maintain the current approach.
HRM is not trustworthy if it has deactivated the systems to just maintain all the equipment.
All of the items mentioned above are obvious things that will be done. I have no doubt that it can be reactivated, but I also have no doubt that it will cost more to do so. There is the cost of rehiring and inspections for operation is different then the cost for standby for example. Also, the proposal is to maintain machinery that won't be used. I can't imagine that continuing very long.
It all comes down to the whims of HRM council. If the equipment is maintained I have no confidence it will remain in that state for very long. No costs or timeline have been given.
See previous comments
As with most things, if they are taken away they never get back. All of that equipment could be out dated when it's required to bring it back on line. Thus creating another expence.
You are in a dream land to thing restarting 25 year old technology after 5-10 years after is is mothballed is fiscally possible. You have no intent of ever reactivating it. Dont even pretend
If it's neccessary then you were wrong all along so the point is moot.
equipment deteriates with lack of use
If you proceed and break the committment why should I have any trust that you will ever reactivate or that the information you even provide is the truthg.
Once mothballed, I do not believed the FEP/WSF will ever be reactivated as it will be claimed to be too expensive by operators
Once a government program is cut it is historically nearly impossible to get it back. I'm also very concerned about the parameters that would be established for re-activation given that standards to stop it are being tinkered with to suit the proposed cost cutting.
These days its better to do more for the environment, in this case its at least the status quo apposed to your amendment to do less for our community.
USE THE DAMN EQUIPMENT AS INTENDED up grade it as needed it should NEVER be dormant
Your keeping it as a backup or fail safe to go back to because in the end it is still required.
NO comments
You will do what you want not what the people want
I do not having any faith that they would be reinstated. We will just be fed more excuses
Now you are saying that the FEP/WSF could be reactivated after addressing every concern implying that it won't be necessary!
I don't trust what you are telling the community.
Typically reactivion is problematic. And what about the cost. More predictable and reliable to leave FEP / WSF in operation.
If suddenly needed, it is not like reactivating it would be a quick process.
Keeping rotating machinery in an operable state while not being used daily, requires occasional operation of the motors/gears. The plan mentioned only suggests that this may happen, not that it will.
Plans are nice. I have seen many, many instances where excellent plans aren't followed. I do not trust you to follow through. The lack of critical information and the extremely poorly written survey do not encourage trust in your ability to follow through on these plans.
I think once it's deactivated there will be decision making inertia/stalling that prevents it from being promptly reactivated. I am less concerned about the actual mechanics of reactivation being difficult.
Still ain't reading that.
I know how the documentation was maintained, so I'm not confident of this much more complicated maintenance.
You can't shut down mechanical/electrical shipment for years and expect to flip a switch and have it back to normal. Ask the navy about its submarines
shouldn't be shut down PERIOD!
Once the horse is out of the barn, there will be no going back. Once a system is mothballed, the staff removed and the equipment left in disuse, it will not be easily or practically brought back to function. As well, who is going to say when there is a need to restart this operation?
I'm sure that we would be treated to all kinds of excuses as to why it wouldn't be worth the dollar cost to reactivate it. What about the environmental costs of deactivating it. Lot's of promises, but most involve mitigation of problems, not elimination of them. And, since the initial promise appears to be inconvenient, thus subject to change, promises mean nothing.
Honour original deal.
You address only technical issues that could prevent reactivation. Budgetary and political issues are much bigger factors that will prevent reactivation.
You argue the FEP is unnecessary. Why even mothball the unit then? I suspect you know instinctively the answer to this. It will have to be reactivated. By then the damage to the environment and your reputations may be irreversibly harmed.
This operation is needed so don't shut it down in the first place!
I'm not worried about the ability to restart the machinery but I do think it will be nearly impossible to get the government to make the correct, proactive decisions should things not go according to the plan. We need to get this right, right now.
Once the process is changed it will be twice the fight to get it back
Lets be serious, no matter what happened this would not happen. First of all it would take numerous wasted council meetings to even get to a vote that would be useless.
If the system can be re-activated if needed, i do not have concerns, provided monitoring is adequate.
Sounds good but wonder what trigger will cause the restart. That needs to be crystal clear
once allowed to stop you will never start again...all about making more money for mirror
Equipment exposed to conditions like in the FEP/WSF is difficult to maintain when not operational for long periods. As well, maintenance workers would be focussed on ensuring needed equipment is operating as opposed to wasting effort on something that is shut down. Finally, what guarantee exists that this maintenance will continue or what situation would lead to re-opening if deemed required.
No, because it does not address the political barriers for reinstatement
What is said and what is done is not always as expected. If shut down, I do not expect cooperation to reinstate if needed. Please do not shut this process down in the first place.
The reality is that when mechanical facilities are mothballed, systems deteriorate and reactivation becomes more expensive than anticipated. This deactivation plan will be a first step to permanent shutdown
It won't happen. This is about money, and it should be about doing the right thing. Government wastes an incredible amount of taxpayer money funding unnecessary projects such as the Peggys Cove upgrades. This is actually important to the residents. Nobody asked the residents about the Peggys Cove project, and If you survey the wider community about that, you'll see that. It was a waste of money
How many times to you need to hear? HONOR THE CONTRACT!
Keep running as is let's face it you all just want to spend the money elsewhere so you shut it down it will never get turned back on.
It doesn't seem to make a lot of sense to spend the money to fully maintain the system but not use it. Is there a timeline associated with the maintenance programs noted above?
That's a loaded question. It should not be shit down.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Inability to Reactivate the FEP/WSF
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
IF you have to maintain the equipment anyhow, we should keep it in operation. I fully oppose this deactivation
The likley hood of reinstatement of processes once cancelled is virtually NIL in my opinion
Once equipment is deactivated it will deteriate from lack of use, parts will likely be cannabalized for other machines on site and could eventually be removed without public input.
Once budget cuts are made it is near impossible to get the funding back. We ask that NO changes be made to the site.
Once you stop using something that has been fought for by so many, it's much more difficult to start from scratch to argue that it needs to be used again.
Any equipment is subject to corrosion and decay the longer it remains unused. The cost of reactivation will be more then expected
It seems that someone is just blowing smoke up my ass. It may feel good but it's not
damage occurs may be irreparable . prevention the key.system works should not tamper with it. we have more and more condos and appartments in hrm . the population of both canadian and international immigrants will increase in next 5-10 years . not familiar how to recycle . preserve all safe guards one incident too risky for small financial return. we risk growing city's water supply .
Once the plant is stopped, getting it re-started, and upgraded will be a time consuming and costly prospect. Equipment that sits idle never re-starts without issues.
If you stop it it won't be restarted
it is a loophole for when the problem of too much organic arises we can simply put on the old hat and say oops but, we are back sorting now. damage is done
How long will the FEP/WSF will be maintained
Once the system is deactivated, the public will have to fight to have the company turn it back on. It will become an issue and for the environment it should remain active.
Once gone it will be a huge task to get it back
This is just another promise, such as the original agreement, that will be broken!
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill, this area is bursting with new population of people and we require this service to keep it green
The first certainty here is that the facilities will face reactivation problems (equipment seizures, corrosion, etc) if they are mothballed for any length of time.. The second certianty is that these problems will then be used to explain that "we can't reactivate the FEP/WSF fcailities. It would be too expensive"
mechanically, it can be put into an inactive condition from which it can be reactivated somewhat painlessly. Issue is with bringing staff back and budgets. I would anticipate the preference over reactivation if required would be to conduct another risk assessment and come up with mitigations
This violates the contract agreement.... and removes a step in the process. Modify if necessary but don't remove
Deactivation of any such plant always has drawbacks. When reactivation is attempted, there are always problems that in turn have extremely expensive costs to resurrect and they then go to a vote and get shot down because of cost overruns. Keeping the facility running and maintained is the cheapest solution.
Isn't it hugely more expensive to undo a groundbreaking, industry-leading approach to waste management, and then redo it later once the harm has been done, rather than just be proud of how Nova Scotia has been at the forefront of this environmental issue? This is penny-wise, pound-foolish.
Who is to say that there will not be an excuse or delay if the government says it is to be turned back on? There will be excuses and it may not happen.
Shut it down as originally promised. Area concessions were not made based on an extended operation or possible reactivation. Find another location.
leave it running and operating.
WHY were these facilities put there in the first place: since these were started no odours---which we used to have to put up with---if this this legislation is passed by the Province, please sale or buy my house NOW!
inital program to decommision seems ok but it will rot and not be maintained, like all pneumatic and hydrolic equipment it needs operation to maintain good function.
But if you're going to do all this, why not just keep it running, maybe less frequently
If you are worried about making sure it could still be used in the future then why would you stop using it in the first place. If you are 100% confident this is the best idea then why have the ability to go back to it?
Once shut down it will take a lot of pressure from local and provincial government to get it going again. This will incur a cost and generate push back from the company. No way. Leave it be.
Maintenance and repair of abandoned equipment will quickly be a secondary budget priority to many other pressing issues. The concern is lack of trust that all the measures will be put in place long term
What if the GRAND plan fails... Then we backpedal?
It wouldn't need to be reactivated if it's just kept in place and used as promised to the community.
I don't believe it will be maintained properly and I also believe that, after a year or two, you'll just say "we're not using it anymore" and get rid of the equipment because it costs money to maintain.
