Appendix D

Summary of Survey Responses

Appendix D-1

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

DILLON CONSULTING

Respondents within 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
Nothing replaces properly trained people on the ground to do the job. Experience to do the job safely is in everyone's best interest. There is no sign, that can match eyes and ears on the ground with a loud voice.
More vehicles will be going to the site and more still as the population of HRM grows.
Hazardous waste
Why fix something not broken
There is constantly garbage along the local roads going to the dump. We don't need more.
with the number of garbage trucks discharging at the face of the cell there will be woefully inadequate control of what type of garbage is entering the cell
Timberlea Parkway is already getting busier. With the new Sobeys and other development. Adding more slow moving vehicles will only increase this problem.
You only care about saving money for downtown projects. and not the Enviroment, time to start looking after the community.
Increased traffic is inevitable given the growing population in the periphery areas of HRM
This is going to increase large slow moving vehicles on our roads which do not need.
n
it's obvious if I don't reply in a way that is negative towards your goal the survey tries to talk you out of our opinion. very bias
HEM signed an agreement - Otter Lake facility was not meant to be operated as a truck and dump landfill!
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
People will not play by the rules and the waste will ultimately end up where it is not suppose to. Some people are honest , but when it comes to disposing hard to get rid of materials, people will break the rules thinking their little bit of garbage won't affect the environment. This is what people will do when not strictly enforced or supervised.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
Increased traffic, noise and accidental spillage along our roadways.
3rd party consultation does not appear to have been completed.
If everyone followed the rules we wouldn't need police. There will be people who violate the rules. Those people will also be more likely to properly secure their load so an increase in traffic to the landfill will likely result in an increased risk of garbage blowing into vehicle paths on highway 103.
You mentioned that some on-site impacts have been identified as representing a medium risk which includes increased disposal area traffic and worker safety. Also, with thr removal of the sorting process, there will be an increase of rats, flies and harmful odour, which puts the workers at risk of contracting diseases
Going from 20 to 30 vehicle trips per day is a 50% increase - that's big. The justification for this is not explained at all, although the implication is that the additional waste will come from commercial sites. Why should this happen?
Rats bite
We have a serious rat issue in Timberlea ! When I owned my propert[redacted] it was closer to the landfill then this and we didn't have a rat issue. It's pretty bad we can look out our window anytime during the day amd see rats in our backyard.
Ill
other issues as well
It still allows for more waste to be brought to the site daily.
What assurance is there these promises made will be kept?
A properly functioning landfill requires these two services to operate. Deactivating them is akin to removing a catalytic converter on a car. Illegal and environmentally foolish.
It doesn't matter what implications you have there's no traffic lights at Timberlea parkway . To much traffic
Added traffic and less sorting
Any changes made such as "medium risk which includes increased disposal area traffic and worker safety" are unacceptable
I've lived here[redacted] years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
This will decrease my land value
Proper disposal of waste
I am concerned about garbage not being sorted and our drinking water being affected.
Increased traffic equals increased trash along the 103 and increased risk to locals
Don't change a system that is currently working
Commitment was made to the community in order to accept waste facility. Changing the process will change conditions of acceptance period. I suspect this survey is filled with hollow facts and promises. The fact is the promise was made, anything else is a broken promise
This area agreed to this site many years ago in the form that is operating now. Maybe it's time for another area to take it's turn with new protocols in place and close this area down!!!
As time goes by and people feel comfortable, accidents are bound to follow, not to mention the increase of trucks on site and on our local roads.
You reference "Medium Risk". This is not an acceptable level of risk for workers; you should be aiming for "Low Risk" or "No Risk"!
I don't think you care about the people who live in the area that deal with rats now and with the shit going into the landfill will increase even more. Their isn't a day or night I don't see a rats outside my home and other areas near by then adding this crap into the landfill the rats will end up destroying homes living in the homes..
No control of what is dumped. This will now be a dump.
Not all house hold sort their garbage to exclude organics. So there will still be untreated organic matter going into our landfill
I am still concerned that waste will not be sorted before being deposited into the landfill. Staff will be a greater risk due to more raw waste being dumped and attacking vermin, animals and birds
Do not want landfill here. We have done our time. 20 years.
Not appropriate
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
Is this taking into account the expected growth of the region? And regardless, this is a survey. It should not be looking to dictate people's decisions.

Respondents within 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
Been there during peak times and no traffic control
Will increase vectors , rodents
You made a contract with the residens of our area for a certain process to be in effect for the running of the Waste management site and that is the only reason we agreed to agreeing to havinv the dump in our area. Now you want to change the contract to safe money. Move the dump to another area and make them have the new system in place. You should not be allowed to alter the contact.
ANY RISK IS NOT GOOD. ALSO TRAFFIC IS AFFECTED
If the proposed deactivation of the front end processor and waste stabilization facility is approved what about the additional birds, rats and odours that will result from the closure.
This explanation was too brief to explain what is changing
There is nothing addressing the increased garbage which will end up on the 103 between the city and exit 3
Because of my grave concern over the increase of collection of vehicles per day which ends up approximately 2,520 per year. Which is based on 5 days per week. That is a very big concern of extra waste and extra which will not be sorted properly.
THere remains a predicted increase in traffic of large euipment on our community roads. Workers going to the landfill are entering a toxic area and unpredictable landfill terrain.
Less management increases risk to workers
It's still a lot of pollution
The mess from the vehicles is also unsightly along the 103. The trucks often enter the community as well for coffee or for the convenience stores
This survey appears to be biased propaganda produced by those that want the changes to take place and is not an accurate way to "survey" the community.
When I purchased property the understanding was that the land fill was end of life. Any increase in traffic is a concern as that increases chances of traffic, injury, loose debris from vehicles escaping, etc..
Labour shortages, government hiring practices (cutbacks to mitigate escalating costs etc) human behaviours in noncompliance with recycling policies living in a big city
More development in Timberlea area means more traffic. More traffic higher potential for accident/injuries as the overpass/sobeys area is a danger
Concerned that items will continue to be
I know that stuff not meant for a landfill like explosives and human remains have been found by the front end processing. Your mitigation would not address this.
The by-products of solid waste deposited in a landfill has adverse effects on the surrounding environment and humans living closer to landfill sites. Sacrificing human living conditions, safety and the environment for money is WRONG.
There are significantly more vehicle trips per day to the landfill area resulting in more waste which leads to more rodents, odour and more environmental concerns for neighbouring areas.
Safety to the workers is very important to me. The FEP WSF should not change.
Currently the amount of garbage on highway 103 on route to the facility is of concern and has not been addressesd, the increase in the number of daily trips to the site further increases the risk of additional garage on our highway
This is not as the original agreement was designed.
No changes should be made
The smell and rats will become big problems
The area is growing as it's being developed and more businesses and people are moving in, in addition to more houses being built in the area. The estimation of vehicle trips does not consider increased waste due to this and makes estimation based on past metrics.
I prefer the current protections remain in place.
I do not see how an increase in vehicles, therefore an increase in waste being dumped at this facility is warranted. I think the amount of materials processed at this site should be the same as under the current agreement and not increased
All current measures should be taken to ensure safety and limit environmental impact for the residents who live nearby
An increase in traffic always increase safety risks
The smell that will be created by this being located only direct area as well as this lowering the sale price of my home as well as the effect during the hot Summer months.
You are whitewashing these concerns. Adding 30% large vehicles but putting up signs. Seriously!
Current FEP/WSF measures ensure the safety of workers as well as the community. There is no need for change to existing process.
The city and province need to enact measures to reduce consumer waste at the retail level
Increasing the number of large vehicles by 30% brings an inherent risk to residential traffic.
The road is already to busy and has had deaths on it
Increased traffic and little confidence that waste will be managed as indicated.
This is nothing more than trimming operational costs at the expense of tax payer. You have an obligation to the community to continue to improve processes, not reduce them to funnel more money to waste management executives. Tone deaf as always from HRM Govt
Increased traffic equals a higher risk hazard
Area is already busy. Extra traffic would make things more congested
1 reason alone is the amount of rats have increased and by changing the system it will only increase the rat population.
The increase in traffic is already significant due to the population increase putting more trucks on the road is not a good solution for flow issues.
No matter what mitigation measures are put in place, there will be an increase in traffic. in an increasingly busy area.
The explanation is very biased
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
The measures appear to be band aide solutions and a thorough and detailed study is required. Signage and written instructions are only as good as the people reading them. There will be more short cuts and ignoring of the signs will happen.
I still beleve
Environmental impacts are not touched upon. How will not sorting and not stabilizing waste prior to placement in the landfill affect the surrounding area?
Items not sorted correctly
Still and big increase
N
The solutions address some issues but supports a less efficient system and contributes to the greater problems
Still an increase 8n the number of vehicles per day which is not acceptable to what was promised when this site was chosen.

Respondents within 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
The smell and an increase in rats, which are bad enough now
We fought hard and trusted Reg Rankin's word that none of these changes would happen, and now or ever will we agree to the start of the downhill trends you are trying to CHEEKISHLY SNEAK past us.
Increased traffic due to a higher volume of unmitigated waste will create traffic problems, an increase in larger vehicle traffic in the area and un segregated waste in the landfill
More garbage in landfill
This is posturing and speculative at best. Removing safety measure of what is going into the landfill will be detrimental and dangerous to those working there and those in the neighbouring communities.
Not interested
Increased smell, more rats
The increased development of that area by sobeys will cause additional traffic to an already busy road
Need more support
More traffic means the landfill will fill up quicker.
Don't want increased traffic or waste
Still to much of an increase
8-10 more loads per day (2920-3650 per year) is a serious increase. Add that to closing the sorting facility. Who could possibly think this is a good idea?!
The increase in need for traffic spotters means more employees hired, more money coming out of the budget, more cost to tax payers
There are many factors to consider
Relying on the compliance of users, providing only signage or peak traffic spotters is inadequate.
A 33% increase in traffic is significant!
the number of trucks increased is not acceptable
Concerned that of the increased number of vehicles from 25 to 30 a day to 33 to 40 a day which represents a considerable increase per day and over time.
We can not predict what banned substances may get into the landfill site and cause risk to workers. Removal of FEP/WSF could see return of ICI waste. Far more traffic and hazardous waste will arrive into the site.

Respondents within 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
With Nova Scotia's high winds, this will not stop litter from escaping the landfill.
There is no amount of fencing that can replace eyes on the ground.
With climate change and more severe weather the fencing could be damaged.
I've seen plenty of garbage along the freeway heading to the landfill that isn't even being picked up now.
Because I don't believe/trust you have an evidence based approach to this issue.
wrong
Not helpful.
There was an existing deal when we were stuck with the dump. No excuse to back out now.
as with the guysborough landfill , though under provincial regulations, there will be , unquestionably, an increased amount of litter, with increased paper being directly dumped at the cell face, escaping beyond the perimeter of the litter fence
Maintenance of the net
This is to mitigate, not alleviate
By not remove waste you will be place more waste in the landfill which will blow around the community.
Portable fencing will fail
These nets are flimsy
I do not believe, or have confidence in, the populace to properly care and separate their individual waste streams. The front end processor provides an extra inspection point to observe potential infractions and mitigate illegal or inappropriate dumping of wastes in the landfill. Once the front end processor is removed from service, it is foolish to believe it will ever be reinstated
More regular litter picking along hwy 103 always a mess
I have lived in this area for years and have yet to see any clean up crews I call Bullshit on this mitigation.
Fences get damaged and I don't trust humans to pick up the garbage the way it needs to be done.
no
because I believe you will lie just to get what you want.
I high winds, I don't see the fences being 100% effective.
These fences will never stay in place during all weather conditions
HRM signed an agreement - Without FEP/WSF there is nothing to ensure banned & unacceptable waste material will not end up in the landfill This is not acceptable.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
I have lived in the area ove[redacted]years and still travel in the nearby wood trails and periodically find wind blown garbage. I as a responsible person won't even discard a candy wrapper or any type of garbage in the environment I enjoy to frequent.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
This is not an acceptable remedy
Hasn't worked so far. The 103 around exit 3 will have more mess as a result of this change.
The removal of the front-end processor and waste stabilizer will increase the amount of paper products added to landfill. With the increasing wind and harsh weather, the mitigation measures are not enough.
Fencing will not stop easy speed of paper litter with bird activity and storms. 3rd party consultation does not appear to have been completed.
Currently Highway 103 is regularly covered with litter and I have experienced multiple occasions where improperly secured garbage blew out of trucks and trailers directly in front of my vehicle. Any increase in traffic will result in an increase of such occurences presenting any increased risk of a motor vehicle accident.
Without the sorting process in place, there will be a potential for a substantial increase in blowing litter. The increase may not be held back by additional fencing, and this will create additional litter throughout the community.
When there are wind storms, hurricanes materials can be blown up and far.
Even if these fences catch 95% of airborne waste that is still a huge amount getting out.
I am not on site fencing will actually control uncontrollable wind
It's more unprocessed trash for no reason
other issues
weather wind blowing plastics in the air.
Highway debris
Their is no proof this happens or assurances it will happen after
Government track record of screwing citizens over.
Fences and nets can tear, and places reliance on the operators judgement as to when more fence and or cleaning is required. If we have a process that works why are we reverting away from it?
It is just another promise.
There in no reason that the FEP/WSF should not be operated at the landfill. It's a vital component to its operation.
It doesn't matter how hard you try, garbage will be everywhere. Landfill has been around for too long here it's time to move it.
This survey is a feigned attempt at convincing members of my community that the proposed changes will not have any negative impact. This is nothing more than propaganda.
These mitigation measures will not stop blowing litter
Organic waste does not belong in a landfill
You say there is highway garbage pick-up but I see garbage on the side of the road for long periods.
If garbage is pre sorted there should not be blowing debris
Stuff can still blow over the nets
much stuff can blow over them
No offsite impacts have been identified because it has never happened, dur to the neasures in place that were agreed upon as a stipulation to put the waste facility there in the first place. Deactivation will contribute to making this a possibility.