Cost of maintaining equipment not giving/ aging equipment. Honor 1999 agreement
Cost of maintaining equipment not given/aging equipment/honour 1999 agreement
Cost of maintaining
Cost of maintaining and star up of fep/wsf no qualified.. aging equipment
The bottom line here is money. Getting budget to reactivate this after it's gone... I highly doubt that will happen. You'll spend lots of money to try to 'fix' something that wasn't broken, but I do not believe you'll turn back the clock. Shame on you since you should be trying to do BETTER and not go backwards.
Why shut it off in the 1st place if you "may" need it again? Please indicate how much money you save by deactivation, and then we may get to the truth.
Once this system is turned down, I will be surprised the PRIVATE operator will take the opportunity to sell this equipment to a different region. Once gone, you won't be able to reactivate this process.
If it ain't broke, don't fix it. Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate. I have a hard time believing that the FEP/WSF equipment would be properly maintained if deactivated.
Once no longer in use, it will be a big target for cost reduction to just do away entirely with the fall back option. I don't for a second believe it will survive more than a few years.
Should not even consider how it is to be reactivated, because it should never be shut down.
Once something is decommissioned it will be difficult to convince all of its necessity again.
Halifax will never greenlight the money to put it back in place.
How much damage will be done and how long and how many studies would it take to re-instate the controls if eliminated?
Having experience in [redacted] plus yrs) it is costly and time consuming to re activate any piece of machinery as well as retrain personnel to operate the FEL.
Why are you explaining what is happening now when the plan is to change what you're going to be doing in the future.
Would like to see the small print please
I believe once the decision to remove it will be the final answer with no real intent to reactivate.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Inability to Reactivate the FEP/WSF
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Mothballed & forgotten is how the council would leave it, any activation would be after the fact of further damage and promise breaking
The FEP/WSF should not need to be reactivated at all, because it should NEVER be turned off.
Has this been does elsewhere with no issues if reactivating is required?
It would cost more for the "shut" down process and maintenance than keeping it running.
If you are going to do all this, why not just leave it running.
Keep it in place if it is working! How we handle garbage is such an important part of how this city works. Who cares how much it costs, it's not a cost to be cut!!
Once it's gone, I have zero confidence it will ever come back. Whatever agenda is driving the decommissioning (HRM staff who obviously don't live in the area) have filled this survey and all the materials with platitudes. No confidence has been inspired that this is a good move, nor that the mitigations will be as effective as what we have. Zero trust or confidence inspired.
When things are shut down they often don't restart
Once removed, believe eventual cost to re-establish will be too great as costs will inevitably increase over time
Come on, why would it be able to be reactivated if it doesn't help....according to the powers that be?????
Because this never happens. Remove these protections and they will not be replaced. Other 'mitigation's' will be proposed to resolve our 'perceived' concerns.
If it is working why remove it.
Equipment never comes back online with out issues after prolonged downtime
If you are so sure that the operation is not necessary, why maintain it at taxpayers expense?
I do not have confidence that these maintenance measures will be performed completely and continually, nor that they would be sufficient to ensure easy reactivation.
If the FEP/WSF is going to be maintained regardless, then keep it in operation.
Afraid the the saving are so great the will be no incentive to start the process back up!
Please do not deactivate the FEP/WSF. Once a process is removed and the budget is removed, it would be very difficult to restart and likely would cause a tax increase when there will likely be not a tax reduction. Please honour the commitment to the community.
The FEP/WES operation is a requirement of the otter lake landfill agreement
Once the government steps in and removes part of the process it will be impossible to get the money back to reinstate it
Once something is closed it would be very expensive to restart
What will happen to the people currently employed there
If the numbers were more transparent, I'd say it would cost more to reactivate the machine then keeping them going.
BS you will not restart. I don't believe you at all. Not even a little bit.
That will never happen
Once it is gone the government I'll not bring it back.
Any equipment unused a sustained period cannot just be turned back on. HRM is current actions - if the equipment was requested to be returned to service - there would be excuses that the equipment is too old, it will cost to much etc. It will never be returned to service , time for HRM to be honest. HRM might as well sell it for scrap - it will never be turned on.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
Unclear how this applies to the issue
Once these systems are removed they will never be reinstated. HRM Council are simply puppets to the Operator of the site!
Inadequate
hy are you even considering taking it away???
Let's not kid ourselves. Once this is removed. It's not coming back
Just leave it!!
who will be accountable to the citizens of HRM that the procedures listed above will be completed to ensure quick restart if need be
That comes with a price that HRM will not pay in the future - fucked again
Why not use it instead of paying to keep it in working order and increasing other programs because of shut down to mitigate other issues
If ceasing operation of the FEP and WSF can be left to the whims (opinions? wants?) of just over a dozen councillors, so too can their resumption. Please do not point to the fact that an agreement will be in place...
Not enough action and to much talk
Does not address for how long.
Why deactivate if you're going to keep up the maintaince?
I have never known a government entity to make a decision to save money, only to 'reactivate' and reverse a decision later, of which will inevitably cost MORE money then if it had of just been kept in the first place.
There is no mention of how much money will be allocated on a yearly basis to be saved for re-installing the sorting facility
This faculty must remain operational not standing by in case the city makes an error in judgement by moving ahead with proposed. Bad idea. Keep it operating.
As demonstrated by this survey, future councils can change plans. First the cell heights were increased, then the pre-processing decommissioned. Why stop if the site will be decommissioned in 2024, less than three years?
How much money has been allocated to do everything required to keep the equipment maintained if shut down.
No more sorting? Not good
To community had to fight for this so it is not a easy process to start it back up. Measures that were implemented should be continued.
Keep protection in place
Once done it will never change back money will secure this deal
I don't believe you do this anyway!
The FEP:WSF seem to have been a giant fight to implement by our community and as such, the removal of this does concern me. I can appreciate the steps you're trying to take, but given the difficulty in having these established, I do fear that once they are removed they will not be reinstated easily even if merited.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Inability to Reactivate the FEP/WSF
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I concerned about the cost to start-up a facility if it is mothballed.
Don't believe the above will be followed.
I do not trust HRM to properly "mothball" and maintain this facility. Also, in my experience, once closed the facility will deteriorate and will never be reopened no matter how great the need.
What guarantees do we have that if things do not work out,the original system will be reactivated.
Again, this system is working for the surrounding communities. We all know that there will be one hell of a fight to reintroduce processes once they are reduced/deactivated!
Once the city has saved the money, there will never be an incentive to decommission the equipment.
I do not trust that ongoing pressure to cost cut, will do this monitouring.
Any "mothballed" equipment "must" be maintained to working condition to be readily reactivated. In my previous experience the "expense" of such maintenance is often affected by "cost cutting" over time.
May never work again...Northern Pulp!
Costly depreciation.
Leave it alone!
Should not be stopped to start with
Once a system is deactivated it rarely would be reactivated especially with costs being a huge factor.
If it's working why change it
You have no idea the extra cost it might take to reactivate this facility at some point in the future - it could cost more to reactivate that to keep open.
in and lives and the environment will pay the price
Equipment can't sit forever and be able to turn back online.
Once this is removed, HRM will never agree to spend the money to put it back in place. They will have spent it on the Cogswell Interchange project by then. We all know that once this program is gone, we will be told we just have to live with it. Rather than pay someone to create these surveys, why not spend some money keeping the area clean and presentable since it already fails in those areas.
Changing back will likely not happen.
So you are getting rid of it to save money and energy, but you are still going to spend money to maintain it just in case you end up being wrong?
There will be no 'going back'
You and i both know thats BS
Once money is reduced it is always difficult to catch up.
Having come from a mechanical background any time equipment is 'mothballed' for a lengthy period it deteriorates and becomes very expensive to restart.
Idle mechanical and electrical equipment will ultimately fail in an unheated environment.
once paused/shut off, it wont be turned back on. Govt will find another reason to keep it off and go back on their work, again
It is unlikely that there will be political will to re-start this program once it is stopped.
No if the the preventitive measures are taken then how long will it take to re fill the fuels that were removed and all other stuff brought back up to operational requirements.
It has been my experience that once something is eliminated from a budget and removed it doesn't get back in. Do the right thing please
would you be concerned about ability to reactivate something you didnt want removed?
dont close it
Trust is broken with in the community
If it was put in place to start with then leave it alone , once something is put into mothballs we all know it will never be brought back stop trying to BS us
Just like the temporary income tax...there never will be an opportunity to do this. I am not a lawyer or an engineer. I am a constituent who has had their faith in elected officials to do right by me and my neighbours.
Once a process or facility is mothballed it seems to never have the financial resources to start back up in a timely fashion without costs the taxpayers
Please do what's best for everyone involved
This equipment will be neglected and left inoperable. If deactivated it is clear it will never be reactivated (there's always an excuse)
It looks to be a major expense to get it going once it stops; it would end up among any number of competing priorities should it need to be reactivated. Just leave it be.
If it's shut down, what's going to be your line to start it back up again?
How much does this cost?
You have given no timeline for how long these facilities will be maintained.
We need to everything we can for our environment and climate change. Money saved will be allocated and very difficult to reinstate
Sure.. Let's brake it down so we can put it together again>... can this get more bizarre????
I don't trust that the maintenance will be carried out in the long term.
I want to see the front end processing resume as soon as possible, so why take it away? Just money? The question format here is generated by interested parties.
The reality is that once it's deactivated it may be possible to start up again but in the real world it's unlikely.