Respondents within 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
Bird and animals would still have access. It is a wind tunnel in that area.
I've lived here [redacted] years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
this isn't going to help.....?
Not high enough
I drive the 103 back and forth to work everyday. Leaving the city on the 103 I see way more garbage/litter on the side of the road before exit 3 than after exit 3. More needs to be done to reduce the amount of garbage/litter blowing out of trucks on the way to the landfill.
Removing part of the sorting process can only lead to inappropriate items entering the waste disposal area
I am concerned about the smell and flies
Again, garbage being sorted the way it has been protects our drinking water. There needs to be onsite sorting of garbage.
It isn't fair for the community to possibly experience increased blowing litter. We deserve proof that additional litter collection will actually occur.
There will be
Why not take the funding allocated for these mitigation measures and additional worker hours, and put them towards continuing operation of the FEP?
As the situation is now there is not enough litter collection along highway 103 leading to the facility.
These mitigations exist right now and seem to be working, but this is while using the Front-End Processor. There is no indication how removal of this will impact the possible litter problem.
Don't change a system that is currently working.
Don't trust people who don't keep their word
No landfill should be close to any residential community
Broken promise
There will always be blowing litter!
Regardless of any action taken, with the amount of wind in this area, fencing will have little effect. Plug, fencing will not stop what animals and birds will carry off site.
Why is there additional litter as a result of these changes, and when collected where is it going?
Fences will not stop birds from taking litter to other locations
jump in a canoe and take a paddle downstream. please see for yourself
It doesn't stop rats and population of them
This will now be a dump
Concerned with birds finding anything that has blown and bringing it out past the fences.
There will be more blowing waste and still require additional staff to collect
The highway leading to the dump is always littered with trash.
Because it doesn't address the risk of more garbage ending up in the landfill do to checks and balances being removed
I am unconvinced.
I do not want ANYTHING blowing around and littering
I think this will help some but some garbage will get out and get into the water along 103 hwy
Offsite measures need to be taken as more litter accumulates. The roads are already not being picked up as it is.
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
You are replacing an effective system with a patch that will be somewhat eff2ctive and require additional resources to manage. Not a plus overall.
The area would need to be enclosed as wind doesn't simply go in one direction. Garbage flowing in the wind won't automatically go to the fence itself because there is a fence. The proposed "fence" is a glorified baseball field net.
Birds and other animals will carry garbage outside the fencing.
There is trash all over, those fences are not working.
More lose volume will blow around and spread. Not the same conteol of content.
Too much litter already from trucks.
Things will still blow over that fence. Especially with the winds in a high open area.
Ever been down to nine mile river disgusting amount of litter
Increased raw organics at landfill
You have no right to alter the contract you made with the area resdents. You are going back on your word.
Need more infor
I hope you have monitoring systems in place to continue to monitor the litter and to put additional measures in place if needed
What about winter? If the additional litter anticipated is spread during the winter months/weather it most likely won't get picked up until spring and by then it has a chance to spread further and result in rodents and birds.
I've witnessed litter blowing off vehicles heading to the dump. Vehicle drivers should be fined at the facility for not covering their loads.
no additional litter is better than the need for new additional measures to address the issue.
I drive highway 103 daily and it is not cleaned daily.
I still see uncaptured litter now. It will be worse with your proposed changes
You claim that the impact will be on-site. You can therefore imagine how the impact off-site will increase with added waste and added collection vehicles on the road which we already have a lot of waste along the 103 Hwy which does make it's way in our waters and ocean via wind.
That area is like a wind tunnel, the fence won't be adequatw
1. Will these mitigation measures actually be enforced? And by whom...should definitely be non-partisan!

Respondents within 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 don't believe the nets will trap all the litter
The litter still blows along the 103. This is not only an eyesore but a hazard for drivers.
It will still blow
Fences are only as good if they are kept up and maintained. Empty promises!
Less oversight by eliminating this important process equals greater potential for concerns regarding every facet of the operation
Instead of using personnel to sort waste you're going to send them out to pick up garbage from around the site? Seems like their efforts would be better put towards ensuring only the appropriate materials end up in the landfill.
Existing measures not successful in containing waste there no reason to believe it will be implemented properly now
Storms will send garbage blowing throughout the community regardless of fencing. Storms are severe
This will not fix this with the wind and seasonal changes
Wind can lift litter higher than the nets.
Nets only catch so much you donkeys
It's not enough
more litter from more garbage that's not controlled, can overwhelm daily litter pick up manpower
Have you driven the 103 recently? If that is what my yard looked like bylaw officers would be at my door!
there is litter NOW along highway it will only be worst
I do not trust these measures will work.
Additional litter collection and removal efforts by site personnel will offset the already small savings expected from suspending FEP and WSF operations.
It's not enough
This is not an un-biased survey. It is propaganda.
There is no guarantee of it being equivalent, or consequences if new measures are not adequate, or in place soon enough.
This doesnt resolve the problem and litter can still blow over the fence
Strong winds don't limit debris to a certain height. AND, The increase of infestation of rats around our home and subdivision in recent years is of great concern to us.
Not high enough
I drive trail bike to back end of otter lake (green head road trail) and see bags and blown litter outside otter lake grounds. Plus the trucking results in a lot of waste along 103
Highway 103 and others in the area are already littered with waste going to the landfill!
continue to see garbage bags/waste along highway 103
high winds are common
Litter can and will blow above and below these nets.
The fences will catch some of the litter, but there will be a lot of 'blow by' and mess that is not contained.
the 103 is covered with litter as it is, sure this fence will help but the trucks going to and from there cover the 103
It is just a bandaid, inadequate fencing
I do not see a price for the mitigation measures.
In high winds these fences would be inadequate
Wind is not always horizontal
The by-products of solid waste deposited in a landfill has adverse effects on the surrounding environment and humans living closer to landfill sites. Sacrificing human living conditions, safety and the environment for money is WRONG.
I am not convinced there will be adequate measures taken to control blowing debris and garbage. Currently on any given day garbage can be seen near the area and on roadways close to the facility. It is a disgrace that we live in this community that has to see this garbage on a daily basis. Tourists who travel the area are shocked at the amount of debris that is present.
Litter is also created in delivery. Also winds etc.
If you do not have the FEP/WSF, there will be more paper flowing in the air. Besides there should be no paper going in the land fill it should be recycled. As promised to the people of HRM and especially BLT
Have observed litter along roadways.
A promise was made to the community. Find a new site and stop trying to make this a dump
They look good, but I know the amount of blowing litter seems to have increased in recent years, and highway cleanup is not regular enough to keep the area looking clean.
reacting to incidents after they already happened instead of keeping proactive measures in place to incident risk.
Fencing seems like it will catch some if the blowing litter but not all. It seems pointless to have staff increasing the litter collection when not stopping the FEP will not increase the litter in the first place.
If it's properly resourced and monitored this addresses my concern. But since the proposed changes are a cost-cutting measure, I have my doubts that the mitigations will be properly resourced.
with increased litter potential for more blowing
Wind storms are significant, will harm waterways and the surrounding forest
Litter is going to spread around the fence during high wind events that are very common in this area
No changes should be made
I see waste along highway 103 on a regular basis. The fences don't look high enough for when there is windy weather which happens often
It's not enough
It's not enough
Bad smell and rats in Timberlea area
So we're going to remove appropriate machinery and use additional staff time and additional fencing instead?? Doesn't seem appropriate and cleaning up after the fact doesn't prevent the problem. The only areas that get cleaned are motorways and yards but not wilderness areas.
Are there plans to hire more people to collect blown waste or will the same number of workers be expected to perform the job that now has more volume?

Respondents within 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
Fences are not able to catch all wind blown debris. Witj front wnd practices ceasing there will very likely be more debris that will be blown about.
Rodents cannot be kept out with such mitigation
There is always garbage on the highway and dump access road now. It will only get worse.
I am opposed to removing the FEP and WSF.
inadequate.
Our winds are too strong and storms are too strong
Nets may not be maintained. paper items will blow over the nets
Keep front end processing
Although cleanups happen along highway 103, there is often garbage along the roadway that blows off of trucks that have not secured their garbage properly.
If this is to proceed as proposed I believe there should be scheduled checks conducted to see if the measures are indeed working to trap and collect the litter or if additional measures are warranted. If warranted additional action may be required to ensure additional litter is not accumulating on or off site
This will negatively impact the wildlife and environment around the landfill
On site impacts remain
Do I really need to explain why less blowing garbage is preferable to more blowing garbage?
Medium risk is not an acceptable risk and who assessed the risk management, was it an independent assesment
More trucks = more garbage. Pretty sure a strong wind doesn't care a fence. If you need to make this alteration, get a new site and stick to the agreement.
The more litter there is the greater the chance that some will get past the fences.
I don't think they will be sufficient
Failure to account for high winds and higher altitude debris in a large open area.
I am assuming those working there already work at full capacity, adding extra cleaning measures in seems like it would take away from other aspects of their job. Also, why take this risk?
loose paper waste picked up by prevailing winds will not be curbed by fencing alone
Frequency of cleaning
Given the current evidence of litter ending up on Highway 103 and the site access road, how can the presence of additional on-site blowing litter have no significant effect on off-site litter?
There is always litter on Hwy 103 near Exit 3 - we don't need more
Rats
More truck hauling garbage to site mean more garbage on the 103. I have never witnessed cleanup on the highway. Your comments above are very vague and not specific as to frequency.
There is litter all throw the woods I go back there all the time the fences don't do shit
Not measures we initially agreed to and no need to change current conditions. All promises have been broken. Will residents receive a significant reduction in property assessments/tax bills?
I don't think a fence can contain all litter in wind which can blow over it as effectively as it has been with the world class FEP/WSF
Ohhh wonderful. A mesh fence will solve all the problems in the windiest provinces in Canada. Give me a break
Wind does not respect wind fencing
birds, rodents and animals can be attracted to this area
with the supposed increase in winds there will be a lot more chance for the debris to be lifted out of the compound
You should be following the agreement made when you built this.
Additional clean up measures do not prevent litter from blowing, and are simply a bandaid solution to a larger pollution issue. My concern is with blowing litter making it's way into nearby wilderness and waterways.
Garbage can still blow over a fence
Because it's not good enough and there's nothing that you can do about the smell on a hot day
Trash bags are already frequently spilled on the off ramps and overpass and blow everywhere. This will make it worse
This will not stop litter
This landfill has passed the date as to when we were told that it would shut down and you are also breaking another promise that you would not be charging the original deal on the landfill.
The amount of high winds will create debris no matter the height of fencing. This only attracts more wildlife to the area.
put more measures in place
It is our concern with what will take place after this facility and the wast process will add to our community.
Looking back at the Sackville landfill there was always visible garbage, with no restriction to garbage collection this will be an issue
if there is no impact and change to the blowing litter why then deactivating the FEP / WSF which protect our environment from burring organic waste, banned and unacceptable substance
There's blowing litter now in the area and along the highway, in both directions. Additional fencing will not not stop all the blowing litter. Full time litter collection may help.
The volume of litter blowing higher than the fence
Portable fencing does not seem like a long time solution
There are gaping holes at each end of every panel of that fence. Litter will easily blow through.
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
Walking off the 103 there is plastic in the woods
This is already inadequate. What about what animals and birds will have freer access to that they will carry off? Without the sorting, there will be more accessible garbage for the wild life which will increase their activity which is unacceptable now!
Loss of jobs, sorting not managed
You will be increasing the amount of potential litter going into the facility. There is no possible way there will not be more blowing litter.
Catch fencing only works if it is maintained/and the debris is routinely removed.
How many are additional litter collections?

Respondents within 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
These measures are already in place, but we continuously see garbage and waste along the 103 from Halifax and approaching Otter Lake. I have personally called while watching waste blowing off of garbage trucks and was passed from person to person passing the blame instead of solving the issue. I am confident this will only increase significantly and our community will suffer.
Whilst a good reactive measure, proactive designs such as a protective pocket through soil berms or pseudo snow fences to create calm air pockets.
N
There is garbage and debris all over the roads today
It is creating solutions for problems that don't have to be made. Support and improve the current proven system instead of adding fencing and footwork
The amount of wind blown litter is disgusting along the 103 and even one more truck per day increases the eyesore I see travelling everyday. This highway is not cleaned up often enough as it stands now.
Portable fencing and having staff pick up excess litter is not a long term solution. With the winds in this area it will be impossible to collect all of it.
The trash is bad now I don't expect it will get better
Seeing this kind of additional measure taken in other areas, blowing litter seems to still occur with frequency
And increase in unsegregated and unsorted waste will lead to environmental impacts to the surrounding wildlife population
Does not acknowledge extra blowing of trash to even address
Not good enough
The deactivation will still happen.
Not interested
Litter is not a problem now, but there is great potential that it will be if the present system is changed.
The wind may blow the litter above the fencing
More than likley the blowing material could have been recycled.
Keep the front sorting as is... no reduction ...
More trucks equal more litter, worker shortage sometimes can impact ability to clean this up, rats out number workers which creates a bigger problem not to mention weather
The amount of litter on the 103 and Timberlea village parkway has not been reduced
Most of the litter comes from vehicles travelling to the site without the load properly secured
It's the amount of litter that collects due to people travelling the highway to get there. It flies off the vehicles on the way to the dump, littering nearby Greenspan. They should have to ensure cleanliness between exits 2 and 3 knowing it's mostly their patrons it's caused by.
If the recyclables were sorted out as they are now there would not be additional items
Still going to see litter
There's still going to be litter blowing around!
Dont believe you/Doesnt look sufficient
Litter can blow over/past the fence and I have little confidence that it is being properly handled.
Animals will still carry litter
Fencing will not catch ALL litter. P
Adding waste means adding more than just "blowing litter"
Can still easily blow out more litter into surrounding area
I live in surrounding community and there is an issue with blowing litter on the access road and all down the 103 now, without increased traffic. Higher fencing will not collect the litter that escapes en route which will be undoubtedly more with an increase in traffic.
Still worry that there will be more blowing garbage
Are you kidding me!!! Crap is falling out of the trucks before they get to the facility.
Will this really work?
Front end staff can now identify hazardous items, this will not be the case with mitigation methods discribed
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
I do not trust that additional fencing will be put in place.
With the right wind conditions, litter can blow very high.
There would be no issue if the present measures are kept in place
That is greaT FOR THE SITE AND APPEARS TO WORK, BUT THE TRUCK HAULING THE TRASH are another issue

Respondents within 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 birds think there is food, they will eventually get use to the decoys.
If the Otter Lake FEP/WSF is deactivated there will more birds! Old fashioned dumps bring more birds!
Why would I want this kind of noise pollution and light pollution in my backyard?
The mere presence of so many gulls on the caps indicates that any possible exposure of wet/edible garbage will attract more.
Doesn't address
with the introduction of raw organics being dumped at the face of the cell the resultant increase of vectors will overwhelm, to a large degree, the suggested mitigative measures as shown at the Guysborough landfill . And which is one of the acceptable comparable landfills used in the dillon study. igative measures ,
Compost in the waste stream will attract birds
If birds are there rodents will also be there and Timberlea has rodent problem.
You are presenting no evidence that this mitigation will work.
By not removing waste and operating the garbage you will be making more organic waste for animals to eat.
I do not believe, or have confidence in, the populace to properly care and separate their individual waste streams. The front end processor provides an extra inspection point to observe potential infractions and mitigate illegal or inappropriate dumping of wastes in the landfill. Once the front end processor is removed from service, it is foolish to believe it will ever be reinstated
Shouldn't be any organic right?
Untreated or under treated compostables naturally attracts birds, rodents and animals but it is not 'natural' for them to use this as a primary food source
As mitigation may partially deal with this issue, it will still leave a substantial concern over proliferation of birds at the site in my opinion.
It doesn't matter how many measures you put in place your always going to have birds more garbage means a lot more birds and rodents.
i don't trust the mitigation methods
A plant design was agreed to when the landfill was permitted. Live by the commitments. Understand there is a cost to that.
n
what about the rats
I don't see how the report can conclude that more birds won't carry more garbage off-site, or that the mitigation strategies will be successful
If there is food, they will come, regardless of attempts to prevent this
HRM signed an agreement - Without FEP/WSF there is nothing to ensure banned & unacceptable waste material will not end up in the landfill. HRM is unable to guarantee these proposed measures will be effective. Culling is unacceptable. How long until HRM decides that, like the FEP, these measures are no longer necessary.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
Since the landfill opened, I have noticed some odours on certain days as well as an increase in bird populations, namely crows and seagulls which creates bird droppings on my property and vehicles a lot more often than the past!
The organic material will draw scavenger birds that will adapt to these measures and they will carry diseases and will cause destruction of our landfill.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
More mess, litter and garbage equals more birds....no way to avoid it.
Removal of the two garbage processing features that have worked beautifully will mean more raw organics to attract clever rodents, birds, flies etc Mitigation measures are not enough.
3rd party consultation does not appear to have been completed.
If organics are present I do not feel the measures will deter gulls from feeding at the site. They will habituate to the noise makers and will use the landfill as a food source.
When birds eat contaminated or poisonous items, plastics etc., it is a problem for birds.
How many birds are culled? What are the federal regulations for culling?? None of this is explained!
Please clarify what this means!
I think taking measures to address it are good. I have no way of knowing if these measures address the issue or not but the answer options or lack of make me suspicious
Birds are attracted to food no mitigation is 100% successful
Bird population has increased in Timberlea and is causing lots of poop issues on our property
Don't agree in this context
The bird population will increase with more access even with the measures in place.
With smell and compost birds and rodents will come. they will get within feet of equipment
Birds are wild and you have no control
There is an organic reduction process already in place. Why create and try to mitigate a problem when one does not exist now.
We bought a house here for what was in place. Had I know it would be a full on dump we would have bought elsewhere.
The FEP & WSF were critical components of the contract the communities accepted. The tactics used by HRM in attempt to remove the FEP & WSF are abhorrent and not in good faith. The format of this "survey" is a disgusting reminder of the lengths policy makers will take.
My concerns are related to the impact organic material (untreated) that will be included in the landfill and the impact on the landfill, groundwater, air quality, etc. The current system seems to do a good job at addressing these concerns and as such, I would support keeping this system
Increased organic matter will cause increase bird attraction
The photo of birds on a capped landfill is irrelevant. The plan of vector controlled efforts doesn't spell out who will be responsible for ensuring effective prevention of bird and who The oversight body would be. More details are needed.
Only time will tell if this will be adequate and if not ..... then what?
This is false information. The Guysbourogh facility is evidence of what happens when organic waste is buried in the landfill. The FEP/WSF should be operated at the landfill.
Everyday at dusk approximately 10000 birds fly from the landfill elsewhere leaving a trail of bird poop along the entire way
Shouldn't be changing anything, leave it the way it is