The fact they are investing in the capacity to reactivate the FEP/WSF systems tells me there is uncertainty around the impacts of the proposed closure.
I don't have confidence that this would return once it is eliminated.
Lack of trust based on experience
HRM is already reneging on the original agreement. There's no way in hell I'm going to trust a secondary commitment.
I feel that there will be no "going back" to the original system. Once again, the HRM has made up their minds and there won't be any going back!!!
I do not trust the equipment will be maintained. Money will be diverted to other things as soon as we turn our focus to something else
Keep your promises of a world class process. Don't moth ball it just encase.
Why would you maintain the facility if it is considered to be of no use. This adds long term costs to the proposal, or there is uncertainty in the success of the proposal.
No mention of training program to keep employee certification up to date - would it be possible to reopen without certifications?

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Inability to Reactivate the FEP/WSF
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
If the facility isn't in use, the maintenance programs will slowly be put on the back burner. The facilities should be kept working as is.
Will staffing remain in place? Who will be responsible for overseeing operations and monitoring after deactivation?
Why do we remove a system which has been effective so far and then try to reactivate if something goes bad.
Equipment that is out of use inevitably becomes harder to restart. And if there is a thought that we may need this again in the future, why are we shutting it down in the first place? Instead, we should look to expand processing and eliminate even more from going into the landfill unnecessarily.
No
The decision to reactivate will be made at the political level - influenced by political agendas. The impacted communities will go through more consultations, perhaps if we're lucky, and a greater waste of money.
You are already attempting a shitty reversal of an environmental protection for this space. I have zero belief you would all do the right thing should it need to be restarted. Zero!
who's overseeing this. Where is the money saving coming from. How much ma power is going to be laid off.
Any time a company shuts something down to save money their is is no way it will ever come back . Money not the health and welfare of the people of this community money that's what's it about sad day for our community
It's old equipment. Im sure if it needs to be restarted you'll come up with an excuse like "we can't get parts" "its too expensive to run" and it'll never be started again
The facility needs to be moved somewhere else
Sounds good but talk is cheap
once removed very hard to reintroduce too little to late and no funds most likely the response
We need to save our planet not destroy it
Equipment that is not used often ceases to function. Try not driving your car for a few years and see how well it then works.
The building should be put to use, not just sit there for people to maintain with no purpose
Just keep it running and then none of this is necessary
.
timing and costs of potential re-activation unknown
If needed is subjective
No information on length of time required for re-activation to full operational capacity, if needed
If the "research" shows that these systems are no longer truly needed, why the need for maintaining them "in case" needed in the future. This smells of placating the public.
Again, that's all great but once your allowed to get away with changing the rules you are not going to go back. It's business.
We have a model system currently. Use it. stop trying to save a few bucks . We are proud of our model system.
- the information above did not provide any details on the costs and timeline for re-activation. Provided there was a 10 year period where the system could be rapidly (< 1 months) re-activated as needed I would be much more comfortable.
No comment on loss of jobs for workers currently employed at this facility
If the municipality deactivates, I can't imagine any circumstances that they will reactivate and it's deceitful to pretend that you might.
restart of machinery not constantaly maintained over time becomse increasingly costly and less effective.
Unused equipment is seldom maintained as promised
If you shut it down, you might just as well sell the equipment, from experience i don't believe it will be able to be reactivated
The front end processor is being shut down to save money, will there be money available to operate the processor again ? I think not.
We agreed to the landfill with the measures in place, now you want to remove them. Against the community wishes, not stupid enough to believe it will be reinstated. Your words are worth nothing. FEP/WSF controls are why and the only reason the community agreed to the landfill. Let it in place
Once removed, safeguards are seldom returned.
Once HRM shuts it down and safe money for other projects. They will never turn it back on. This isn't about protecting our community and saving the environment it is about money!
Sorry, don't believe any of it
Money will dictate
Don't shut it down!
Once you make cost saving changes, you will never go back.
I simply do not trust that the public will be informed whether it needs to be turned back on.
It is clear that the decisions to reactivate in the public interests would not be in the best interest of the public. Having this agreement was a safety net to help ensure the communities around the landfill were protected. Making the decision to reactivate in the hands of the administration, and not one agreed upon from the beginning is sketchy at best
it's obvious "we'll keep the facilities around on standby" is a straw mam to talk opponents down. it's another empty promise that's easy to break. if you shut it down to save $, there's no way you're going to go back on the choice and reactive the facility. we're not that dumb, sorry
Costs. Inability to maintain / afford talent to run the machinery in the future. Advising turn it back on due to egotistic issues, i.e save face on a poor decisions
No estimate of the cost of reactivity or for maintaining deactivated equipment is given.
Costing???
If this is kept in place "just in case" there must be a potential probability of there being an issue with it being shut down. For the marginal cost, why not just keep it running?
The fact that this is even a question...
FEP should NOT be stopped at all.
Will be no need to restart as it will not stop
who will decide if it needs to go back into operation , what about costs that will be incurred as a result .. nothing if free .....
The facilities themselves would be in a dormant state and will need to be maintained over the long term at a significant cost which is a waste of resources. More importantly, once the government become accustomed to the lower costs of breaching the commitment, it would be extremely difficult to get the will of the HRM councilors back to do the right thing and honour the original commitment
Just keep them running

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Inability to Reactivate the FEP/WSF
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
this is unbelievably stupid. Maintaining in case of need will cost as much as leaving in place.
Cannot be done
If the city will continue to maintain the equipment, they should keep it operational.
IT COSTS A LOT OF MONEY TO KEEP A FACILITY IN HOT IDLE. IF YOU ARE GOING TO DO AWAY WITH IT, DO NOT KEEP IT AROUND "JUST IN CASE" YOU WERE ***WRONG*** THAT IT WASN'T NEEDED! IT ***IS*** NEEDED.
Since you are trying to dishonour the original agreement, it is very unlikely you will reinstate the FEP once you decommission it.
It's not the technical ability to reactivate that concerns me....it's the political lack of will to do so.
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated
First I heard of any of this!
Based on other examples machines will break down etc. when it comes to reactivate there will be many factors that impact such. How can we trust the city when they have already ignored their original promise and are now justified how they did not. The same approach will be used in this circumstance.
What is the process to have it deactivated if the community sees it necessary? How much red tape will we have to go through to have this option considered?
If you keep it you don't need to be concerned about this. Regardless you should honor the original agreement and close the facility as originally committed. The community doesn't want it.
Without usage all machinery decays and therefore becomes more expensive to repair and reactivate. This cost will always discourage persons overseeing the decision to reactivate FEP/WSF. This cost of reactivation or building of WSF/FEB basically negates it ever being reactivated
The issue of restarting the FEP has more to do with profit margins , priorities of environmental principles and political will more than mechanical maintenance
Complex mechanical systems deteriorate over time. Besides, didn't you say the these systems would not be using any electricity? From the description about it sounds like energy consumption will still continue.
We all know this equipment will not be properly maintained. Over time any protocols put in place will lapse. Please honour the agreement
Fire hazzard
The City isn't going to want to spend money to bring it back into operation if it is taken out of commission because it will cost money which the city won't want to spend once it has been defunct.
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
Near impossible to ever turn things back
You should not be deactivating
I cannot trust the Municipality. They have demonstrated that they do not abide by their agreements with the residents impacted by this change. Furthermore, new councillors don't seem to agree that contracts made before they were elected are valid.
IF you don't use it, you lose it. What about the manpower/knowledge of making this stuff work? Close it down, that knowledge base goes elsewhere
I do not know if the equipment will be maintained indefinitely suck that it can be reactivated.
If it's going to be so easy to turn it back on, why not just fix it so that it's working properly and keep it on.
Once it it's changed to allow additional waste streams to enter Otter Lake it will never be changed back, only allowing Mirror to make more money.
The damage will already to done.
Still takes time and money and more time to reduce to acceptable levels
deactivation is not the correct direction
I doubt HRM's ability, and its will to do this.
Why would this be maintained if nit used. Of course it won't be maintained. What evidence do we have that it will.
No frequency or timeline has been provided for these measures for maintaining equipment. It's only a matter of time before this maintenance is deemed too costly and not necessary. If the negative impacts are long term, it may be too late and very difficult to « restart ». There is also often little political Will to restart something that has been stopped.
As with every answer so far - That's all great info you supply, but it supports only your position. How about the other side? How can this survey be considered balanced? why not an equal area given to the monitoring committee to provide their counter views? This is shameful - I expect better.
I am not worried about the possibility to reactivate the sorting process. I am worried that the municipality will be reluctant to trigger to the reactivation because of the cost. They will say "it 's only a little smell once in while..." while none of those making the decision actually have to live it.
once shut down, next step will be to dismantle
Equipment not used will break upon reactivation and you will not be able to afford to fix it
It seems that shutting down will be just as costly as keeping it open. All the extra precautions and scheduled maintenance programs, it might as well stay open. Regular use will ensure that all safety guidelines are maintained as well as properly heated and ventilated areas will ensure that condensation and seizing of machinery and electrical wouldn't be an issue. Better off to keep them open
How quickly would it take to get said systems up and running, even with politics involved? How quickly will staff be called in to work with machinery should things need to get up and running again?
Once something is taken away, it is always difficult to get back! Do not remove it at all!
keep in place, chances are slim of reactivation if deactivated
My concerns are related to what the threshold is whereby a decision to reactivate the system would be made. What are those circumstances?
Once they are removed, no one will allow putting the measures back in place
NO
Once a service is taken away, despite promises, it is rarely reinstated
Should not be stopped
I do not want to store these facilities, I want them to remain in use.
MOTHBALLING Facilities DOES NOT WORK! IF HRM removes the FEP WSF PLEASE SHUT DOWN OTTER LAKE LANDFILL!!!
For these to be implemented it will take time which is another way of saying there will be delays between problem and solution. During that delay period the community suffers
Define what this means and how the public will be notified about the results: "facilities could be put back into operation if needed".
It should not be closed, period.
I do not believe that HRM will spend that money to maintain something that is not being used. After a few years it will be let go into disrepair.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Inability to Reactivate the FEP/WSF
If No, please indicate why the information provided does not address your concerns and/or any additional concerns you may have with this specific item (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Saving money is often more important than keeping promises
I have indicated why in earlier answers and support the otter lake committee in their knowledgeable opposition to councils removal of these items
Shouldn't be removed because the city wants to save money. We've already taken a cut to collection of recyclables whisk is ridiculous.
Nothing is ever put back once taken away
Saving money at our expense
I don't believe your word since you want to breat your commitment.
We all know Murphys Law.. in addition, the measures to monitor and maintain the deactivated equipment will inherently involve costs will those outway the cost to keep it active?
I dont think u care enough
If you have to reactivate it's too late. Rates and stink. This is in close proximity to a beautiful community and golf course
This is costly and unnecessary
It needs to be closed. End of story
Could be put back ???? Let's be clear....once you get what you want in deactivation...the process to reactivate will require more red tape and turning the clock back after its affects you cannot do!!!
Once the change is made i am not confident govt would ever decide to reberse it. This new plan is completely unacceptable
Realistically, the city will never agree to re-activate the WEP/FEP once they have got rid of it. Fake reassurances here.
Bullshit! Mothballing 20 odd year old equipment and then reinitiating it if there is an issue is totally unacceptable. The damage will be done by then. Plus how do you expect old equipment to be put back into service after sitting idle. This will cost more than what you are trying to save by reneging on the agreement with community!
HRM should do the honourable thing and keep things as they are
I just don't believe the promises. People making decisions aren't looking at all the facts
Leave it running.
Always difficult to find money to reinstate once it is taken away
No faith that the maintenance of the units will be maintained if the operators don't even want them.
It's always more difficult for govt to restart something than it is to suspend it - I remain concerned.
There is no undertaking by HRM to establish a " dedicated reserve of funds " so that if the need arises to reactivate the FEP/WSF processes, the funds are readily available to make that happen without the necessity of going through the regular HRM budgetary process.
By the time damage is done, the cost of re-introducing measures will be more costly.
Any piece of equipment sitting idle is never guaranteed to work properly again at startup. Again not enough information. Public session needed. What is the cost of all this maintenance while sitting idle. Does it require more employees? Are you not restarting the machine on a regular schedule? Too much left out in your canned responses.
Reactivation decision comes down to money, not readiness.
I am sure there will be additional costs, which will not be approved, so even if it is "easy" to turn back on, damage will already be done, and council will find it cost prohibitive to turn back on.
This is aging equipment. There has been no costing of keeping assets idle, no costing of deactivation of aging equipment if it is even possible. FEP/WSF is probably dated technology after 23 years. Where is the investigation of more modern efficient methods? Poor use of taxpayer dollars and a betrayal of trust to communities.
This a 23 year old process. The ability to reactive at reasonable cost is questionable. What is the cost of 'idling'? What are the costs of reactivating. What about new technology? Surely more efficient means are available 23 years later. means
In a perfect world it would all go tickety boo.
They'll never reactivate it re: this is all about the almighty dollar, not our health, not our safety, not the environment.
The strategies cited to be Putin place are well needed, but how will they compare with costs of the previous system.
Once it's off it won't be turned back on it never is
It looks like most if not all concerns regarding the deactivation of the FEP and WSF equipment is OK however no cost has been given by the survey as to what the cost would be to restart the FEP&WSF and in how many years would the deactivation take place.
Who decidesnifnitsbnecesary? Clearly HRM does not value the input of its citizens and you are trying to undermine/undervalue the Community Minitoring Committee. I know about the faculty because of their regular communication. I am comforted knowing people who understand this stuff more than I do are working alongside govt to ensure our needs are met ancmd concerns heard.
No need to deactivate that you keep operational doing the job. Leave it alone
If this system is being maintained it should be used. We (HRM taxpayers) are paying for it - it should be kept in place and used.
Equipment is meant to be used, the longer it sits the more forseeable problems. After all, thats why you spent of maintenance. Due to the expected increase in volume, at some point if it is decided to reactivate, the system will not be sufficient to handle the new work load. By keeping it in operating (FEP, WSF) it can be improved as we grow.
The longer equipment is mothballed, the greater the liklihood of neglect to poulities - as time passes - easier ways of develop things will take place - facilities will deteriorate.
Once shut-down, moth-balled or removed, should the need to reactivated or replace equipment will be far more that the cost of normal operation and maintenance not to mention the delay if getting funding and approval. In the meantime, the environment and health of poeple and animals in the vicinity of the landfill will be endangered. Is the cost savings of removing the WSF worth that?

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Other Items Related to the Proposed Deactivation of the FEP/WSF
Please indicate any additional specific items of concern with respect to the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Communities will be less trusting of governments if HRM and the provincial government go back on their commitments to the communities affected.
HRM betrayed the original community committe that developed the 1995 Strategy by not implimenting it either in full or even in principal. Now HRM proposes to betray the common understanding of the several agreements it made with the local community and all of HRM by using weasal words like "acceptable" to twist to their own purposes. This is dishonorable! Do not proceed!
Specifically I am concerned with why there is discussion about shutting down the FEP/WSF which mitgates many of the issues with a landfill in a consolidated and efficient fashion in order to funnel less effecient methods when there is a facilty already built and staffed. Also, the FEW/WSF is recognized as a gold standard for landfill processing and our city deserves this.
I'm just tired of HRM saying one thing and doing another. You say your going to do something do it. Put some actual work on stuff like this. Why was the letter in the mail the first I heard of this? Why wasn't the information part of the mail out. Why wasn't it on social media? It feels sneaky
Motivation! This is a poorly justified move by HRM and Mirror NS that is highly suspect.
See comments re HRM not accepting recommendations from the community members of the CMC. Keep your promise to our communities.
Attraction of bears and other rodents to the community
I fear that the site might be pushed beyond its initial expectations. The city should be looking for alternative sites now.
LEAVE OTTER LAKE ALONE. What about all the other banned substances like plastic, metals, household hazardous waste. Possible return of ICI sector. Paint, bateries, and so much more. What about the possibility of murder victims that far to often are documented to be disposed in dumpsters. You have found bodies in your FEP in the past How will you find them now.
Lack of trust going forward with anything that HRM proposes or guarantees. Just read the questions in this survey and anyone can see that it is designed to find the answers that HRM requires.
all of the previous points, more garbage more odur, rodents, risk of water contamination
Smell, increased traffic, the potential of materials changing that requires FEP/WSP procedures,potential for less maintenance or enforcements
If we continue to have leaders go back on their word and deny the obvious then there can be no trust. Why vote when this reoccurring pattern is not being stopped. Do what you say? Dont play word games with the people. Its embarrassing for everyone as you make up stories and we pretend to listen.
Based on this information provided in this survey, it becomes clear that intent is to close the sorting regardless. In doing so you will be creating a big question mark around any information or data that you provide and the confidence that you can be trusted will be gone. The confidence in the science/information being provided is lost when we can longer trust the source.
As time elapses, the WMF will become excessively filled, like Sackville, problems-known & unknown-will increase and there will be NO ADEQUATE FIX for these problems at the end of life for this facility
I find it disingenuous that there are no questions in this survey about property values or tourism. When we bought this home we knew about the proximity to Otter Lake but given the FEP/WSF it seemed acceptable. If these cost-cutting measures go ahead I can't imagine it won't make people feel differently about moving to this part of HRM.
These days its better to do more for the environment, in this case its at least the status quo apposed to your amendment to do less for our community.
The traffic and trucks dangerously cut people off on the road and cause traffic.
Rats
I'm concerned in general, this is just a cost saving move to take away something that works
How does this change the expected lifespan of the landfill?
The health and safety of the community should come first. Look for other ways to save $$. Once the environment is compromised it is too late. Shame on all of you that go along with this change. Shame, shame, shame! We have trusted you as representatives of the people you elected. Apparently our trust is not important.
HRM media coverage seems targeted at CMC not the landfill operation. It is very beneficial to have an engaged community group for this urban landfill. HRM should leverage this relationship instead of destroying it
While finding technicalities in the agreement to try to shut down FEP, the agreement as understood by all of us in the surrounding communities was the FEP would be part of us accepting the landfill in the first place. Honor your commitments and don't hide behind technicalities for this or even the agreed to life span of the landfill.
One of the main assumptions in the deactivation plan is that pop. growth continues at 1% annually, while the NS Dept. of Finance has published a rate of 2% per year. Life span for the landfill is projected based on tonnage, while the cells fill by volume. The stabilized rate has a higher compaction factor than untreated waste. This has not been considered in the reports.