Respondents within 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
More organic material will result in more birds and there will be more organic material.
How can you say there are no off-site concerns when birds will do what birds do while flying in the area. There is no way you can take in organics and not have increased bird population in the area.
Organic waste does not belong in a landfill
These measures will be inadequate if the front end is shut down
Killing or scaring birds is reactive. Pre sorting prevents organic waste in the first place which prevents bird attraction
Untreated organic compost garbage can can attract more birds
if organics go untreated, more and more birds and rats will be attracted
"Increased frequency", "Emphasis on minimizing size"..... There is nothing tangible here. Specific actions/timelines please.
New changes will impact more birds and wildlife
I've lived here [redacted] years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
birds are still going to gather there.
Concerned about harm to bird life
Why would I accept medium risk. Leave the system that is in place remain unless there is something better
It is not proven to work
Birds are always a concern along with rats
Though you probably will not listen to this or write it down anywhere I am very concerned about rats and other things that will be digging in the garbage that is not sorted
We will bury it more frequently may help with the birds as a symptom, but it's still allowing the waste management facility to effectively turn into a truck and dump.
No measures against animal incursions into the site are perfect, and the combination of that inevitability plus increased risk of contamination makes their presence a bigger threat to the environment.
Not enough detail in your proposed solution to address concerns. More untreated/unsorted trash = more birds/rodents
WE HAVE SEEN AN INCREASE IN SEAGULLS SINCE THE LANDFILL BEGAN (NEVER HAD ANY BEFORE). BELIEVE IT CAN ONLY INCREASE.
Losing the Front-End Processor may increase the amount of food waste disposed of in the landfill. The smell this generates may attract more birds to the area. The measures above work now, but for the limited number of birds present, but there is no evidence that this will be enough if bird populations increase.
If the front end processing stops, I do not feel these measures will do enough to keep the birds away from the landfill
na
There wouldn't be a medium risk if you maintained the current system.
The proposed removal of the system at the facility would exponentially increase bird activity, which would then increase potential for harmful cross contamination in the bird community of illness.
Seagulls will still be attracted and end up in the community
Broken promise
We have already seen a significant increase in crows, geese, mice and rats?
Plane and simple, you can't control what birds do, especially with the increased numbers that will be attracted to the area.
Very few birds congregate at the site because of the processes currently in place. When birds feed at conventional landfill sites they carry garbage to other places and can become infected by zoonotic pathogens in the organic waste and act as carriers.
The current management method is successful we should not change
Current measures are ineffective. It won't improve with proposed changes
the problem already exists. proposed changes will not make it better
Birds are not the only animals that cause problems rats do
Birds are attracted to dumps.
Birds and other pests will eventually ignore the Bird and vector controls
Because they do not work as I've seen first hand in St. John's City dump in NL
Birds and other animals will eventually find a way into the landfill
concerned that birds will come into contact with trash and bring it into the community
Again these increased mitigation measures will require more costs and staff. When continuing with the FED would not require these additional measure
It won't control the Rat population that has overrun the Timberlea area.
It doesn't address the stench
Presorting is essential to decreasing the attractiveness of landfill to birds
Problematic at best
Again, you take checks and balances away and this increases then what? There is a reason these were put in place
Those are the cheaper/bare minimum options. There has not been a study to see how effective it will be without the other measures in place.
I am unconvinced.
The birds at the Guysborough landfill indicate that this will still be a problem
These Scavenger Birds will go to Brunello GCC and surrounding area
The birds will eventually get used to to all the measures meant to keep them away and flock to the location anyway
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
It's a nice picture of Seagulls, however, I don't see any crows. Every evening I see 100's of crows leaving the landfill. Your bird management does not seem to be impacting the amount of crows attested to the landfill.
Guysboroygh has covered method. Not really effective.
There will still be birds present. Example: parking lots of restaurants. Even if there is no food there for them at that moment- they know there's the opportunity for it so they will still be present

Respondents within 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
More trash, especially that that isn't sorted will attract more birds. It won't matter what measures you take.
Additional organics (primarily food waste) entering the landfill will greatly increase the attraction for birds and rodents. Mitigation efforts are expensive and unnecessary if the FEP is retained and/or enhanced to further eliminate organics.
I AM COBCERBED WIR G VOLUME AND ATTRACTION OF BIRDS AND GROUND BASE CRITTERS, RATS ETC.
If the garbage is not sorted, it will still attract birds despite your efforts which seem minimal at best.
Car gets covered now with bird droppings
Without processed organics at landfill, lots of birds
No matter what you say there is no reason to justify changing the contract you signed with the residents of the area, HRM can not be trusted in any contracts they make they can move to alter things as they want too. Your word means nothing. and you can not be trusted to live up to your word.
If remove the front end monitoring, then more organic matter will enter the system and this will cause problems of smell and increased birds and rodents. What is happening to garbage from apartments condos and institutions? Is that being sorted now?
Need more infi
How do you know that the mitigation measures will be enough and if additional funding is required that takes away from any of the savings you anticipate from the deactivation of the FEP and WSF
If the organics are not removed the dump will attract creatures, big and small. We already have enough rats in our neighborhood. Rats and seagulls go hand and hand. I am old enough to remember the Sackville Dump !!
Sure it might help at the actual facility but the birds will be coming to the area and just won't go directly there. I am old enough to remember Sackville landfill
If there is more organics, there will be more birds. More measures will be necessary and will cost money that is supposedly being saved
More food = more birds.
There are already so many birds around that area . So placing a cover on freshly dumped non sorted waste it not good enough
With added waste. Even with the above mentioned measures. You will not be able to control that many birds, rats or vermin as the added waste will be a strong attraction and odour.
The front end processor cannot be eliminated. People do not separate garbage properly.
It is ridiculous to remove the FEP and then claim that there will be an increase in the "efforts" to control scavengers. If you don't remove the FEP, then you wouldn't have to increase the mitigation measures.
Bords are still attracted to the area.
More regular waste will still attract more birds - especially seagulls and other scavengers.
mitigation does not eliminate, only attempt to minimize, allowing there will be some increase
Remember what took place at the old landfill in Sackville.
We have already seen an increase in birds and we were promised this would never be a landfill. You are putting our family's at risk and lake pollution
Same as my previous comment
Can't trust you
Even with Proposed measures there will definitely still be an increase of birds
Safety of wildlife must be of primary concern and medium risks are not appropriate
With people feeding the birds in our neighborhood we already have a problem with birds and rats
We have increased crows now tearing our garbage bags
No details provided in your "control efforts" or "emphasis on minimising size of landfill". I highly doubt you intend to follow through with either of these with specific, measurable mitigations.
This will only help minimally. The best measure is not removing the measures that already work.
Imagine wanting to produce a dump instead of sort for the environment then using increased frequency's to deter birds from flying in nature.
Open cells will always produce rodents Nd birds. The amount of funding required to mitigate this would be outrageous
if it's a medium risk at the current status and vector control is being used, how much more vector control can will be necessary to NOT increase the current number to attract birds, what will deter the birds in the first place
Food brings birds, and without adequate sorting we will see more
We currently have numbers of sea gulls in our neighbourhood ..... I fear shutting down FEP/WSF will increase these numbers significtly
Increased frequency of bird and vector control efforts at the landfill disposal area and around the landfill in general will again offset the small savings expected.
You will not know the impact until the FEP/WSF is de-activated. At which point it's too late.
This is not an un-biased survey but instead is being used as a tool to sway those affected by the changes.
The best an easiest risk mitigation is to just keep the FEP/WSF operational and avoid this. Also it isn't a Medium Risk it is a High risk which will guarantee to hit and become an issue. Unless your Risk Advisor is predicting this is the first time in history that the impact will be that the increased attraction of birds that will happen will only be birds that are trained to stay in the landfill.
I am concerned of the hazardous waste the birds will be exposed to
Efforts to resolve problems created by the landfill over the years have fallen short of eliminating problems associated with bad smells and increased rodent activity.
Tons of rats in Greenwood heights area. I grew up out here and never saw a rat. In last 10 years they are everywhere in the neighborhood
Has never worked
I'm concerned that without the FEP there will be increased food waste which will attract birds.
seeing seagulls this far from water is disheartening as they are carrion eaters
I am concerned that the increase in organic waste will be an attractant in spite of the above measures.
I do not trust the proposed system to work. Many households do not follow guidelines for waste separation and relying on this factor is naive. Increasing waste and decreasing sorting measures close to residential areas is disrespectful and not a proper solution. Save mkney somewhere else.
I do not believe that these measures will be sufficient
https://www.solidwaste.com/doc/birds-and-landfillswhats-the-big-deal-0001 I am not in favor of murdering wildlife
I've seen many bird mitigation measures at commercial properties and property manager do not find them particularly effective
The report results are INCONCLUSVE. You are lying to the people.
The mitigation measures outlined do not adequately address the problems associated with the expected increase in birds and the associated noise and health risks.

Respondents within 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
Failure to reduce surface litter will encourage scavenger birds to the site unless there is 24/7 mitigation
Have you not learned anything from the Sackville DUMP site? It did not work. The FEP/WSF works and should not be discontinued. There will be more birds in the area. There will be more rats.
increase cost of mitigation practices, instead of maintaining existing risk reduction practices.
Again what is the point of increasing bird control if not stopping the FEP wouldn't increase the birds
again, mitigations must be properly resourced.
more food equals more birds
More garbage brings more rodents smells and birds
this is a backwards approach to managing wildlife and will require significant effort from staff to maintain. Costs for this are not adequately being accounted for.
No changes should be made
While medium risj on site the additional bird traffic may result in increased birds in residtential areas close to the site. Will monitoring be done in those areas??
The birds will still come
Noises won't be enough to keep the birds out
more organics will attract more birds
Scaring birds away from the area with greater tactics can disrupt and displace bird habitat and migration routes as well as keep them away from the landfill but scaring them into the community.
Animals adapt
With all these additional mitigations it seems the WSF and the FEP do play an important role. Why not keep it or improve that system.
Who conducts these "measures" and how often? Even if they're done now, we have the FEP/WSF in place now too. You don't know how this will change when it's not.
inadequate, insufficent info provided.
I don't believe they can be controlled this way
There will always be seagulls
Not sorting the garbage and then dumping them in a hole
We are around 7 km from the present site. We do see gulls, etc in our lake and are suspicious about their possible connection to the landfill.
The attraction of birds to waste in the community is very concerning. Currently there are times in the subdivision where birds are ripping into garbage bags and leaving a mess in the road. Whose responsibility is it to clean up the mess? Because I certainly do not see the residential collection people cleaning and nor do some of the home owners.
Too short term
On site impacts remain
There is no way to stop in in flux or birds to the site if the site becomes more attractive to them
These are fine in theory but in practice we know what Sackville was like. Let's get real!
I have concerns with the risk assessment process as medium risk is still an unacceptable risk
We have more birds in this area since the landfill with the measures in place currently. More predator birds WILL come. Thanks for think of the safety of our outdoor cats.
If there are more birds attracted to the area then there is a greater chance of birds carrying disease.
I am concerned about birds but more about rats
It already doesn't work, why should we expect it to start?
Current measures are in place for current system. I don't think the added measures will make much difference if more birds.
gulls & crows especially will be attracted the moment waste hits the ground as is evident to any backyard birder.
More organic waste will attract more birds.
I'm unsure how potentially attracting additional migratory birds to site (and potentially increasing the likelihood they are harmed due to operations) can be considered an on-site issue alone. My understanding is that the Migratory Birds Convention Act was set up to protect these animals, regardless of property boundaries.
increased smell will attract more Birds
Have seen increase in bird population extending beyond the landfill. This would increase more so with loss of FEP/WSF process
The removal of the FEP/WSF will cause more attraction of birds and pests
Birds have to fly to the site some how. They attract predator birds who will also seek prey in surrounding neighborhoods, like cats and small dogs.
There is always a circle of birds above the dump every time I've been there
I am concerned that the smell will attract more birds and animals
Little to no faith that what they say is what they will do. Also concerned with increase in rats and other vermin.
What a lovely picture. Now whats the dump look like before its capped? This is shifting the responsibility and onus on ta
If the management of the face and daily cover is insufficient it will attract birds.
What are you going to do? shoot the birds for mitigation???
we have been seeing more gulls in our area the last few years
You seem to be spending more money than you would be if you left things as they are now.
Feel this will not be enough. Deactivation was not the agreement
These mitigation strategies do not replace the need for the city to uphold it's current contract commitments.
Just as stated
More birds will come with lack of sorting
because you are just spinning more BS
Sounds fine on paper but we know in reality that it won't work.

Respondents within 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
At the present time here in Timberlea we are some times impacted with numerous birds ie seagulls , crows and starlings hovering in our areas
Crows are definitely an issue in the area already making a mess
If the FEP and WSF is deactivated the increases in organic, banned and unacceptable substance have a chance to enter the landfill and will increased the bird population which not be manageable by the above mitigation
If you lived in the area would "you" be happy with "a medium risk"
Many birds will still be attracted by the increase in smell
With less sitting there will be more food, and more food laden plastics. The biological imperative to feed will override their fear of your measures. I work [redacted] where similar deterants are used. They don't work particularly well.
Didn't propose a real solution
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
As previously stated; currently measures are unacceptable and ineffective. How do you expect the minimal increase in control efforts will reduce the impact of the greater increase in scavengers!
It's not just birds, it's rats and other rodents being drawn to the area
You will be increasing the amount of garbage that birds want to eat. "Increased frequency of control efforts blah blah blah" isn't an actual plan. It is just wind. More birds will be attracted to the dump. "Mitigating" that will never be 100%.
There is not adequate description of mitigation measures to ease my concerns.
Organic waste will attract more birds/scavengers/rodents regardless, especially at night. Falconry/noisemakers seem to be an expensive offset
Culling ... no
Efforts and "emphasis" are just words, not solutions. Do not create problems that aren't needed and that you cannot manage!
Increased garbage, increased amount of birds.
I know little about falconry but it hardly seems possible a team of expert falconers will be taking up residence and a large enough flock of falcons will be at the ready to handle rats and other birds gathering to go after the new menu
Our crow situation as is now, is more than ample--you know--MOTHER NATURE????
These measures are not guaranteed to reduce the increase in attracted birds to the area. And could lead to more money being spent to compensate. When in reality the current system works perfecting fine, and deactivation of the current system seems like a poorly evaluated cost saving measure
I don't believe it is enough
More attraction equals more harm
Mitigation only goes so far. What is currently there works better.
There is no guarantee that what information you have provided here, is accurate
The measures you mention do not work.
Increase of birds at the facility means increase of diseases and other preys.
There will be more seagulls flying around crapping. More crows too
I dont think added mitigation measures will actually be used.
If successful I will inherit the birds and we have enough picking the garbage now
Organics not sorted from waste Will birds and other wildlife and rodents
Geese effect many ply spaces for children due to their droppings
Because it wont be that simple, once you make a big mess of it.
Not going to stop them.
The more open garbage, the more birds.
If you stop sorting out organics, this will become a huge issue.
I do not think less birds will be there if you deactivate the FEP or WSF
Sounds like a load of crap
I find it hard to believe that the deactivation will not cause more bird activity in the area. Saying you will have an emphasis on minimizing the size of not a commitment.
the birds may be attracted and mitigated at the site but once drawn to the area, other garbage and food sources will keep them here
Increase in amout of bird poop in landfill AND surrounding areas
The issue of increased bird activity is not addressed
If you are willing to cover fresh waste daily and increase vector control, allocate these resources to maintaining the current system as agreed upon. I also worry about whether the measures taken will be humane and respect of bird populations.
I don't think the mitigation efforts will be enough, given the research I've done.
It's hard to forecast if those measures will work
I don't believe in the efficacy of your propose measures & they are being down played.
Remember Sackville!!!!
Dumping everything will bring many more rodents and birds.
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
There is no additional mitigation methods being put in place. There is an identified (medium) risk of increased attraction of birds but the mitigation methods remain the same as they always have been but with a key word describing them as "enhanced"
Birds are attracted to organic food, organics do not belong here
Again...we are enhancing bird attraction with these proposed measures that would not occur if present measures stay in place
This mitigation is short lived and only works for a short period. Risk vs reward. Where there is a food source the vectors and vermin will risk it.

Respondents within 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
Don't think baiting rodents will help. Money will spent to manage the baiting program.
I already had severe problems with rats at my house. I am already concerned that the current program in place is not enough. This will make it even worse!
poison also kills other wildlife that feed on garbage. get ratter type dogs like those that have been used in New York city to control rats sol don' have to New York city to clean up vermin
More unsorted garbage more rodients!
We know how difficult it is in real life to rid an area of rodents.
Rodents cannot be eliminated with a "safe" baiting program; they can only be somewhat controlled as new animals will replace ones that die. More exposed wet/edible garbage will bring in more replacements.
With the proposed deactivation of the FEP/WSF. The above measures will not meet the increase influx of rodents that will occur. Again showing the improtance of the FEP/WSF currently in place. Many people living in the city do not seperate their waste to the standard which is required to be able to deactivate the FEP.
Because I don't believe you are taking an evidence based approach to this issue.
Not enough being done
I'm still worries about impact of rodents
I don't trust HRM to follow through.
no amount of baiting traps will capture the introduction of raw organics with the truck and dump directly at the face of the landfill.
I don't believe that the baiting program will work
Living in the area I have seen a increase in the number of rodents. Changes in the landfill will only make it worse. .
YoubRe presenting no evidence that this mitigation will work. How many traps? How often? What will be with expected rodent increase and how much is the appropriate trapping effort?
We have had an explosion of rats in our communtiy. The FEP/WSF is the best defence against increasing rats, we need to deal with our garbage.
Poising animals , rats , get conditioned to the poisoning and end up poisoning created that eat them
There will still be additional rodent populations that cannot be eliminated
I have seen an increase in rats in the Timberlea area over the past few years
I do not believe, or have confidence in, the populace to properly care and separate their individual waste streams. The front end processor provides an extra inspection point to observe potential infractions and mitigate illegal or inappropriate dumping of wastes in the landfill. Once the front end processor is removed from service, it is foolish to believe it will ever be reinstated
Increased activity can be avoided if we continue with the front load system we currently have. Just keep it!
I have some experience with rodent problems due to compost bins near our property and the problem will return even if baiting is applied. The elimination of the FEP and WSF will no doubt cause an increase in rodents, this will be difficult to control using the methods you suggest.
It's insuffficient
n
rats are more abundant in this area since I moved in. you can't tell me adding organic waste will not make it worse.
There is no evidence that the mitigation measures would be successful.
All of the nearby residential areas seem to have plenty of rodents! Baiting kills many more creatures than rodents!
There is no turning back if the proposed baiting system fails. This impacts residents , attracts larger animals
There will be an increase in the rodent population with the elimination of FEP
HRM signed an agreement - Without FEP/WSF there is nothing to ensure banned & unacceptable waste material will not end up in the landfill. HRM is unable to guarantee these proposed measures will provide effective rodent control. How long until HRM decides that, like the FEP, these measures are no longer necessary.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
I have noticed a high increase of rats in the neighbourhood which i attribute to the landfill in our area.
What are these baiting measures? Will they be effective? How can you be sure they increase of rats and rodents will not outnumber you baiting program.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Baiting will in itself not control the rodents
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
Current situation is already out of hand. Can't imagine it getting worse. It would be awful.
Impossible to obtain with some traps.
Rodents are smart will increase with the increase of raw organics into the landfill. The present systems doing a fine job. Why change things now?
I don't think you can stop the impact from rats.
3rd party consultation does not appear to have been completed.
Rats are extremely resourceful and adaptable. They have managed to extend their range to almost all of North America. I do not feel baiting will be effective at preventing them from leaving the facility. It may help control numbers at the facility but there will be an increased likelihood of rats leaving the facility and establishing themselves in the surrounding area.
It apprears that the baiting system is insufficient to offset the increase number of rodents because the rodents will multiply faster than the baiting system will remove them.
Ever since the construction of the brunello golf course, the rodent problem in my neighborhood has increased dramatically. Not sorting trash before burying it will undoubtedly increase rodent activity even more. Unacceptable. The facility was established in this area only because residents were assured the front end sorting would be maintained. Promises are being broken.
Baiting can kill birds also, and must be very controlled.
The "baiting program" is not explained. How much toxicity does this add to my local environment?
We are ready have a rodent issue in many neighbourhoods. No matter what baiting is done we will see an increase
Timberlea is overrun with rats
I don't know the success level of baiting programs. From my experience, rodents, and especially rats are able to learn from experience and tend to shy away from bait/traps after time
Rats are not possible to control there is no real way to prevent further rodents

Respondents within 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
We have a rat issue in Timberlea and this is going to make it worse. Anytime during the day you can see rats running around our yards, coming out if compost bins, they are ripping open garbage that is sorted correctly and ripping open our washed recyclables
Don't agree in this context
when i moved to Timberlea there was no rats over the last 5 years i have trapped over 500 rats.
We already have a bad problem with rodents in the area. They are not controlled well and will avoid the bait traps as they learn where they are. Rodents are very smart they have increased greatly since the landfill has opened
it will generally increase rodents in the larger area
Never had rats in Timberlea before the landfill so change of measures will only make it worse
Why increase a problem when one is managed well now. It is well known that organics attract the unwanted.
Baiting is proving to not be effective against high reproduction animals.
The FEP & WSF were critical components of the contract the communities accepted. The tactics used by HRM in attempt to remove the FEP & WSF are abhorrent and not in good faith. The format of this "survey" is a disgusting reminder of the lengths policy makers will take.
Same reason for my previous question. Organic materials are not meant for this landfill and as such, there needs to be a process to address organic materials that arrive. This was the original agreement with the community and must be honored
More organic waste is going to attract more animals. We don't know from this plan who is incharge of oversight and how rodent trends will be reported. How do we know of we need to re implement the removed equipment? We need a better plan and milestones before moving ahead
Territoriality might drive some of the rodents out of the landfill site before they take the bait.
And if it doesn't work ..... what is plan B. Why are you not continuing with the current promised plan?
More false information, organic waste should never be buried in a landfill. The FEP/WSF should be operated at the landfill.
There is rats the size of cats in our composters. They chew a holes in the bottom. This is a contributing factor from the landfill
I have yet to see any evidence that you can contain rats to a specific area simply by baiting them. We already have an increase in rats since the landfill was put in place.
There is already a huge rodent problem in this area. Removing FEW/WSF will only provide the rodent population a food source and allow the population to grow. As long as there is a food source, there will be rodents which will then migrate to the surrounding area. To say there is no off-site impact is ridiculous.
Organic waste does not belong in a landfill
You keep talking about the current measures yet that does not adress what will happen if you shut down the front end site and allow raw organics to be dumped.
It will still bring to many rodents
As with birds, pre sorting organics out reduces rodents attraction in the first place
Rats, rats, rats
untreated organics untreated will attract more rats,,this area has enough of them already
Define proximity
More compost material will attract more rodents - You have listed based on systems in place. Change will affect these systems
I've lived here [redacted] years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
we already have a lot of rodents here. this WILL attract more.
Again why would I take on additional risk even medium risk. Leave it alone or make it better
This is not a proven method
Never get rid of rats. It's a huge problem on Timberlea.
The unsorted garbage will be of a source of rats absolutely you're right up does nothing to counter argue that
The rodent issue will always be a problem
Your proposal will create the garbage that attracts rodents. What has been done is working -- it is NOT broken so do not attempt to fix it by coming up with a reactive solution to a problem that you are about to cause.
I am uncomfortable with baiting problems and believe the problem should be dealt with before reaching that point.
Garbage is rodent food. Providing bait nearby is just offering another plate on the buffet. It may help, but it certainly will not solve the problem.
See my previous response. No mitigations are perfect, so overall, the risk of spread of contamination into the environment are going to go up.
HAVE SEEN RATS IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD OVER 10 YEARS (NONE BEFORE THE LANDFILL). MORE RECENTLY. PEOPLE HAVE BEEN SEEING MORE. BELIEVE THEY'RE RELATED TO LANDFILL AND GREEN BINS.
Attract and kill, nice!
Bait programs work as a means of feeding rodents with poison. With a limited food supply, rodents are more likely to eat the bait. Increasing their food supply (introduced with the loss of the Front-End Processor) decreases the likelihood of eating the bait, and will encourage breeding.
na
They don't address the unscreened garbage going into the landfill that make have hazardous materials and compostable items that should not be in the land fill
There is already a rodent issue in surrounding areas and there is that word again...Medium risk. Anything you change that makes it worse is unacceptable.
Rats will only increase with the increase of a food source
Rodents are already an issue in Timberlea!
Rodents carry disease, especially when access to untreated/in sorted garbage is readily accessible.
Timberlea is already over run with rats and you are intent on attracting even more
Broken promise to the community
We already have seen a significant increase in the rodent population.
Once there is food on site for rodents, the population is bound to explode and we will never get rid of then, not to mention the increased disease it will bring with them.
There is already a rodent problem in the communities surrounding the waste facility. Meaning that current mitigation efforts are not effectively handling off site impacts. If waste is no longer sorted the potential for increased rodent attraction is greater. Naturally the rodents will migrate to the surrounding areas. The negative effects for off site are larger than assessed.
We already have issues with rodents in the Timberlea area. Changing the way of dealing with waste will just add to the problem.

Respondents within 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
With the change in processing it will not be enough and we already have a rat problem in Timberlea
Timberlea now has a rat problem. it was not always like that. Indeed in the last 10-15 years. being [redacted] i certainly understand that baiting is only effective when no other or minimal food sources are present. they have already migrated outwards.
Little black rodent boxes don't solve the issue. It will get out if control as we now are living with the problem and it will get worse.
It will be a dump
Why will rodents go to baited traps when there is a buffet of food available to them?
You'll need an awful lot of baiting traps. How about all the rodents that get around this measure.
There is already a problem in this area with rodents and by disabling the Front end processor you are just giving them food to feed off of plus breaking the promise made to the community surrounding the landfill when it was first opened
There are already many rats in Timberlea. Changes to this facility will make this worse
We currently experience issues with rodents in our area, additional untreated waste will only increase the attractiveness of the landfill to more and more rodents
It will attract more Rodents.
Absolutely not! We have more rodents now than ever in my [redacted] years at my current address in Timberlea due to the current modus operandi of the landfill. I disagree that you're new proposals are going to aid in that regard at all and especially if you take away the FEP/WSF
There is already a large population of rodents in the area. Baiting is clearly not working and can harm other wildlife
We already have rats you are inviting more
Attracting animals and then killing them is wrong if the problem could be resolved by keeping current measures without having to harm animals
I would love to believe people really only send when should go there, but every garbage day shows that not all people do. If increased, this increases this issue and harder to get rid of
Rodents will always be attracted to anything remaining in the waste that they can eat.
mitigation measures aren't needed if you don't create a problem to mitigate. This survey feels less like a survey and more of a railroading the survey taker into a pre-determined answer, which seems to be the norm with surveys I've done from HRM over the last few years. What's the purpose of sending this out if you don't want our opinion?
I do not believe this is true
There's no way to keep up with breeding of the rodents and they already a problem, it's just going to get worse
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
Additional waste and less controls of the garbage deposited at the landfill will attract rodents. Once the controls are removed, they would never be reintroduced. Don't stop what is already working. If you wish to stop, relocate the facility.
Landfill very close the BLUFF Wilderness Trail...baiting could impact wildlife wandering near landfill.
They're rodents. Being put in our community. This is severely disrespectful and will have a major impact on the future of our community. I.e. the ongoing development and future development
The opening of Otter lake facility introduced a rodent problem in the area which will only get worse.
More trash without sorting out of food waste will bring more rats to the area.
We already have a rodent problem in Timberlea with the current baiting system, I doubt these measures will do enough to mitigate the very likely rodent increase that the change to this area will result in.
Additional food waste in the landfill will attract more rodents than would be possible to bait or trap. Halifax is the 4th rattiest city in the Maritimes. It would be less expensive and more effective to retain and / or enhance the FEP to eliminate food waste from the landfill.
You see rats runnjng around at the landfill now, it will increase, dont beeak what is relatively working now.
Ridiculous amount of rats the closer you get already.
If you do not plan on sorting the waste and doing more than the above suggestions it won't help the rodents from coming to the landfill.
Ask anyone in Greenwood heights if that process is working
Your word was given in a contract with the residents of our area and you have no right to make any changes.
There are already rats in the surrounding neighborhoods, this will only make the problem worse. Not to mention that it will probably attract bears and raccoons. It wont matter how many traps you set, it wont be enough.
As a community member I have no way of knowing if the current measures are adequate, continuing monitoring and assessment is necessary.
Need more info
With the increase of rodents results in the increase of offspring. The more rodents the more the chance they will move into the residential areas. The more rodents the more issues and costs associated with trying to control them.
You can't stop rats, if you put the food out there they will come !!
A bait program deals with after they have arrived not preventing it from happening.
We bait around our property and have had neighbours use professional companies as well, it helps, but it isn't perfect, the professionals tell us organic waste near properties must be kept at a minimum to help.
No need to deactivate the front end process there are too many issues that will arise from this to local neighborhoods.
Rodents are already a large concern for the area. Extra baiting is not nearly as effective as the reduction of additional rodents to the area.
There is already a problem with rodents in the area. I don't think these mitigation's will be sufficient.
I am concerned that if organics are not sorted out, there will be more food (organically) for rodents to feed on. This has not been addressed in this statement
Baiting will not effectively defer rodents. The fact the report has not identified the risk does not mean there is no risk. Full impact will not be understood as the processor is still functioning.
Rats are already a huge problem - additional trapping will not solve the issue.
There are numerous RATS in my neighborhood already. I have had to purchase traps, use them and dispose of the bodies already. Most was 23 in number 2 summers ago. I Strongly DISLIKE having to do so. Our dog and grandchildren are the reason I do this. Fewer fleas on the dog when the rats aren't here. Fleas can spread disease. $$ to control fleas on dog, concern over our health as a family
Timberlea has few rats before the landfill. We have an abundance now. You should do many years of community rodent control with or without your expansion
B3t1n9
Timberlea already has a huge rodent / rat problem. I feel this is only going to get worse . This was never suppose to be a non sorted , dump and go landfill
You cannot believe that the rodent are only going to go directly to the on-site. Yes it will attract them even more which in turn will attract rodents in the on-site and they will not all be baited and will keep on looking around off-site as some communities are already too close.