If one step is all that is being changed, why ask about staff safety or increased traffic? You're removing hazards, not increasing them. You have not provided cost-risk-benefit in a useful way. Any time a government wants to reduce environmental protections in an obfuscated way, my concern increases. If you want me to believe you, do better on the report and the survey first.
I am concerned that this survey is biased.
Deactivating waste sorting is the exact opposite of what we should be doing with regards to climate change. Just be honest about this being a naked cost-cutting measure.
Main concern is that 'saving money' will be used to justify continuing to lower the standards, and increase risk to the nearby community and waters.
Why is the same company (Dillon) that handled this for Mirror also doing it for HRM? Why would anyone expect a different outcome from the first? There's the real stink. As the old saying goes, follow the money. Timing is good now, memory of the original agreement is fading. In the next 20 years, tens of $millions to be made by breaking your word
what's next?
If you truly care about the environment, you'll look into more and more automation. We're in the 21st century and technology is a powerful tool. Use it
As Halifax builds more and more apartment buildings where little or no monitoring of waste occurs, there is even more need for the Otter Lake FEP/WSP operation. It is ridiculous that this is even being proposed at this time when Halifax is increasing its high density living communities.
Taxes going up
Honour original deal. The loader was a reason I moved to beechville. We were suppose to be a role model for the world as dumps go. Why make deals if you do not choose to adhere to them. If I knew you would get rid of the loader I would not have moved in current location.
Alternatives should have been considered besides "status quo" or "deactivation". I'd strongly consider addition of a bioreactor to deal with early methane generation from stabilized waste - quantities are tiny, right? So it should be no problem to build a big enough bioreactor. Waste processing should be continually improved, not just giving up. Also 400 char limit is nonsense.
I am a realist with respect to human nature. History proves me correct. The FEP is a sufficient deterrent to the citizenry of HRM to adhere to WM rules. If you remove the deterrent, the behaviour will return in some form or fashion.
Do you live here? Then how can you tell me what is working for myself and my neighbors. Furthermore I have huge concerns with all the additional illegal dumping that will happen. This is a growing concern for all of HRM. Have you seen the side of Prospect Rd? It's only going to get worse. So I guess Prospect Road is now just a dump. Open your eyes. Absolutely unacceptable
People are simply not good at separating their own garbage into the appropriate glass, plastic, metal streams. If the manual inspection of waste is removed everything goes into the dirt. This facility sits atop the water system that drains into Shad Bay and it's critical that care be taken here.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Other Items Related to the Proposed Deactivation of the FEP/WSF
Please indicate any additional specific items of concern with respect to the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
With all of these proposed mitigation measures, given that the original agreement is being dismissed there are no assurances that these new measures will be maintained. Trust is lost now.
it was part of the agreement to locate it there....man up
Just concerns
Monitoring what is put in the landfill affects the safety of water, animals and people in the area, it affects the air quality in the community on route to Peggys Cove. Continue the full process used at the landfill and protect the area as expected by the public..
If you are gathering this information from residents, then share the aggregate results of the survey back to the community.
This is all government Bullshit!
Property value.
We have a great system so leave it alone.
Our community has hosted this facility, HRM's compost facility and HRM's newly proposed replacement compost facility. There are mornings, particularly in the summer months when odours from these facilities impact the community. At a minimum HRM should operate the facilities in accordance with their intended designs and commitments.
Deactivation is just the first step in lowering environmental protection measures at Otter Lake. More will follow if the Province relaxes current regulations.
All of them.
We can't rely on members of our community to do their part in sorting waste. I wish I could say we could but the more people you have coming to HRM the more waste we are going to get and their will be more people who do not comply with rules and regulations.
Honour the original community engaged agreement. This will help mitigate the current community opinion of local government as low life scum balls
Move the site outside of HRM far away from any community. See what the trucking charges would be! They would be much more than leaving the site as is! We do no agree to any reduction to services at the site!
Extreme lack of objective information here. This is supposed to be a survey and not promotional material to convince people they should vote in favour of stopping use of the FEP/WSF.
Will this shut down be putting anyone out of work?
It's all bullshit, very angry.
Lose of jobs
I just hope that everything which you say you are going to do happens and goes well.
whole process was difficult to achieve with the confidence of prospect area residents . we trust this process of recycling this system has done everything we were promised it would do. any amount of savings not worth the risk too much of the growing city needs constant monitoring . many people do not comply many new people to the area can make serious mistakes
This survey is set up in a way that does not provide the population that will be affected to give our real input .
Future monitoring of the facility and what we have left behind. Business operators will move on leaving the tax payer to address the issue that arise. Is there a liability that the operators have in place for 25 years from now when we are in a bad situation
when something works like the FEP/WSF, why gamble with removing it
When issues do arise with rodents birds & odors property values will decrease in this area.
You have ignored how much these things catch when people are notoriously bad at sorting. Especially given the influx of residents from other provinces where recycling and compost are handled differently, as well as the high number of apartment and condo buildings going in where residents are notoriously bad at sorting their waste.
Other areas of the province need to be looked at instead of Otter Lake. Additionally, there are other systems implemented around the world for disposing of garbage including ways that generate electricity and heating for homes.
Organic waste should not be buried in a landfill
How long does it take to re-start the system?
If HRM proceeds with its plan despite it original commitment and citizen's opposition, it will be unable to convince any other community to host a landfill in the future, when this one is closed. HRM would have demonstrated that any commitment they make are not worth much. It might cost HRM a lot in the future for the sake of "saving" a couple million now.
If the waste stream now contains low levels of material for which the FEPWSW was initially comissioned, I would prefered to see it geared to divert more material from disposal and to recycling. This effort to eleminate some operating cost is based on new interpretation of the initial permitting of the facility and assumptions of ICI waste continuing to be diverted outside of HRM
What happens next, first the FEP/WSF, then maintenance of the monitoring equipment, then cancellation of proper shut down procedures, then the fields are built into the sky like mountains. and all those employees loose jobs. It's a no win situation.
I am concerned that no community will ever be able to trust HRM's word again about anything, seeing how you have treated this agreement over the course of the last decade. The public has repeatedly opposed these maneuvers, but you seem determined to wear us down so that you can break your promises for the most short-term and ephemeral profits.
Aside from breaking the agreement, HRM is not making any effort to increase public awareness or compliance with diversion of organics. The existing rate of diversion is too low.
we are no where near the society that can be trusted not to lapse, I'm not saying this is on government - there are programs out the to educate its citizens buy we are not even close
Sorting materials is essential for maintaining less odors, less rodents and birds, less debris and dust and flying litter. Keep our processing plant at its best for our community, our water and the air we breathe. Please.
I am concerned that the city will keep finding excuses to weaken the criteria and make excuses to continue operation or reactivation.
More food equals more stink, put it in your backyard if you don't think so.
It's bullshit. Plain and simple. Respect the original agreement you Fucking lying pieces of shit! Let's have an excuse/answer for everything ffs.
DON'T CLOSE THIS FACILTIY AND KEEP YOUR PROMISES AS LAID OUT IN 99.
I will say this again---WE DO NOT WANT ANOTHER Sackville incident--It seems to be working now with this equipment in place---Please do not interfere with your original promise.
more doing things that the government historically promissed they wouldn't do, where does it end? the government need to engineer and set-up recycling facilities and waste product streams to be processed back into usable goods.
Green cart pick up should be increased to weekly otherwise more product will end up at the facility
A lot of scared home owners and environmentalists. Let's not move backwards. Not everyone recycles. There is still food and organic waste in "garbage" . Leave it alone.
Leave it alone and respect the host community. If you need to save $2M from a $1B there are a lot better places to look.....starting within the public service....
Again, 400 characters, really??? Can't even begin
400 character limit? A joke.We've hosted this dump for longer than promised & now city wants to break more promises. Lower income areas near this site are being treated like we don't matter. Time for this dump to go-maybe to the south end or mayor's neighbourhood.
The cost of keeping the FEP/WSF in good repair & then having to reactivate it if necessary. Who decides if it's required to reactivate & how bad must things get for local residents before a decision is made?
Honor 1999 agreement

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Other Items Related to the Proposed Deactivation of the FEP/WSF
Please indicate any additional specific items of concern with respect to the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
Honour 1999 agreement
Honour 1999
Honor 1999 agreement
It can't escape my attention that this facility is in proximity to 2 historically black communities. It shouldn't escape your attention either. This is 2021. In the 22 years since this community agreed to allow the facility to move forward we have learned much. We've done very well, considering. Going backwards is simply the wrong thing to do.
You gave us promises and assurances when you put this in our neighborhood! Obviously, that doesn't mean a damn thing!
These types of systems should not be operated by PRIVATE operators. They should be municipal employees as they do not have any stake in the profitability of the system and will be more invested in the long term sustainability for the community. If the PRIVATE operator is too expensive, send it out to tender for a new operator.
This comment format is BS. Grrrr. This proposal is all about saving $ not about looking after our future environment. Curb side Diversion has been great, but not everyone complies. 2/3 of our waste is now “out of sight” due to loss of Flow Control (and thus revenue). That waste is just being buried so we moved that “problem” out of HRM geographically but it still exists in NS.
Keep the FEP/WSF. Do not deactivate.
Your survey focuses on organics that shouldn't be in the waste stream to begin with, but fails to consider all the other other harmful things that would go into the ground unchecked if the FEP is shut down.