Respondents within 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
It was agreed we'd have a state of the art landfill that would prevent this crap and now you're trying to go back on your word with a system that won't work. I thought the original life expectancy was 20 years or less. It seems we're already there, so now you think it's a good idea to start dumping raw garbage in an area surrounded by lakes.
If you a very minimal problem now with rodents due to the FEP, then why mess with something that's working? Instead, you spread poisonous over a much larger area affecting more animals. Absolute insanity.
We already have a serious rat problem close to the dump and it will no doubt not help the situation
Rodents continue to be attracted to the area. No mitigation process will 100% address this issue.
There will definitely be more rodents and these mitigation measures will not stop them. There will be more rodents that will spread to surrounding (residential) areas
the amount of rodents in the neighbourhoods surrounding the landfill have steadily increased over the last several years, anticipate this increasing exponentially
We have a rediculious amount of rats in the area noe and this will make it worse, baiting will effect wild and domestic animal, water pollution and effects the entire environment.
Same as my previous comment
Where is the data supporting the claim of no off site impact? Has a decommissioned FEP/WSF been studied? Have several?
I don't think enough is being done to control rodents. I have lived in Timberlea for over [redacted] years, and believe there has been a dramatic increase in rodents since the landfill was put in.
Deactivating the FEP/WSP will likely lead to more organic material in the landfill. I am unclear on how this reduces the number of rats attracted.
Because these mitigation measures are not entirely effective. Why is this facility in such close proximity to residential areas? There are rats out on the streets even during daylight hours.
Rats are rats
Generally baiting programs are not effective if the food source is maintained for the rodents. This will result in a net increase to the rodent population
What is the difference between the current baiting program and the mitigation one?
Rodents will spread
We trap rats everyday already in our neighborhood
We now have rats in our subdivision, Greenwood heights
Baiting will not be an effective measure. Once rodents arrive in larger numbers they will disperse into areas far beyond the landfill disposal site.
Baiting will only work minimally and will present a risk to animals who might feed on poisoned rats depending on the type of bait used. The best measure is not removing the measures that already work.
You are all literally so dumb it amazes me. You will not control an ALREADY out of control rodent issue we experience in this area by adding more open pollution to our area. Give your head a shake
I have lived in timberlea for [redacted] yrs. Since the existing dump has been here the rats have been ramped and the smell on some days is enough to make you sick.
Timberlea is already filled with rats because of the dump!
rat control needs to be more directed to the reason for rat increase and managed in an environmentally conscious way not by bating
They are all ready here, and we're not before
Our neighbourhood is growing at a fast rate and I fear closure of FEP/WSF will result in an unacceptable increase of rodent population
I've lived in Timberlea my entire life. That facility has brought a major rodent issue here.
Again, I do not trust these measures will work. There is already a massive rodent issue in timberlea
Because you can never get rid of rodents! They breed no matter what!
We have issues with over run populations of rodents now. Living so close to the disposal, I don't believe just some baiting in the facility area will be enough
Timberlea is already infested with rats the current measures are not enough. De-activating the FEP/WSF will only make things worse.
Rodents are a problem in our area now and will only get worse. It is not so much the delivery of rodents to the area but the growing population that already exists and will continue to grow.
Adding poison to a area close to my home is very concerning. Espically with the risk of it escalating up the food chain, or it being inadvertently moved. This ever so slightly increases the risk that a lost pet may be poisoned by the change.
So your risk is that it will increase the attraction of rats (which is an issue as it will happen and not a risk) and you are going to invest in rat poison to fix it. A mitigation to the risk would be something to avoid the risk. The mitigation being to the risk would be to not deactivate the FEP WSF. There is a difference.
I don't have confidence in the sincerity of a biased report, written with the purpose of justifying deactivation of this part of the facility. The residents of this area were promised by the council of the day that front end sorting would be a permanent part of the Otter Lake landfill.
All of the mitigation measures are weak. They might do some of these measures, but they will eventually fizzle out or not do them enough in the first place.
We already have a rodent problem in the area I don't see how this will help the situation
If the FEP/WSF is removed a key layer of detection will be gone as well
You are planning to stop front end recycling
Due to the increased rat problem on our property we have now had to implement, at our expense, yearly rodent control measures to decrease their presence on our patio and lawn areas during the milder seasons.clearly this problem is increasing despite your present efforts as we did not have issues in earlier years.
Like last response, it obviously isn't working as there are many rats in Greenwood heights area. Please ask anyone in that neighborhood
The rodent problem continues to increase in our neighborhoods for many reasons, adding additional food sources will not help control these already existing populations.
The area is already teemimg with rats and other vermin
have to eliminate rats from my property
What type of bait are you using and how can you guarantee that other animals will not be affected?
if the rats think/know there is food available, they will come and NOTHING will stop them. The only way to keep them out is not to provide any source of food in the first place.
Baiting will not fix the entire problem
The number of rodents would only be slightly reduced with baiting. The extra food supply will be what drives the numbers.
We already have rodents in our yards and only see it getting worse .
Landfills change animal behavior, so do methods of extermination. The best idea is not attract them in the first place.
Like the other measures mentioned, i believe this also will be insufficient... my community is being shafted in the name of pinching pennies and nobody gives a rat's ass (and there will be plenty of those to give!)
There's no way to effectively manage a large onslaught of rodents. Limiting the bait is the main way. Is this a rodent poisoning plan? If so I have additional concerns.

Respondents within 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
Still too many rats in residential subdivisions
The by-products of solid waste deposited in a landfill has adverse effects on the surrounding environment and humans living closer to landfill sites. Sacrificing human living conditions, safety and the environment for money is WRONG.
Our family has lived in this area for [redacted] years. We never experienced rodents on our property prior to the opening of the Otter Lake Facility, but in the last number of years we are seeing a significant number of rats in our yard. We regularly trap and kill these rats and can expect there will be a significant increase in these rodents if the proposed changes take effect.
There will be an increase in rats and other rodents. Increased trapping will not stop their prolifferation
The rat issue in BLT will only increase. Once again, have you not learned anything from the Sackville DUMP where FEP/WSF did not exist. This system works and should be continued. The traps will do nothing compared to the positive effect FEP/WSF
Have seen more rats in my neighbourhood lately. Maybe there has already been reduced waste removal!!??
Increase in rats in our neighbourhood.
A promise was made to the community. Find a new site and stop trying to make this a dump. Our community will see an increase in rodent beyond what we already have.
Report should have included estimates based on other facilities that do not have FEP&WSF.
We already have a rodent problem, of course increased rodents will spill over the landfill boungries
What are the potential negative effects on normal resident wildlife of an increase in baiting? What kind of bait will be used and is it persistent in the soil or water?0
Timberlea has a bad rat problem which needs to be addressed
potential for rodents increases with more garbage
The changes to the FEP will increase the attraction of rodents to the area.
You will also need to deal with the increase rodent issue in the surrounding communities, we have enough of them now, will only get worse.
We live here and this is not acceptable in our backyard
increasing the food source for rodents will significantly increase the population in this area - baiting just introduces more toxins into the environment. This is a complete step backwards and negatively impacts the wildlife that eat the rodents and the waterways.
No changes should be made
Will monitoring be done on and off site to access the effects?
Also not enough
less sorting will attract more rodents
Rodents eat toxins and then arrive sick or die in our yards and get eaten by pets.
Again, more workers will be required to perform a job which now has an increased load of tasks.
Like humans or viruses , animals adapt to their environments. Less front end sorting means more undesirable materials will enter the INd fill potentially attracting more rodents
Our subdivision is overrun with rats , has been getting worse and worse ...otter lake has always been a problem for Timberlea residents
There's no way the baiting program will deal with all the rodents
Have seen some rodents in our area currently and am concerned about the population increasing and crossing the highway
There has been an explosion in the rat population in Timberlea and surrounding areas due to the dump. It will only get worse.
I prefer the protections remain in place as promised and agreed to.
We have noticed increased rodents/mice and rats since the landfill opened
inadequate. this is porpaganda, not a survey
Rats are out of control now and will get worse with the new proposed changes
Will not catch all the rats. There will be more with the new usages
I don't want food waste or recycling going to the site
That won't work ☺. Keep front end processing
Continue to be concerned about rodents not being caught by efforts used.
There is currently a rat problem in the Timberlea area. It is already almost out of control. There should be no tolerance for any additional risk for having additional rodents. None!
The rats in my backyard that my husband continues to trap tells me your measures are not enough.
Will harm other creatures
We have seen an increase in rodents in our community since the landfill opened and this will not help the provlem
On site impacts remain
Leave the FEP/WSF in place and mitigation won't be necessary.
Baiting rodents does not solve the problem. Increased food in the landfill will create more rodents, causing a need for baiting. In addition, poisons used on rodents are painful for the rodents and harmful to the greater environment, including harming birds.
Rodents will come.. You can bait and kill all you want. Their numbers will increase over the months and years and they will invade the neighboring communities
Again it is assessed as a medium risk, the assessment should be independently conducted
Seriously!! So the rodents are so intelligent they won't travel! More rats here now since landfill was built and now you tell us you can manage it!
If there are more rodents then some will leave the area to find food and go into the community.
I don't feel that current measures are sufficient
Bating causes toxic inclusion in local ecosystem, with significant dangerous contamination.
HRM does not look after any rodent issues in HRM. Even in the core they do not bait rats any more and that why we have such issues within HRM
I am concerned the increased baiting program won't be enough to handle increased numbers of rodents.
There are too many now.
Baiting programs are marginally successful, as well the type & effect of certain bait is an inhuman way to get rid of rats
Treat the source not the symtom
More organic waste will attract more rodents.

Respondents within 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
The current mitigation measures are inadequate. Rodent problems in this area are more common than in other areas.
Areas of Beechville, Lakeside & Timberlea currently have a huge rodent problem now due to the presence of the landfill. It will only get worse with the proposed changes.
Just because you have people working there on site doesn't mean it won't attract more rodents to the area
not what we agreed to when landfill came to our area
Rats arw terrible in Timberlea and nothing is being done about them
Using poison in bait can cause other animals like owls to become sick and die if they eat one of the rodents.
Removal of the FEP/WSF will increase attraction and need for control of rodents
I have lived in the same house for almost [redacted] years and I see an increase in rats in my neighborhood since thesite was opened. Proposed changes will increase the problem that already exists with existing measures in place. Your argument above is uninformed!
There are more rats in blt then any community I ever lived in
I live in Timberlea (since [redacted] the issue that our neighborhood has is directly from the landfill. Both my neighbors on each side have captured 15+ rats in traps over the summer. And this is no new and is happening throughout Lakeside as well
Have lived in Timberlea since [redacted] and in past few years have seen an increase in rats. I have traps and they don't work, why should I believe this propaganda?
Timberlea is well known for having a rat problem that the city has not done enough to mitigate. Residents have rodent chew through their car wires and the last house I rented as well as two neighbours have rats climb under the siding into the roofs in governors Glen causing thousands of dollars in damage. My concern is HRM has gone back on their promise to close Otter Lake.
Timberlea already has a significant rat probem. So a medium risk although medium only compounds the already significant issue even further.
Definitely not, there is already a rodent issue within the area and outside the area as well because of this facility, a few more traps will not mitigate anything.
the rodent population in Timberlea keeps increasing each year.
we are still seeing rats that i must get rid of and would expect even more
You wouldn't need the baiting program if you continued to follow what was promised.
We are already experiencing a problem with Rats in our neighbourhood.
I do not want rats in my neighbourhood
Then what?
Not enough. Deactivation was not the agreement
The city needs to uphold it's commitments instead of creating new problems.
Who is going to monitor the batting?
We already have a rodent problem and this deactivation will NOT help matters. This site is so close to residential neighborhoods and you have a responsibility to keep the site running as safely and effectively as possible
We have rodent issues now with proper sorting so it will likely get worse with no sorting.
Because the areas around the landfill are overrun with rats and it's only getting worse
Rats are already a huge problem in Timberlea area. I currently use traps and bait outside and catch 4+ per week. This will only increase if it goes through
Rodents will not respond well to baiting if there is a supply of organic waste to feast on. With no front end separating, more organic waste will end up being in this facility. Therefore, more rodents and other wildlife will be attracted.
This will increase rodents to surrounding areas - do not want this
you are just chasing them into our residential communities.
Bait stations are ineffective as the poison is no longer effective against babies born to females who have fed on the bait.
do NOT deactivation the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
With open dumping it is only natural it will attract all sorts of vermin .Presently a rodent situation exists in our areas , I have made this complaint to HRM in the past, their is no vermin control in our areas this is some what due to the rodent infestation at th
I can't imagine the city will have baiting 5 kl. Away from landfill
Baiting does not work when there is garbage everywhere, not a good fix
By deactivating the FEP and WSF more organic material, banned and unacceptable substance will enter the landfill and will attract more rodent. We don't want another sackville dump on our had this close to the citty
There is already a major problem with rodents in the area. The city can't control the rodents problem now. more unsorted garbage will only exacerbate the problem.
Rats will find a way where the food source increases. We are told that all the time with wildlife
If you are knowingly bringing additional rodents on-site you can't expect to bait/trap/kill them all. Not to mention if you are using poison to secondary delivery if poison to other animals which eat the deceased rodents.
Baiting can only do so much, and rodents are starting to out smart these traps. With reduced sorting ability this will most definitely attract rodents to the area
this is insufficient.
I have caught 6 big rats near my house in the last 4 months..More organics in the garbage will mean even more rats
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
Concerned that this might not be enough
The current measures do not come close to controlling the present situation in rodents. We have a major problem throughout BLT with rats and mice which is on the increase. If you discontinue the current 2 sorting areas, this will only multiple the already bad situation.
Baiting programs need to be elaborated, material that is not stabilized may attract more rodents.
Are area has been know to have lots of rats. Is the city prepared to supply traps or bait to homes with these issues at no charge to the homeowner?
Won't work
There will be more rodents.
I would like to see strong waste sorting measures in place to ease my concerns.
The baiting is not working there are rats everywhere in this neighborhood now. So current measures are not even enough
Rodents are already an issue, and will only get worse.
N
I don't believe this will solve an already out of control rat problem in the Timberlea area

Respondents within 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
if you're baiting, you already have the problem
This matter is greater than a medium risk and using the word implementation without explaining the process is NOT an acceptable solution. A hard NO on this non-answer to a serious issue
I have lived in this area for the past [redacted] years. Rodents were never seen until this disposal site was placed here and now they increase in numbers every year. This is an ongoing problem that will continue to get worse and residents are angry.
Baiting programs are not always successful. This area has a huge problem with rodents and this will only increase the problem.
The Rats are bad now, I don't believe it's gonna change
Just saying baiting will happen doesn't give actual verified numbers and percentages of successful mitigation. We aren't talking about a few dozen rats. Unchecked, who's to say we might not get hundreds and hundreds of rats and lord knows what else. The rate of baiting would have to be astonishingly large. Prove it can be done.
Your band-aid solutions will NEVER outrun the rodents. Say what you like, it is US who will be hit .
How can you implement a baiting program, if one already exists. And at that point, does a poor job of managing rodents in the area as it is, while the facility maintains current efficiency. Increasing the volume of waste and then trying to compensate for the increased rodent attraction hardly seems cost effective or sensible
Same, not acknowledging more issues
Timberlea is already overwhelmed with rodent issues.
Rats will move around
8
Baiting won't be effective. And if the bait involves poison it is an ecological nightmare for animals that might scavenge poisoned rats.
Concern on how long you will maintain these measures until eliminating those to save more money. The entire proposal is in contempt of the original agreement with the community
There is no guarantee that the information you are providing is accurate
Halifax is infested with mice and rats now. Changing the system will only increase the problem.
There is currently an issue with rodents in the BLT area. This will certainly increase the population in the area.
Entire community that accepted the landfill site is infested with rats now. It will guaranteed get worse!!!!!!
We are plagued with rats in our neighbourhood and it is only going to get worst.
Rodents breed quickly and are disease carriers. Neighbourhood cats will eat the rodents and become ill. The cats will urinate, defecate, and further spread disease.
Rat population in my area appears to currently be unmanaged any increase is not acceptable
BLT community has a massive rodent problem that I've personally witness ruin homes. Baiting is not going to solve the problem at all
I've lived in Timberlea for [redacted] years... I never saw a rat before this shit hole was forced upon us.... I spend far to much money and time trying to keep the rats away.... I'm too old for this shit.. i
We the people that live near the landfill have seen an increase to rodents providing yourself a solution doesn't provide us one. They will continue to stray into our community
Poisoning rodents will have an affect further up the foodchain. Ie scavengers will be poisoned as well
Do you have any idea how many rats are in this area???!!! Already there are so many, they are run over by cars. My neighbour trapped 18 in two weeks. Baiting is also dangerous to wildlife who prey on rodents
There are already too many rats in this area.
To control rodents at a landfill would be an additional expense.
Timberlea is over run with rats, likely from the landfill. Do some community outreach research and attempt to assist with the issues.
Is the baiting using poison that will affect other animals
Rats have increased in this area since the facility have opened, not hoing to stop it.
Rodents are already a huge issue and increasing landfill dumping is going to create an exponential increase in rodents
This will attract so many more pests, which will then spread to the surrounding communities who only agreed to this landfill if there was a sorting facility.An agreement was signed. You cannot violate it at your convenience.
I feel the deactivation process will bring more rodents
Rats are already an issue. So you will just make it worse
There are so many faults in Timberlea. We see them all the time, despite residents efforts to control them. This is while the FEP/WSF is still in place. You lie if you say deactivation will not impact the rat population. It is disgusting.
rodents are already a large issue within the community - with the construction at Brunello these rodents moved into other subdivisions. More food sources means more rodents
Timberlea has a long term known issue with rodents, esp rats...zas it is and we donot need anything to attract more to the area. Baiting programmes can harm other animals and/or pets
So you'll add more of a food source for wildlife then kill them?
I don't believe baiting will be enough to control the increase that will be seen in the area
If on site there will be more offsite too
The surrounding communities already have an extensive issue with rodent control. If you deactivate the FEP/WSF and rely only on "more baiting" I worry about an even great influx of rodents in our neighbourhoods. Making them less sanitary for our children, decreasing the real estate values and also giving the communities a stigma.
It's not enough!!
Again you dont know the full level of the increase
I have lived in Timberlea since the inception of this bitterly opposed project and have witnessed the advent of the growing rat presence in the surrounding areas.If HRM were interested in doing a survey approx to this concern,it would signify that this problem is extant.
Wait until all the extra unchecked crap gets sent into the landfill....rat heaven!!
We already have a massive rat problem in Timberlea and baiting and trapping does not work if there is a massive food supply. They will keep coming back or reproduce quicker. Remove acces to food and they leave
this is a big concern.
You say there are no offsite rodent issues, have you asked the people who live nearer to the dump?
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
I need further information regarding the baiting program they are proposing.

Respondents within 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 attracted to organic food, food doesn't belong here
If the Fep and wsf is removed..more rodents will ultimately be a problem.i don't want to be infested with rats!!
If there is an increase in rodents on-site, it stands to reason there will also be an increase off-site
The increased food source will increase population and breeding. Not just at the site but the surrounding communities.

Respondents within 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
More vehicles more dust!
All of your mitigation responses so far are horrible for the environment, this just makes it worse
no amount of dust suppression will fully compensate for the significantly increased traffic going to the face of the cell.
I don't have a problem with dust. I have a problem with shutting down the FEP/WSF.
Less trucks means less dust.
n
tembec. what in the hell is that? something else that is no good for our health.
The Otter Lake Facility was not meant to be operated as a truck and dump landfill. That has not changed since HRM's original agreement with the public's agent.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
Trucks displace a great deal of air when driving. More trucks means more dust and poorer air quality
Stuff that blows out of trucks and drops off garbage trucks is on the road sides often.
Chemical use
Stop putting lipstick on a pig to try and make it look good.
The FEP/WSF should be operated at the landfill.
The smell around our subdivision is awful as it is
more traffic more dust
Burying waste will produce more toxic and smelly dust
I've lived here [redacted] years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
The disposal area is dirt and dust
Still an increase in dust
The explanation states to work toward minimizing ,,,does not state completely prevent it
Broken promise
You will not be able to control the dust when windy and it will end up in near by communities
the problem already exists.... '(Tembec) is used as necessary to reduce the generation of dust'.
Hard to control volume of traffic to a dump.
Dust, smoke wear and tear will create dust and fumes I don't trust this will be controlled
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
More trash, more dust.
How often is this dust repellent used since you say as needed. The rain will increase the mud therefore causing dust when it dries.
Need more inf
With additional disposal traffic there is the additional dust but there is also the additional truck emissions resulting in additional air and noise pollution
I am still concern with the increased dust as there will be more collector vehicles on the road and with warmer climate, more dust will be inevitable. As well. Positive drainage. Concerns over the drainage which will also affect the lake/waterways around the Landfill.
As the picture shows, despite mitigation attempts, dust is still created.
Increased dust filled with additional bird and rat feces into the environment there is going to cause illness unacceptable
Same as my previous comment
Increase of traffic due to closure of FEP/WSF will necessitate an increase in the moving of earth/dirt to cover increased waste product that was previously screened by the FEP/WSF
Don't trust this.
You can't control the wind. Trucks are heavy and cause dust on dirt roads.
You are spending all of this money (including the tax dollars we are spending on you as consultants) and increase costs associated with this. Just to save a measly 2 Million a year and creating all of these issues. The easiest solution is often the best. Keep it as is as it is working fine
By the time all these extra measures have been put in place the $2 million savings turns into pennies. Just keep the working system in place. Why move backwards? This is a huge step in keeping the city/ surrounding area clean and beautiful. Please don't let it start to unravel.... we know it won't stop
Is there going to be increased traffic? This would concern me
Do not see any concrete measures to measure and address the problems associated with the generation of dust.
You are trying to make dust an issue? This is a very minor concern. I will not agree with anything you are proposing if it means ending the FEP/WSF. This was part of the agreement for BLT to have the processing facility place in our area. You can't break the contract. process that works.
Concern not related to deactivation of (FEP/WSF) but expected increase of traffic due to population increase.
More traffic more dust
increased traffic means increased dust
It's not just the facility but surrounding areas which will be affected by increased dust.
Maintenance has historically been inadequate and to ask for more in this location is not acceptable. We want the dump closed here send it somewhere else.
The dust at a dump contains many toxins that harm the surrounding wildlife and waterways. We should NOT be increasing it.

Respondents within 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
No changes should be made
Bad smell and rats in Timberlea
Air quality
Unsure what product Tembec could have on the local Fauna
Save on dust suppressing supplies and honor your agreement.
not certain why this question is asked. do you expect increased site traffic with this decision?
Are we not in an environmental climate emergency? Practice what you preach!
I am concerned that HRM is going back on their promises in regards to this facility.
There is dust in the picture you are using to try to say dust isnt an issue. Next.
mmitments instead of creating new problems
What is in Tembec? How does it effect the soil, animals and humans?
do NOT deactivate the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
If a dust suppressant is used now, then it bust be used sparingly from the amount of dust I see.
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
Will bring dirt out onto road and highway eventually
N
Pretty hard to stop the air flow and dust particles
Change the facility, but manage issues in the same current fashion
No way to be sure
Not interested
The chemicals used to prevent mud and dust will still have a negative effect on air quality.
Current dust levels are high, has to been unhealthy for any additional increases
Increased traffic, Increased blowing litter and there's dirt on the sides of the road, especially from winter months. There will be more dust.
Same as previous answers..deactivating will not solve this
Excuses. Leave the fep
Minimizing dust and mud is not preventing dust and mud.
The sample image shows dust generation. An increase in traffic will this create more dust.
More trucks more dust.
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
The landfill should not exist at Otter Lake
Your text says one thing, however your photo shows dust being produced. Further concern from increased traffic.
What is Tembec? What solution or dilution are you using. What are the environmental risks. They used to say asbestos was safe but now we know better.

Respondents within 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
If the FEP/WSF does help reduce greenhouse gases, keep it anyway dispite the electrical cost. Any food waste will attract rodents.
We are not doing well environmentally now,changing the process is not a good idea
Greenhouse gas will increase with the deactivation of the FEP/WSF. Maybe NS Power should stop using coal to generate electricity! Some wind turbines at Otter Lake would generate electricty for the FEP/WSF!
This landfill WAS not to be used or expanded in this way. Disappointing that we're having to fight something that was promised wasn't going to happen.
But perhaps more effort should be made to pre-treat other gas generating material
Not enough
Not what was promised in1995.
Why not do both?
the wsf does reduce greenhouse gas, absorbed in the bio-filter; and if the issue is not enough the option is to increase the amount of days of days curing in the wsf from the current 21 days
All sources of gas need to be addressed. What about emissions by increased traffic, for example. Again, no quantitative e information is presented so effectiveness cannot be assessed
We need to slow down the FEP/WSF and increase staff so all organic is manage. Shutting down the FEP/WSF is a mistake.
What about other toxic gasses emitted from non controlled items building up
The last thing we need is anything that further contribute to greenhouse gas emissions
Although ||I still have some concerns as you state: "food waste only makes up a portion of the methane-generating waste deposited in the landfill" but it still does make up a portion.
The system in place is more effective.
Prevention is better than mitigation. The operation had an agreed to set up including the front end processor. Yes there is a cost to that, and the city agreed to that when the landfill was permitted. Stick to the commitments.
n
and on top of that you try to draw additional people to our area to help you pay the bill which will also increase our waste.
Diverting material from the landfill is the best way to reduce greenhouse gases. Allowing waste material to go into the land fill i inhibitors s not acceptable and does increase the potential for increased gas emmissiounmonitore intent was to operate the Otter Lame facility with no banned or acceptable waste buried in it. This has not changed. HRM should honour the agreement they signed.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
There is always the potential for failure of the lines and tanks and then the damage is done.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active"
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
The smell will be bad. A reduction of extra greenhouse gases is not the same as NOT raising the levels at all.
I feel that with the increase in raw organics to the landfill and the safeguard presently in place has done a pretty good job to date.
We are at a point where every ton of greenhouse gas that can be eliminated must be. If residents of HRM need to pay a little more to reduce one of the worst greenhouse gases then that is what we should do. It is time for HRM to show some leadership on Climate Change.
By removing the FEP/WSF, more methane and CO2 will be introduced to the ground and although there will be less electricity used, and less CO2 emissions, it will still produce a negative impact on the environment.
Saying the gases are "not anticipated to increase" does not fill me with confidence. If electricity is the issue, then work on pulling electricity from cleaner sources.
Changes proposed will cause increase
Why mitigate it when we can not produce it
you are assuming that everyone will source separate which may not continue
The claim of electricity generation creating co2 can equally be refuted with electricity generated by wind or solar.
You're poisoning your community members.
The FEP & WSF were critical components of the contract the communities accepted. The tactics used by HRM in attempt to remove the FEP & WSF are abhorrent and not in good faith. The format of this "survey" is a disgusting reminder of the lengths policy makers will take.
I support the existence of the FEP/WSF. There may be other sources for energy that would reduce greenhouse gasses.
Additional organic matter in the landfill will cause more long term off gassing
The fact that the two prices of equipment do something to mitigate the issue of greenhouse gases is a good reason to continue using them. If the net impact of running them betters the Gas emissions, why are we going backwards.
I am not confident that removing the FEP will not affect gas emission. Instead of using electrical power as an exceuse, why isn't solar power generation and storage being installed onsite?
Organic waste should never be buried in a landfill. The FEP/WSF should always be operated at our landfill.
The garbage system is not perfect for the environment
I do not want any additional organics placed in the landfill not to mention other toxic materials. With no front end sorting who knows what will wind up in the landfill.
Rather than saying that it is okay to allow organic material into the landfill because the net amount of greenhouse gases produced is less than the electricity used to separate the organic materials, you should be consider greener sources of energy for that separation and keep the organics out of the landfill. This will allow even less greenhouse gas emissions.
Organic waste does not belong in a landfill
Why are you talking about the use of additional electricity? That is a separate issue about how NS has been slow to move more towards green energy vs fossil fuels. Honestly, this question is very diversionary and purposely misleading.
We can already smell the dump this will make it worse
I am not informed enough to form an opinion
Yes this approach works - changes by allowing compostable material will increase gases... smell!
I've lived here [redacted] years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
theres still going to be an increase
I smell the processing plant on a fairly regular basis WITH the FEP in place. How bad will the odor be if that is removed????
If you are concerned with the electricity use the find better solution rather than stopping the existing process
I don't feel their will be a reduction in greenhouse gas.