Residents will not be able to properly sort waste to the level that this new landfill would require.
I’m concerned about the RATS
Not adhering to the approved and agreed contract rules and regulations
Tired of being told this is how things will be then, when it is no longer convenient or cost affective- changes are made. We are told what changes are expected to be made but not told of what will actually happen. This change is not best for our environment
Keep the eye process as is.
Everything concerns us. You guys promise and never hold up your end. Our councillors is not working for us
I am concerned at the fact it has been a state of the art facility for many years and a model for numerous facilities around the world and it should remain open to keep things clean and people employed.
Closing Burnside, more trucks, more waste
If you pollute my property, you will be sorry
If the FEP/WSF is deactivated, the Prospect Community will be very vocal about how HRM has broken their promises made to the community and breached the contract they entered in 1999. With all the focus on climate in 2021, it is disgraceful that this municipal government has chosen this route.
The Municipality wants to break a contract that was agreed to by the community to allow the landfill. This agreement is required to keep our community clean and safe of odours, rodents etc. Honour the contract!
Property values for the close area!
The material being diverted has gone down but it has not been eliminated. The front end processing serves an important function to minimize the amount of material going into landfill. None of the proposed mitigations actually address this issue at all.
Transparency and truth. Equity and fairness!! Safety and smell
This was never to be an option!
The history of landfills in Halifax and elsewhere is replete with broken promises and angry residents.
Loss of jobs
Removing employment of workers affecting their livelyhood.
I don't like the fact that you are relying on the public to sort out organics and biodegradables. Once again, I witness on a daily basis the complete lack of sorting in an industrial setting. So I see how much organics need to be sorted out. And that is just one industry.
The additional mitigations listed throughout the survey would not hardly be required if it was an inert landfill. Organics do not belong in the landfill. The FEP/WSF needs to remain in operation.
Why are we changing what is work, I don’t like this experiment in our community!
Please do not deactivate the FEP/WSF. I am concerned how HRM keeps trying to break their commitment to the community.
The FEP/WSF operation is a requirement of the otter lake landfill agreement. It is the stop gap to ensure organics a do not go in the landfill. It is the stopgap. To stop it is equivalent to stopping medication because you feel better. In 2021 it is negligent to even consider removing an environmental process.
We need to preserve jobs and not change what Nova Scotians are proud of ... others learn from Our facility ... we need to power on
Our property values will go down. Why would any of us want to have this happen? We purchased a home here as it was a nice place to live. If these machines are shut down, we will have seagulls, rodents and bears in the area. We will also have a “dump” smell and garbage flying everywhere. Stop this NOW!!!!
As I stated before you paid for the consultant so the answers will be in your favour and not the resident
HRM was leading waste management. It had community support. Otter Lake was accepted as a location because of promises about how the landfill would be managed. HRM keep eroding the intent and the agreement with community - we should be looking to do new a better things re waste management not falling back to old "dump" and run. Very disappointing and dishonest.
This survey is leading and directing a response and does allow for important concerns to be addressed
This survey is not user friendly and does provide sufficient information regarding the mitigation strategies
Too many to list, no confidence in HRM to listen. This survey is a joke, only being done to say they consulted, then they will ignore any and all concerns. They operate under the Steve Adams rules" If we listen to the people we would get nothing done. They all should be ashamed!!!!!"
The survey has been composed in such a way as to deter many people from wading through such a convoluted , badly structured, misleading survey designed to , instead of having great public response, will at least discourage many from responding. But isn't THAT what you want???
Will decrease property values
hy are you even considering taking it away???
“If it ain’t broke, why fix it?”
Lower property value. More stink than usual. Not going to help the community.
with the present system in place and working as designed , we know WHAT is going to the landfill , the the FEPWSF shut down , we will not know
I'm calling my Councillor. And more, standing up for my community! Thanks for your incredibly biased survey format that I paid for. Well done.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Other Items Related to the Proposed Deactivation of the FEP/WSF
Please indicate any additional specific items of concern with respect to the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I recently returned to HRM after living away for [redacted] years and was shocked at the state of of things government corruption, no obvious plan in place for controlling the growth in population, the unlimited building with no changes to the infrastructure to accommodate this unprecedented growth. I was shocked by the racism in the police/RCMP. So disappointed in what Nova Scotia has become
Just wondering how many jobs will be lost to the deactivation?
Waste management is critically important to our environment. We have come quite far from what I remember about the "dumps" of my childhood (I am [redacted] I would need to see much, much more research done before feeling comfortable with changes at Otter Lake
Why break something that works! People are huuman and if sorting ia removed we are in trouble!
Don't trust council that don't do a good job representing their people
Significant waste of money to not use the FEP/WSF after we've paid for it especially since there will be unexpected and unknown problems to come
Why would anyone agree to putting a “dump” so close to a lake in the first place.Did they think HRM would keep their word?
My house depreciating. The end of enjoying being outdoors in my community. Not smelling fresh air on my property or in my home.
This survey is corrupt. It’s not a survey it’s a one sided carefully crafted propaganda machine
The environment should be protected at all costs! Also, there is always garbage at the start of the Prospect Road, a gateway to our beloved Peggy's Cove. This is a huge tourist attraction. Every effort should be made to ensure this garbage laying along our roads doesn't happen. We put up with this landfill in our community at least honour the agreement.
Too many families are still not sorting garbage as required by law.
There is absolutely no reason to change how the process is being done. Saving $$$ is not a valid reason.
It’s time to relocate this landfill the cells are full it’s time to move on, you sit next to a protected wilderness area, many lakes and you think it’s ok to remove protection! No acceptable!
Broken trust.
Im concerned that this deactivation will have a significant impact on the future of our communities.
Follow original agreement.
I have no faith in the Facility's management or HRM Council to look after the interests of my area. By adding organics material to the landfill, you are reducing the useful life of the site. How long do you intend to operate this landfill, 40 years like the Sackville landfill?
I am concerned about the increase in volume of waste being disposed and the impacts that will have on site capacity and life span.
We place trust and now we see things which could significantly change many of the vital aspects of keeping groundwater and safety operaton and wild area protections. I see the savings as being done to affect those living close in many ways. Air and excess of certain wildlife looking for food.
Excess flies, maggots, other gross insects etc
What is the alternative? Is there a new location being investigated when this site reaches it's agreement date? Has there been any future planning for the next site? It seems HRM just wants to convert this site to save the fight for a new site for a later date.
Illegal dumping, pollution
This goes against the community and the agreement that was made to close the landfill. It feels a lot like environmental racism and systemic racism in the first place. We live here and it smells and we do not feel respected with this again being pushed forward.
It is a world class environmental standard, why would you want to save a small million or so on a billion dollar budget. This is so small it is rounding.
I believe all organics should be captured and processed before hitting our landfills
It should stay. I don't care if the rate of "Other waste" is 2 % of what it once was. A deal is a deal. We expect the company to co tunue with the front facility until the Landfill is closed
There has not been an appropriate forum for community consultation. This survey is not sufficient and is not driven by a third party making it and the content extremely biased. Completely unacceptable to the community impacted.
This proposal is everything the previous government said it wouldn’t do. Even more so than the fact that the government said it would be closed by now, they protective measures they put in place are being removed because the cost is prohibitive.
Just don’t to live close to a landfill
It’s going to Pollute our lakes and rivers it will be bad for the environment
I moved to the 'former county' to get away from garbage, pollution, rats and smells. Having a landfill in my area brings your city stuff to my backdoor. Please respect nature, and the people who want to live near it by keeping or even adding more front end processing to this landfill.
Won't this take jobs away from people that are working there if you deactivate this location. With the way our economy is now we don't need to be taking away jobs from people.
I am concerned with how this is not being discussed everywhere. This decision effects all of HRM but most people who have heard about this survey are residents that live near the area. This should be advertised on public radio, at local schools and universities, grocery stores, etc.
I believe that we should still have secondary waste sorting as we cannot rely on people to do this in their homes. People do not sort, clean, and place items in their proper places and if we wish to continue to have less waste in the landfill then we need to continue with the sorting.
The report is considered inconclusive by experts. At the very least, further research is required
I WANT THEM TO KEEP THEIR PROMISE AND MY GOVERMENT TO BE HONEST FOR ONCE IN ITS EXISTENCE
All of my reasoning is based on already published evidence.
Loss of jobs. if the shut down the equipment then what will the workers be doing. It's call unemployment!!!
I am concerned with increased bird, insect, rodent activity as well as the horrible smell that will be coming from the facility if you go ahead with these changes
Location of future disposal site
if you told us deactivation was happening eventually and by force, i guess we should just sit down and shut up.
honor the original agreement
I am concerned with lies and propaganda by government when they ignore agreements in place. When they lie to tax paying constituents
everything trust has been broken
Pack up and move it elsewhere if you can’t go or the agreement
Why are you addressing this issue to save a few million dollars over the environment, what is the true benefit to me for you to do this
Betrayal is the biggest concern. This infrastructure was a good plan and remains so, but for a few pieces of silver, the council is willing to shut it down.
Please do what's best for everyone involved. What would the Otters do?

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Other Items Related to the Proposed Deactivation of the FEP/WSF
Please indicate any additional specific items of concern with respect to the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
FEP keeps dangerous goods out of our environment. If it weren't for FEP, a lot of hazardous waste will be ending up in the ground rather than having been sorted and redirected as appropriate. Look outside on collection day & see that residents are not following the guidelines in place already. FEP protects us and the environment. Halifax wants to be better on the environment, this isn't the way.