Respondents within 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
If the waste is not being properly sorted than this is all a fairytale.
Your argument is dishonest. Yes, FEP/WSF consumes electricity ... but what it results in is far more environmentally responsible..
If you just stopped picking up garbage in general, electricity use will go down but that doesn't mean we should stop processing it. Climate change is a massive ordeal confronting this generation and anything to enhance waste processing is preferable. "Anticipation" of not increasing greenhouse gases is not good enough.
Green cart program is great if 100% of residents can be relied upon to follow it. Companies and apartment buildings rarely sort their garbage like the rest of residents. The FEP is necessary because people are unreliable.
Some of your information is false and promotional to your advantage
IN THE PAST THERE WERE TIMES YOU COULD SMELL THE LANDFILL WHEN DRIVING BY EXIT 3- "A PROBLEM WITH THE SYSTEM". BELIEVE IT CAN ONLY GET WORSE.
I still have concerns
I am concern about the city putting wet garbage in this land fill.
I am concerned that when the front end processor is removed that products that are not suited to the landfill will be overlooked and that hazardous wastes can enter the landfill
Stabilizing those materials has other benefits doesn't it? Options to utilize clean energy for power?
Just trying to save money at the expensive of the environment
Again the explanation states “reduce”. Not eliminate
Broken promise to the community.
Methane gas
Rather than burn the methane gas with flares, why doesn't HRM look into methane collection and onsite methane powered generators. The potential electricity created could be used to power or offset the energy needed to run the FEP/WSF thus reducing GHG/CO2 emissions.
Are we really doing enough to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions anywhere?
Insufficient
amount of methane will still increase due to no "policing' on front end and removing organic
It doesn't matter how much you say you addressed the concern and got ways to deal with it you would never admit it that it doesn't work when it proves it doesn't
How is this good for the environment?
Still going to be generating gas as more vehicles and trash are delivered
If they work.
More, not less needs to be done to mitigate methane gas in our fight against climate change
This explanation clearly demonstrates how the FEP and WSF positions help divert methane producing products from the landfill.
The best way to keep these in check is by following the current procedures. Once the damage is done, harder to deal with
The fact that you even mention additional greenhouse gasses means that there will be more.
Trucking alone will add to green house gasses
It doesn’t matter, eventually the garbage will stink to high heaven it it’s sitting there rotting with more garbage being dumped there every day. The horrible stench from the landfill in the previous location is actually burned into my brain and I’d be beyond pissed for that to happen again basically in my backyard
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
With the elimination of the FEP/WSF, more composing material will end up in the wrong area of the facility. I know of several folks who do not separate their garbage correctly and the elimination of this process will only impact the operation and effect of this facility on the communities.
It's not a solid win. Just a different aporiach/similar to now. Stick with proven system.
More unsorted trash will create more ghg’s.
Not cinvinced Will it go back to the old way and the bad odor return to the immediate communities .
There should continue to be sorting of all waste to the landfill. This is what is needed to decrease the greenhouse gases. You are using this to save money. This directly impacts our community.
Still burning off the gas now?
It does not matter what you write in your statements. A contract is a contract and law biding citizens are not allowed gto change contracts when only one side want to do it. The only reason the dump was agreed to be in our area was because of the contract. Do not break your promise that was made.l t Od e
Would you like it if every time you went in your back yard it smelled like methane? You need to honor the 1999 agreement with the surrounding communities. Processing things less will not improve the smell, period.
Where are the organic causing the methane gas coming from? If this landfill is producing Methane gas than we certainly do require the Front end monitoring to continue. With global warming such an issue, Halifax needs to do all it can to decrease the production of Methane
More infor
I believe any additional waste going into the landfill will result in additional generation of greenhouse gases. You don’t anticipate this but you have no guarantee.
So less electricity so and more issues is a reason to shut it down. Come on
we live here - you likely do not; therefore we should not loose any reduction of greenhouse gasses.
Show me the research, not your interpretation of it.
You quantify the potential reduction of gases from less electricity consumption but do not quantify the potential “Small” increase from your expansion because you don’t want us to know.
As per the 1999 agreement, Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill”.
Some of your data is faulty and some of your statements are inaccurate...more like guesses at best,
Greenhouse gases will contineu to be emitted not only onsite but also by incraesed traffic to the site thsu rendering a concentration in this area and a contribution to the very issue we as a province and a country are trying to resolve.
says does not anticipate it to "greatly" increase, so it will increase. Does not quantify "greatly".
Sounds like the buck is being passed once again. This is all about saving money and not about that is best for the community!

Respondents within 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
Same as my previous comment
You have no issues providing data to support decommissioning, yet don't say quantitatively how much greenhouse gases are reduced through the use of FEP/WSF. This survey is full of bias towards decommissioning and does not present a balanced view of the situation.
My concern is related more to the odour of the emissions and its impact on nearby communities. I understand in terms of greenhouse gases this does not represent a significant increase.
Climate change is real , government is not
We need to continue working on Gases in the environment in this area.
The best measure is not removing the measures that already work.
This should not be considered so close to such a growing population. In 30 yrs who knows what this will have cause health wise
can't the methane gas be generated into electricity continue using the FEP/WSF
Closure of FEP/WSF will result in an increase decomposing organic materials and ultimately an increase in methane gas.
I don't think it's enough
The current approach is not working. I can frequently smell the landfill from my home. And if reducing greenhouse gasses is really a concern for you, install solar panels or wind turbines.
You didn't provide the upper limit of potential green house gasses for this change in the landfill.
The increase use of electricity is why you want to destroy the surrounding communities. It is insane. The survey is a mess and it incredibly biased
I don't have confidence in the sincerity of a biased report, written with the purpose of justifying deactivation of this part of the facility. The residents of this area were promised by the council of the day that front end sorting would be a permanent part of the Otter Lake landfill.
People do not sort their garbage well enough to remove the current measures in place. There will be an increase in the amount of organically that make it into the landfill. There are already days in which we can smell the Otter Lake dump from our homes, removing the current process will increase the smell in our community. This will have a negative impact on health, wellness and property values
Every little bit helps. Even if it is a small effect, it is still an effect that mitigates the release of greenhouse gasses. This is not the time to be taking these small steps for granted
Increased organic waste is going to increase all the problems associated with that.
Still don't believe it, we don't want Timberlea area to suffer like sack like dump. This community allowed the dump to come here for a specified period and specific procedures. How can you keep changing them?
No system is perfect.
we currently have a world class system, to shut it down because some people think it is no longer needed is cray, if you think that less is better, put it in your back yard.
The composting of organics in will greatly increase the greenhouse gas. This measure is will do little to contain it.
I do not trust your research
The majority of methane is released before the landfill is covered and is NOT measurable. The only solution is composting.
The report results were inconclusive and you are lying to the people
The explanations provided do not give me assurance that green house gas emissions will remain at an acceptable level.
The FEB/WSF is diverting items that cause methane gas. Don't try and fix what is not broken.
A promise was made to the community. Find a new site and stop trying to make this a dump
- more methane gas will be produced, and chemicals from things like batteries could be going straight into the landfill. - there are no guarantees the industrial, commercial and institutional sector (ICI) will continue to send its waste to sites outside the municipality.
Sounds like this survey is trying to sell the deactivation of the (FEP/WSF) instead of asking opinions.
we do not need more greenhouse gases
We don't want to deal with harmful toxins leaking in the air here. If the garbage doesn't come to this location we will not have to deal with these harmful gasses. Send it somewhere else. This area has been exhausted.
NS is quickly greening the grid (80% by 2030). It is very short sighted and a step in the wrong direction to remove this from a quickly greening grid - sighting GHG savings is VERy misleading.
No changes should be made
What is done with the gas that is collected? Hope it is not burned off into the air.
Any greenhouse gas increase is unacceptable. The offset in electricity is only relevant while our electricity is not green, an issue HRM could solve by buying green energy.
Do the right thing and look at alternative energy sources. The more not diverted the greater the potential for increased odour.
As we move to renewable energy, the extra electricity needed to run the FEP/WSF won't add more CO2 to the atmosphere
Seems like there is some kind of answer to these concerns but they really don't do much
I do not believe the dump has been handled properly and any addition to its current function will be disastrous.
I'd rather an innovative solution be found rather than simply shutting down the community protections.
during periods of temperature inversions we have noticed increased foul odours in the past two years
I don't believe you can do it and it will work
No significant change, who decides what is significant?
We should be removing anything that would produce gas from going into the site.
Although carbon offset might happen this will not reduce the potential for additional gas to be produced with the potential for increased smell, etc.
Find another way to offset the electricity usage - install solar panels or some other measures. There should not be an increase in greenhouse gases. If anything we should be continually striving to reduce the gases. These are our homes and our community. We take great pride in this place. It is devastating when you come out of your house or open your car door and get a whiff of the gases as it is
I believe you can always do better in this area.
We need to take all possible measures to reduce greenhouse gases since current research on climate change suggests this is negatively impacting the environment and our weather patterns
The province is moving toward using renewable energy, including solar and wind power. I worry that if this is deactivated, it will never come back online. When we're of coal and using renewables, are we going to reactivate the processor and save those gases? I'm guessing not. Let's keep that food out of the landfill and as the province moves toward green energy we'll save the gases in all areas.

Respondents within 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
We all know that as soon as the FEP/WSF is removed, the organic content in the garbage hauled to the site is going to increase. It is human nature to do what is easiest, and if there are no checks at the site people have no reason to separate the organics, especially if they don't live close to the facility and therefore won't be affected by all the increased odours as a result.
You can put a number to the saving of CO2 emission but no number to the increase
Mr. Savage would you like to move here and smell these gases or try to sell your house? I don't think so!
More organic waste means more decomposition and more greenhouse gases.
No, trade off is not a reduction. Rather we should also look for ways to reduce/replace electricity consumption.
Food waste that is not diverted by the FEP to the WSF for treatment will increase greenhouse gasses. Haligonians are living with the effects of climate change. This proposal to deactivate the FEP/WSF is an extremely irresponsible way of trying to save 2 million dollars.
The current systems do not mitigate the smell of the landfill. I live near exit 4 and we occasionally smell the landfill. I'm concerned this will happen more often, devaluing our property and making our community less attractive.
This is an issue that should be addressed by NS Environment and Climate Change. Maybe the money spent by the Mayor to attend attend COP 26 could help offset the costs of electricity for this process.
not what we agreed to when we agreed to landfill
Removal of the FEP/WSF will cause an increase of methane gas in the landfill. We need to take measures to reduce methane gas wherever possible.
Not everyone sorts their waste properly. HRM cannot stop that. Large apartments are going up every day and there is no way residents in these buildings properly separate waste. Even neighbours do not do this. This is one of my biggest concerns.
Not stabilizing material...
Trading one set of minimal problems for another set of maximum problems makes zero sense.
I am concerned with odours affecting our property values. I'm concerned HRM is going backwards on their promises to close this facility. And now aren't even wanting to use the world class system they have.
Self explanitory
The organics that would have been composted in the WSF will be taken to the landfill and dumped. They will decompose there.
Organic materials should never be buried in a landfill, they should be separated at the FEP and treated at a proper facility
Sorry, I don't trust your information.
Concerned you are not telling us everything
Deactivation not the agreement
mmitments.
gas is released before it gets in the landfill
With the lack or sorting unnecessary recycling could be missed creating more waste
Need to do everything we can to divert waste from landfills
Use the games to create electricity
do NOT deactivate the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
By deactivating the FEP and WSF more organic material will enter the landfill and cause more greenhouse effect
Not sure that is accurate
this does not factor in the new proposal.
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
Without the sorting, there will be more organic waste and materials getting put into the land fill. People are people and if they know they are not being watched, there will be an increase in organic matter as people won't give a hoot. Many feel recycling and composting are a complete waste of time and a great inconvenience. You will be only increasing an already bad situation.
People will put more organic sin garbage if they know it's not being sorted
Using acronyms and abbreviations does not allow me to understand this statement fully.
Electricity GHG comments redundant post 2030 (NS off coal). Expected increase in methane and plans to actively address (and fines for exceeding controls)? Plans to offset GHG increase with biosolids (for methane conversion) or trees (liquid leeching). Are savings to be used to proactively increase HRM education around improved recycling?
N
Deactivation creates more problems than it solves. Find a better way to support the power usage than shutting it off completely
Increase in volume to the site, increase in gas emissions!
It still projects an overall increase in greenhouse gas emissions. If the province is truly concerned with climate change, reducing our ability to sort and manage waste while increasing emissions is a step backwards.
Any increase is bad
by deactivating the FEP facility there is a greater chance that methane activity will increase due to the additional organic matter being added to the landfill.
Deactivating the FEP/WSP service to save money is an insult to humanity. How dare you put such a valid and worthy tool to pasture, simply to save money. Your study of this proposed deactivation is bogus and biased, as is this ridiculous survey.
More garbage and removal of current processes will impact all areas of landfill in a negative manner.
Not interested
Processing organic material in geological areas has too much potential to pollute air and water.
Increased ammount of gasses will be produced.
No reductions... if it's working so we'll you want to scale back ..no keep it as is.. no to reducing
Closing the facility is only a means of saving the city money. It needs to remain as is.
This will only take away part of the problem. How are you keeping the stink away ?
The use of the adjectives like somewhat, or not greatly do not convince me that this intervention will protect the environment or reduce greenhouse gases and help prevent global warming.
Food waste should be sent to compost instead of the landfill regardless of size. A head of lettuce is bigger than 15 cm but could be diverted
Wasn't supposed to be able to smell the waste either but we do.
More landfill more greenhouse gases. Find an alternative electricity.

Respondents within 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
Deactivating will nothelp
Even if a decrease in power is proposed to decrease gas emissions, it will violate the agreement of maintaining the FEP/WSF for the surrounding communities.
There is no additional measures really being done
The FEP/WSF will no longer be in effect & the main thrust of this exercise is saving money over environment.
GHG reduction...smoke and mirrors...the community agreed to the current configuration...did I mention Sackville..
WSF output and organics should not be buried in the landfill
I have read before the FEP/WSP process accelerates the decomposition process and gas output. If that is true, any organic item only has a specified potential energy. If this is accerated we should have a shorter tie for treatment overall. Reducing long term costs and returning the site to nature in less than 50 years after closure.