There are rats now in this area, I hope you can Guarantee this will not worsen
Why.
This is not only a total betrayal of the original assurances given to the surrounding communities, but it is also a betrayal of the public trust in their elected officials. Moral of the story is, that a promise is only as good as the current politician is still elected. All bets are off when the future generation of politicians does not feel the need to honour their predecessors commitments.
I don't want to see waste sorting revert to individuals who then have to transport various categories of waste to various locales.
THis is a negative change for the local community. There are zero positives for the local residents. Aside for the environmental issues it will have an impact on local property values
The agreement made with the community should not be dismissed. This process was agreed upon in good faith and any changes made should be approved by the community affected.
Really, the issue is one of lack of trust. Breaking agreements
Otter Lake is directly across from Long Lake Park and on a major tourism route the province invested heavily in with renovations at Peggy's Cove. Why do you not have a bigger and clearer vision?
Who knows at this point if there will be any additional items of concern. We won't know until this happens.
That the true results of the changes will not be made public and hidden. We were not supposed to know there was a compost facility in our area. Well I know it from late spring to early fall. My complaints fall on deaf ears.
If this agreement with the community is going to be broken, what other agreements are planned to be broken?
I'm concerned that regional council is full of fucking jackasses that only think about fucking bike lanes and don't give a shit about anybody outside of the peninsula.
Why would HRM want to slowly decommission this word class facility. I'm sure it's not the $2 million estimated savings.
The facility seems to be working fine, so I question the need to deactivate. Cost savings seems to be the primary reason and given the potential for impact on a growing community - that's not good enough reason. Timberlea has grown significantly in the last 5 years. Has that growth been taken into consideration? I'm not seeing that in the survey or the reports available.
[redacted]
Again, this seems like the easiest/cheapest solution as opposed to actually increasing standards. As opposed to saving a few dollars (which is really not a significant amount of money when compared to the full city budget), we should be looking for opportunities to better process waste and improve the standards applied to what goes into the landfill.
The money being wasted in this consultation process could be much better used. Why break a system that's working rather than support and make it better?
This survey was terribly written and slimey in the extreme. HRM is attempting to back out of an agreement and in ADDITION to that is trying to convince the residents in this area that backtracking on environmental protections is somehow good for us and in our best interest. It is not. Stop trying to convince us it is. It is in YOUR best interest.
who's monitoring the facility, how many manpower is being laid off, how long if there is a problem will it take to fix and why is this a problem when it is a world class facility. Just once can we take care of the environment now and not try to fix our mistakes later.
That the Mayor and this council would even let this happen shame on them
This facility must be move somewhere else not in this community.
Anything and everything to do with this
This survey is so disappointing. You are try to predict our concerns and then try to convince us it is not a problem. The issue is that you are trying to save <1% of your city budget by removing a system that should be considered a minimum for sustainable practice. Halifax has the highest municipal taxes in the country. We pay over $6000/year.
Why is this change/removal necessary? Answer: It's Not!
I am concerned about discarded hazardous items that won't be sorted out.
The City of Halifax is experiencing tremendous growth in residential builds. I have read nothing in the information provided about the anticipated impacts of increased refuse generated by the population of Halifax.
I think it is working and should be left in place to continue working
Kelp to the original
How will you handle the excess waste piling up? Won't that limit the life span of the dump, will you take over larger areas? I feel the decision to deactivate the FEP/WSF is strictly about getting Maximum profit for minimal work and leaving sustainability out of the equation.
illegal dumping
The credibilty of the council and HRM staff to make ethical and environmentally sound decsions nil in my opinion
Causing mistrust in the government. Treating certain members of the municipality as if they're worth less than others. An extremely biased survey like this shows how little you care about us.
overall procedure is not listening to the general people surrounding the areas
Eliminatiion of employment positions of those staff working in FEP/WSF
It seems like a set backwards to save a little budget money
HRM needs to honour it's commitment made to the people on route 333. The people in good faith agreed to allow this landfill in their area and now HRM want's to rewrite the terms to save money-not because it's a better idea-but to save money.
I don't believe residents sort their waste to the degree necessary and the environment and climate change should be the worlds number one concern, especially Halifax. We should be trying to improve not make things worse.
FEP/WSF controls are why and the only reason the community agreed to the landfill. Now after we are stuck with a dump that already smells and has rat issues. You want to remove our existing measures and make things worse. Leave it alone.
Methane, nearby wells
HRM needs to deal with our waste and start caring about the environment!
Very angry and disappointed that we are being walked over in this community. I also feel this survey is probably a waste of time as council has probably made up its mind and nothing we say will make a difference
Our taxes in the area should reflect the smell and rodents , water run off and air quality , birds / crows noise
I would like to know how the money saved through deactivation will be spent. Will it be reinvested into other public areas, saved for improvements/repairs to the Otter Lake site, or be considered as a reduction of waste management costs to the public.
Clearly government ocersight and control is what is at stake here. When agreements are made, it is vital that the public is able to trust that the process will carry on. The FEP WSF a we're important when proposing the landfill in the first place. It should continue.
im concerned this survey was written by proponents of the deactivation of fep/wsf in attempt to dissuade the public from protecting the environment and their best interests. there's no substitute for doing the job the right way.
Reputational damage to the community, i.e people wanting to avoid moving here for fear of the aforementioned issues, and HRM's huge leap backwards. Also, what kind of ridiculous survey is this that I need to spend 30 minutes justifying my dissatisfaction with your 3 paragraph explanations on how everything will be fine? It's by design this is difficult and time consuming.
Remember the public uproar when Sackville was closed? If the currently high standards of Otter Lake are eroded then civic authorities may see a repeat when it becomes time to pick a new site.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Other Items Related to the Proposed Deactivation of the FEP/WSF
Please indicate any additional specific items of concern with respect to the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I don't believe the significant increase in residential housing has been accounted for and that the WSF/FEP will cost money to shut down only to be restarted again in a few years for an even higher cost than if it had continued operating.
The study only focused on engineering issues. The social issue of systemic racism is never mentioned which indicated the natural racist attitudes of HRM. Environmental racism was at the forefront with the original agreement whether it was recognized or not.
It is time to look for another landfill area. This community has more than held up its end of the bargain. Where and when will this site be closed ?
People will not sort waste to the level needed; safeguards that ensure removal of hospital, industrial and commercial waste will be gone; contaminated pollutions may easily leach into nearby watersheds; odours will increase ..
Trust! After the fiasco of the disgraceful Sackville landfill/dump, no community anywhere wanted to host a new landfill, which was entirely understandable. The very things you are now proposing to remove (FEP, WSF and community monitoring) were the essential, minimum requirements for community acceptance. They continue to be just that!
Local community being thrown under the bus keep present process or move the dump have had to live with the stench when bladders were reopened and recent fire at dump indicates something has changed recently to cause issues. If you can't keep agreement with community find another location to dump your trash.
no information presented to the public except this survey there should be a well publicized meeting taking place is all effected areas of HRM ie Lakseside , Timberlea, Prospect residents should be able to express concerns and ask more detailed questions ..
The intent of the original agreement was clear. The FEP/WSF was the reason the community agreed to the location of the landfill. Changing the terms of the agreement now could leave the HRM exposed to significant legal and financial liability. This could easily offset the savings by shutting down the FEP/WSF. The big picture is easy to see here. Hopefully honour and common sense will win out.
This community is home to the otter lake facility, as well as the ragged lake compost facility. At the an absolute minimum the municipality should be operating both facilities with the intent to reduce impacts to surrounding communities being top priority. This doesn't appear to be the case given this proposal.
I have no faith that the run-off, smell, rodents, blowing garbage will be improved
The entire proposal is ridiculous and flawed in every aspect. Did somebody get paid for this travesty?
What safeguards will be in place to ensure hospital and commercial waste will not enter this facility?
IT DOES NOT RESPECT THE ENVIRONMENT AND IT WILL NEVER EVER SAVE ANYONE A DIME. WHAT NONSENSE TO THINK IT WOULD.
This is all about money...it has nothing to do with environmental concerns, or concern for the surrounding communities. Politics trumps again
Na
It's time for another community to deal with HRM's garbage. We deal with household waste at Otter Lake and green bin waste in Goodwood and construction waste in Goodwood. Take it somewhere else! Otter Lake wasnt supposed to be used for this long.
An increase in methane gas.
The FEP/WSP need to stay activated period.
Devaluing our properties and community.
Negative impact on q of l and home value.
I haven't written any further comments here in this survey as I'm recovering from a concussion. Wading through the information provided in this survey is enough for my brain at this time. I do not feel comfortable with the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF and as a homeowner in Beechville, I strongly think the FEP/WSF should remain in place.
If deactivated, no other safe guards will be put in place
Honor your original agreement.
If City Staff can utilaterally decide to shut down safety and aesthetic measures designed to aid one area of the City then they can do it anywhere in the City. Once City Staff unilaterally gets their way on this part of the Landfill they will be emboldened to cut costs elsewhere.
The Nine Mile river has much recreational potential. Increasing the amount of organic material will do nothing to help .
Loss of jobs for employees during a global pandemic.
I'm concerned that HRM is ignoring the social contract with this community by making this proposal. Please honour the agreement. We have a responsibility to protect our planet and our community. It is short sighted and disrespectful for elected officials to support this. To say it's easy to reactivate shows a lack of understanding of what will really happen if the FEP/WSF is deactivated.
Too much shit in there
Property values, state of our communities,environmental impact, just honour the original agreement that has been in place please.
Mitigations are not in alignment with the original agreement.
Just don't trust the process
I'm very concerned that an important decision is being made based on biased and misleading information. HRM staff are highly compensated but clearly unskilled if this survey is any indication of the competency of the people making this recommendation. Honor the commitment made
We do not have the support of our councillor so we won't have a chance getting the municipality to reactivate the FEP/WSP.
Just like with the previous landfill prior to OtterLake, land/home values may be significantly affected. If that is the case will HRM top-up diminished sale prices? Will other areas of HRM have any trust in future agreements they may reach with HRM. It's my opinion that HRM is attempting to renege on the intent of the original agreement with the population within the 3-5 km area.
Landfilling unnecessary waste
It is time for HRM to start siting a new landfill facility and get it out of our community. We graciously hosted the site based on the agreement which HRM IS NOW RENEGING ON!!!
Aside from the environmental aspects, it's pretty concerning that our elected officials have proven themselves to be completely untrustworthy and unable to keep their word. Quite frankly, I'm disgusted.
As a resident on the 333 we already deal with the increased traffic daily from the C &D site and New Era Farms, this is coupled with the stench from New Era and the constant noise and dust generated from the increased traffic and machinery in use. Now there will be an additional 7800 trucks and various other vehicles in the area that residents will have to deal with.
Honor the original plan. Period!!
Traffic , rodents , odor
Estimated cost is far less than the reality of cost to restart. cost will be pushed onto the taxpayers who fought against it being shut down to begin with.
Finding loopholes in agreements from over 20 years ago does not mean that HRM should renig on their agreement to keep our community safe. A safe and healthy environment is important for my family, my children and one of the reasons we chose to live in this community was due to that promise.
the FEP/WSF was created back in the conception years to perform a specific tasks, those tasks are still required, and need to continue to perform as developed
HRM has kept the issue exceedingly quiet. My perception is that it would prefer to limit discussion on the topic.
This survey has little to no reporting to back up the claims. It is a bias survey because it is the delivered by the those who gain from the removal of the FEP. The facility operates at a high level now. We do not wish to see the operation quality diminished.

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Other Items Related to the Proposed Deactivation of the FEP/WSF
Please indicate any additional specific items of concern with respect to the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
I am concerned that the municipality is reneging on an agreement that was made at the start of the process. It does not instill confidence in the government or the process. Residents will no longer believe that the government will hold up its commitments.
I still can't put my full comment in here - hopefully there is a field that will take meaningful comments before the end of this survey. Super short version - Google defines agreement as "a negotiated and typically legally binding arrangement between parties as to a course of action." Enough said. Stop it.
Having a landfill nearby is not pleasant but I realize it has to be somewhere. The truth is that the great majority of the time, we don't even know that the landfill is nearby. Because the actual system works. People will say : "not in our backyard". Well, it is in our backyard. You made a deal with our community. You are supposed to represent us. Be respectful.
Not sure of the nature of other items.
Concernrd as to how many times the life of the facility will be extended past initial agreement as well as jobs for workers at FEP/WSF
You are breaking the agreement made with the communities that generously offered to host the dump with specific requirements. We had a deal with you, when no other community would have you and for very good reason.
More information required for understanding what counts for medium risks and reasons of deactivation FEP/WSF
Loss of jobs... City council not following through with commitments to communities surrounding Otter Lake Landfill and having issues with pests and water etc in these communities
SMELL, it is rancid. I gag every drive home.
The dozens of people that have been working there for 23 years since the place opened are going to be without a job over a test trial
Quietly not honouring agreements and changing the rules is criminal.
The front end processing at Otter Lake is a critical part of HRM's waste management process, it should not be removed without a clearly documented replacement plan. To remove FEP without negative environment impact HRM would be relying solely upon the general public's understanding of waste sorting and disposal, investment into public education must occur if FEP is to be considered for removal.
When the Landfill was proposed it was only supposed to be there for 20 years with all the systems put in place, under the current council and mayor, more land was expropriated land fill life was extended PAST originally agreed upon. Why make a agreement if the current Goverment is just going to break promises.
This is letting the community down
The proposed savings don't justify the regression of the existing plan.
Property values will decrease, Offensive orders will result, organic material will attract rats, scavenger birds, vermin that carry disease and destruction, ICI material will end up in the landfill.
So little specific information is contained in this survey that it is difficult to articulate other concerns.
I do not trust the promises being made here. In a few years a new party will be elected and blame past government for the previous bad decisions made and we the people, taxpayers, will be left with the waste!!!
This is a world class facility.It has gained international acclaim. Why change something that is a shining example of excellent waste management ?
Property value is a major concern.
Your breaking your commitment to the community, if it aint broken, etc. A few million dollars of savings is nothing if we lose our environment.
Not a good idea to just dump garbage , it was once a concern at the old landfill and your just going to cause the same issue .
All garbage will end up being put in to the ground and that's not how the landfill was setup to run in the first place, and it break the guidelines to which the is to be operated under by the province
Direct impact on wild life, full impact. Complete reason for wanting to do this? What you have in place now barely works.
Extension of the life of the landfill, lack of trust that the FEP/WSF do not provide extra protection
After something has gone wrong it's too late.
The very fact this agreement is even up for discussion has affected real estate in the area. If you moved from Alberta here you would be deterred from purchasing a home in Brunello because of these potential changes. Once rats infest an area it's too late. An agreement is meant to be honoured. Do not experiment at the expense of our community.
I can't emphasize enough how this will most likely negatively impact the quality of life (due to odours, rodents, etc.) for the area. Property value dropping is also a massive concern. This proposed deactivation is unacceptable.
All of it.
All of it
The timeframe of the landfills existence in this community!!!!
I am concerned that this is the beginning of erosion of environmental protection and community control. Most particularly, that when the landfill is due for deactivation and must be re-located, other communities will not be willing to accept a landfill and the community that willingly welcomed a landfill under stringent conditions will be stuck with it permanently.
The lack of respect shown to the community by Council in opening up this same conversation yet again to save a couple of million $'s. We want the FEP & WSF bought up to date, refreshed and improved and kept in place for the LIFE of the facility.
It is a sad statement that citizens cannot count on government to life up to its stated commitment to maintaining a world-class facility.
For me, it's the lack of honouring the original agreement, which, BTW, is inaccessible from your link. It doesn't work. When political expediency is allowed to override comittments entered into in good faith for the sake of an (estimated) sum of easily dissipated money, it stinks.
People become less concerned with sorting their household waste
This survey monkey process - skewed so as to promote the idea that removal of the FEP/WSF processes is a reasonable option for the adjacent communities. Survey lacks balance , for example much script dedicated to promoting the positive aspects of the proposed deactivation but limit put on number of words in the response sections of the survey.
Eroding environmental protection is not an option. Increasing protection is.
My property value.
Hold a public meeting so we can ask questions. Your canned responses and precise comments and questions do not calm concerns.
Ability to handle ICI should it return to Otter Lake. Dated technology being maintained at unspecified cost with no acknowledgement of the risk associated with failed startup.
Violates 1999 agreement/commitment to communities. Puts 'unacceptable waste' in landfill. Instead of precautionary preventive approach deals with poor outcomes after the fact. Medium risk far too great. A complete betrayal of trust on the part of HRM.
Keep your promises to our community. This is bullshit.
A contract is a contract and revisiting this every few years is not warranted. I feel council keeps trying this hoping people will finally give up and let them have what they want.
To the average lay person much of this documentation is beyond our scope of knowledge. How can we be sure council has made the right decision?
It's immoral. My taxes alone could fund this thing. I'd like to move Patty Cuttells hous to the land cap and see what she thinks of living there, the traitor.
There are MANY people who don't sort their garbage at all this will add materials to this site that shouldn't be there the FEP/WSF have kept the site as positive as possible and without them the community will suffer

Respondents outside of 5km of FEP/WSF Based on Postal Code - Survey Responses to Other Items Related to the Proposed Deactivation of the FEP/WSF
Please indicate any additional specific items of concern with respect to the proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF (400 character limit):
Open-Ended Response
How do you said bye certain parties at HRM's but the deactivation of the FAPNWSF will save over $2 million annually. This is very misleading. This whole survey backs up what HRM staff recommended to our counsellors and does not give other important facts that would refute all or most of their findings.
Beaurocracy, transparency and accountability
With our FEP/WSF how do you keep banned materials from entering the landfill. What should I separate if you are not doing your part. Leave it alone. Do your job.
The entire opreation should be shut down adn relocated elsewhere. Area residents were promised from day one that the site would be closed in 25 yrs. Times up. Start looking for a new site NOW.
This initiative represent a completely dismissive distain for the surrounding neighbourhood.
This was a big deal several years ago. At that point we could have public meetings. Today you want people to go on a computer. For those we do not have computers, they are at a disadvantage. Throughout this survey, not once has it been layed out just what the FEP/WSF has done or the importance of it. It appears it all comes down to costs of running, and thats what you really want to deter.
Item is ? stated that a saving of 2 million in a budget of 2 billions ~= 0.002% miniscule. However, it's likely that a contract of some sort will be planned to eat that small saving.