Respondents within 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
I have lived in the area near the landfill fo[redacted]ears. Only notice oder a few times. "potential for odour issues at the landfill may be increased by operating the FEP/WSF", the word "may be" doesn't make want to get rid of the FEP/WSF.
HRM is one of the fastest growing municipalities in Canada. How can you maintain the landfill disposal site as small as possible. More garbage will bring more odour!
I don't think this will be enough to mitigate the smell
Again, we shouldn't even be having this discussion. There was the guarantee and promises made when the original site was given the go-ahead.
Again people in the city do not probably seperate their waste correctly. I use to live in fairview where green bins were never used by the appartment/ townhouse buildings near me. Meaning all the compost would go in the black garbage bags. FEP/WSP is needed to stop the wrong doers. Not all people hold the environment to a high standard and dont want to be bother with it due to ignorance.
Not enough
I believe this will not provide enough protection from odours
Depending on the weather we endure odours now.
the option is to increase the number of days curing in the wsf from the current 21 days
I don't believe that the mitigation will work
This will not alleviate the odour. Measures will reduce odours but I am confident it will not remove all odours.
Both the description of the effects and their mitigation is vague and not based on evidence. How do we know the proposal will work?
By shutting down the FEP/WSF will make the area stink. we need to deal with our waste and the FEP/WSF is the best solution.
I think some of these been in place and often can smelll the lanfil
Your standards are a minimal approach to a controlled situation. Are your standards going to become more regulated in the future?
I do not believe, or have confidence in, the populace to properly care and separate their individual waste streams. The front end processor provides an extra inspection point to observe potential infractions and mitigate illegal or inappropriate dumping of wastes in the landfill. Once the front end processor is removed from service, it is foolish to believe it will ever be reinstated
I can smell the landfill coming in the 103 when it is damp out so more organic equal more smell
Odour has not been a problem with the current set up. Leave it as is
There is enough odor coming from that place now DON'T CREATE ANOTHER MONSTER.
The report is inconclusive
Stop trying to change the permitted operation. Also good luck trying to permit a future landfill if it is demonstrated that the city will try and get out of their permitting commitments as soon as it is convenient to them.
n
that sounds like more lies
Existing measures are satisfactory for stabilized waste; there is no evidence that they will be successful if the waste isn't stabilized.
When there are more organic sin the ground, there will be more odors. Will all these existing methods be continued or stopped to save more money in a few years?
Same comments for all boxes. Promises are broken by government.
Proactive monitoring? Then what. How is that a mitigation process?
You can smell the land fill as it stands now, eliminating FEP will not help the smell
Without the added protection of the FEP/WSF these mitigation measures are no guarantee. Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill. Keep the FEP/WSF active.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
Measures in place or not, once sorting stops at the landfill an increase in organic matter will cause an increase in odor. One person's Greenbin can smell rotten on its own letnalone loads of matter entering one condensed landfill site
I have lived here ove[redacted]ears in the area. I have noticed the odours on certain days!
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active"
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
The risk is just too great to our property values. When the odours aren't contained, are you also going to give us the difference when we have to sell our properties at a reduced value???
It sounds like there was 3rd party report when this went into production, it sounds like there should be another for the turning down of the process.
I don't feel confident that there will be no increase in odours. It seems counterintuitive to me that you can increase the organics and not increase the odours.
If more truck loads of waste will be added to the landfill, it seems logical that an increase in odour will occur.
As long as the said approach is carried out.
Come on , odour monitoring is not acceptable. We do not want more issues in this area that the landfill causes
Again why do this when the current system is tried and true
On warm summer days we can smell the facility in the summer time
You are unable to quantify the increase in odor and, therefore, unable to ascertain that your current measures will remain effective.
I diasagree
in summer on humid days the stink is bad you have to close the windows.
The community agreed and was told no compost waste to be used facility when it opened, Keep your word!
Go visit the Sackville site it still smells. On hot summer days we still have door in Timberlea. This will only get worse with this plan
It's bad enough having to smell weed all of the time from the idiots around. I don't need to smell the fucking dump as well.
The FEP & WSF were critical components of the contract the communities accepted. The tactics used by HRM in attempt to remove the FEP & WSF are abhorrent and not in good faith. The format of this "survey" is a disgusting reminder of the lengths policy makers will take.
Additional organic matter in the landfill will cause an increase in odours
So you proactively monitor for odors. That's not a mitigation.
I do not live close enough to smell the facility, but I care about the people who do.
Why would I be comfortable with more odors? Would you?

Respondents within 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
Organic Organic waste should never be buried in a landfill. The FEP/WSF should always be operated at our landfill.
It smells like rotten eggs everyday it is damp. Disgusting
The otter lake facility already generates unpleasant odours on any given day. It is so unpleasant at times, particularly in hot humid weather, that we have to close our windows. No increase in organic waste !!!
Residents in the area already have problems with odours. It is not possible to add organics to the landfill and not increase odours. Claiming there are no off-site effects is ridiculous. HRM is trying to pacify residents with this survey and justify their plan.
Organic waste does not belong in a landfill
It will create more odor not properly sorting garbage especially organics from residents garbage
Existing approach will not be enough if changes are made and you know it. Maybe you would like a house next to an untreated dump??
If untreated the odours in the summer will become unbearable mostly during summer months to the community
We all know odours will increase. "Maintaining as small as possible", "proactive monitoring". Again, 0 definitive actions as to what will be done to mitigate odours.
changes to existing procedures will change the smell levels
I've lived here [redacted]years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
theres still going to be a smell regardless. we live in a nice place dont ruin it
Same as last answer. It stinks now....removing the FEP will just make it worse.
Why would I be ok with adding more than inert material to the waste management like was agreed to
Previous odor issues occurred at this site that impacted the community.
You have not convinced me at all
It all sounds ok but will the odour travel more in our warmer climate. I think probably, so I have my concerns.
Again, this is a solution that comes from your change that creates a problem in the first place. We have not had problems with odours since the current decomposition is working. This entire survey is leading respondents to approve a measure that you want approval for ... it is biased in its approach.
There will be more than odours it will impact the lands around it
We will bury it faster just means you're accepting that waste that shouldn't go into the facility will end up there without the FEP. This creates a new problem and these "solutions" just address some of the most noticeable symptoms.
You say you'll continue with your current measures regardless, i.e. nothing changes - yet you're cutting the machines that reduce offensive waste. It doesn't add up. There will be more offensive waste, so logically, more odours - and even if those don't reach human nostrils they remain a powerful attractant to wildlife, increasing contamination of the environment.
You can't predict the future. Based on other landfill sites there will undoubtedly be smells. Please don't make guesses as if they are the truth.
The mitigation measures are not working very well now so I can't see how it will get better.
My concern is that it will take far more years to break down & if/when you restart the frontend processor, it will have already been buried and smell.
Does not explain what will happen if the monitoring shows more order then it's being taken care of with present situation.
I do not believe that there is no potential for increased odours offsite.
na
Discontinuing the front end processor will result in articles not suited for the landfill to be disposed of there and the odours will increase and they could be hazardous to people's health
Easier said then done and you don't have to live here
Please stop I do not want a landfill near my home.
Moderately reassuring, but really quite speculative.
as small as possible is a very relative term and does not fill me with confidence
Broken promise to the community.
During certain times, weather related, you can smell the dump!!!
Heard the same store before when lived close to a facility in Ontario, and made little to no difference on hot windy days. And we have a lot of both.
We hope that all the above measures will continue to mitigate odours but Councils have been known to cut costs in the past - what guarantees do we have that these measures will continue?
HELL NO. really don't care what consulting firm says. I live here. i smell it often on heavy mornings. nothing said or written about proposed changes can alter that.
Again lies
How is this environment.
These measures are incorporated in St.John's NL city dump. They don't work. When the wind blows in the right direction the whole city stinks. It's awful.
Organic matter that is in waste will make our community smell on hot days
It will turn into a Sackville Landfill. Stinky and rodent infested.
No changes should be made to current practices. It is rare that we smell the landfill in my area of Timberlea. However waste is being treated now must be working well. No changes would be of benefit in that regard.
I lived [redacted]before moving here and the stink from Robin Hood Bay dump was awful throughout the city. Damp days I could not leave the house because the smell was so bad.
No, again, what they are doing currently is working, remove it and it can be a totally different experience. There was a reason these checks and balances were put in place
The fact that you mention additional odours means that there will be more.
When I lived in Timberlea a few years ago, and at times when I drive by on the highway, you can smell the facility as it is today. I can't imagine it will get any better with the proposed changes.
To many variables involved
There's no way to mask the smell when garbage will continuously be dropped in there
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
BLT is a growing and thriving community. Reducing a process in this system that is already proven is and mistake and concern to the community. Odour is one of the major impacts to our communities and it effects quality of life. It will occur as the wrong garbage will end not sorted correctly.
Not an improvement. Just more risk.

Respondents within 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 are basically telling us to smell garbage all day and be okay with it. If you want to have this put in place- it needs to be in a secluded area with NO community in the surrounding area.
More unsorted trash will create doors.
I'm sorry, but I highly doubt that any of these changes are going to help with odors being emitted, and living "downwind" of this area as someone who spends a great deal of time outdoor I do NOT need to be smelling this crap at my house. I do not want any current/future children in this area also being affected by what will likely be reduced air quality that would be the result of these changes
Again, without the FEP to prevent an increase of organic materials into the landfill there will be additional generation of decomposition gases having unpleasant odors. Odors from the existing landfill can already be noticed on occasion during the summer. Any increase is absolutely unnacceptable.
Smell is already a problem
The sorting of waste needs to continue for our communities environment.
Burying food waste will always rot and produce an odour not all food waste goes into green bins
Honour the contract.
I dont want my community to smell like a landfill.
Again this issue is a result of organics in the landfill. Definitely seems to me we need to continue with FEP to determine what organics are going into the landfill and how best to reduce that amount.
Moreibfro
You anticipate the odours will increase if the FEP/WSF continues but what about the additional items going directly in the landfill that would normally be sorted out.
Sorry but it never worked at Sackville despite all the promises. The current model is working and has been agreed on.
More organics = more smell
I have personally toured this facility and see the value the processor adds , consultants make assumptions and we will not know the full impact until it is potentially too late.
It is easy to say that there will not be an increase in ordors - but what happens if this does not turn out to be the case - Timberlea loses and no one will care - it will be done.
Again, show me the research, not your interpretation of it. Monitoring for odours is not the same as preventing odours
More fresh waste = more gas. Your have not proposed any additional measures.
We were promised no landfill, I don't believe your information regarding odours
If odour is an issue then why not moved the landfill out of any residential area . Brunello estates will have a hard time selling property with garbage smell 24/7 not to mention people playing golf and the children inhaling this in the neighborhood
FEP/WSF is a requirement as per the 1999 Agreement. I do not believe that by removing these two systems and increased organic matter and materials. That we will not have an issue with odour and gases.
That's nonsense
There has been no evidence of noxious smells from the landfill in my area since it's inception. You're grasping at straws to get the public on your side I don't believe anything that comes from Dillon. They lied prior to the installation of the landfill 20 years ago, and they're probably lying now.
The site odours have been an issue and will remain so under the current construct.
Used in other areas that still generate odors
while it mentions the current system allows for quicker production of landfill gas, it does not discuss whether the amount of total time the gas is produced is the same, shorter or longer.
If it is NOT broken stop thinking it is better to put money in your pockets instead of looking after the promises made when this was opened.
As a long term resident we know this is going to increase the horrible smell that comes from landfills which is why we didn't want it to begin with. The current process speeds of the process and also helps decompose any smells faster. We were promised to not have this becomr a landfill! Again unacceptable!
Same as my previous comment
We already experience odours during certain weather conditions. I cannot see how this could possibly get better with current measures .
There have been incidents in the past where odours impacted the community and this is not addressed in the mitigation plan.
Your proposal stinks
You state that the WSF helps to start the microbio process before heading to the landfill - I am concerned that without this kickstart the odour will increase. am concerned that this odour will have a negative impact on the community being built in this area and the use of the outdoor spaces including the bluffs.
About once a year we can smell the facility for some reason. It is disgusting. If this worsened people will not move here, housing prices would decrease and this area would lose the hot growing family orientated area it is now.
On some days especially summer , we get the odour
The best measure is not removing the measures that already work.
Again I will comment on your lack of basic intelligence. How about you sort the garbage and not make a landfill you swine.
There are already fouls odors coming from the landfill. It's enough to wake you sick to your stomach. It was promised when it was first put there that odors, rodents etc would not be a problem... what's going to change? Nothing except our property value. Thanks Hrm
You can already smell it as is, it's just going to get worse
what about a biofilter system to eliminate the odour?
I don't believe it,
Management of future controls regarding commercial and residential waste being sent to Otter Lake cannot be gauranteed - as an example what if Chester stops accepting our commercial waste.
No on or off site impacts due to odours have been identified but that does not mean they will not occur. We do not want to live close to a stink. These changes are not in the best interest of the community.
We get terrible smell now! Can't see that changing.
There will be a huge impact on small the larger the landfill gets. It's way too close to residential areas to solve any issues
I can freqnetly smell the landfill from (and sometimes even inside) my home.
We currently experience odor. The listed methods sound like status quo, and therefore a net loss for us residents.
You are wrong. This change to save a measily 2 Million a year will definitely create odours. The FEP/WSF was part of the agreement in putting Otter Lake in. We are all concerned about the increased odour in our community that will definitely with this mistake when you force the change. You don't live here and don't care but we all feel cheated

Respondents within 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
I don't have confidence in the sincerity of a biased report, written with the purpose of justifying deactivation of this part of the facility. The residents of this area were promised by the council of the day that front end sorting would be a permanent part of the Otter Lake landfill.
I think this mitigation is insufficient
The odours will only be worse and spread into the community with more organic waste getting into the landfill with the removal of the current system. If no addition measure are taken then the surrounding community will be negatively impacted by the smells.
You promised the community to front end recycle, I expect you keep your commitment.
I am sure the same things were said at the sackville, ns dump. How did that turn out. Easy for people to change rules when they don't live in the area. They want to keep it at otter lake as long as possible so it doesn't move to their community next
I'm not sure that is enough given the proposed changes
I don't believe it.
no one really knows what effect the proposed changes will have, we have no reason to believe that the existing approach will be able to deal with a different situation if changes are made.
It is still going to stink and no one wants to enjoy the smell of garbage while they are outside in their yard with their children it is not safe
We have had issues with odors in the past. Eliminating part of the process to contain them will only increase the odors.
We once and awhile can smell it as it is now and if we lose the measures in place it could be more often
My nose does not lie! I have smelled the difference.
This explanation implies the microbial treatment process will be slowed down. That doesn't sound like efficient treatment of the landfill. We're bringing in a lot of new residents to the area, increasing demand.
I can still smell the landfill on some days
The by-products of solid waste deposited in a landfill has adverse effects on the surrounding environment and humans living closer to landfill sites. Sacrificing human living conditions, safety and the environment for money is WRONG.
No assurances provided regarding odours which currently can be very disagreeable especially during warm and humid weather.
There are still odours despite current mitigation procedures. I do not believe with less waste management that there will be a reduction in the odours.
I have visited the site and had an extensive tour through the HRM Master Composter/Recycler program. The FEP/WSF works. There was minimal odor. You haven't told us where or what the "daily landfill cover" will be. It is not necessary. The current system works.
I don't believe or trust HRM to have my best interests
The solution is to find a new site and build it however you like. Our community has held up out end of the deal and rather than putting in the work to find a new location you want to take off the FEP, thurn it into a dump and say to hell with our community and the agreement?
If this change is supposed to reduce the smell, why hasn't it already been implemented? There have been many days in the past 5-10 years when the smell from Otter Lake has made eating a meal difficult because the air is just too rank.
The processor and stabilization facility are crucial to the surrounding communities' agreement to host the landfill because they mitigated the risks of pests, environmental degradation and smells.
Soft words such as 'may' should be excluded or replaced with factual evidence based on current conditions and other facilities that do not have FEP/WSF.,
You're asking us to trust you, and I just don't.
There are odours from the landfill many days around the 102 Brunelleo area
less sorting means more odour
The changes WILL increase odor, as noted above. The plan is just to maintain current measures. Will the FEP be re-instated if there is odors in the community? I doubt it. Since HRM seems intent on breaking the original agreement in order to save money, I doubt very much they will reinstate it.
Just an additional odour to deal with in the area, bad enough we deal with "pot" all the time.
If the garbage doesn't come here will not require this type of mitigation that has the potential for failure. This will never be 100% efficient and will fail, we will have to deal with lowered property values and smells high taxes and we don't want it. Send it somewhere else.
Every facility of this type that I have ever had the pleasure of working near has had significant odor issues. We can smell the dump occassionally now - was this on-going issue brought to the attention of the Consultants? It is not mentioned in their assessments so it would appear that they were not provided with this critical bit of information.
No changes should be made
The FEP prevents severe odour causing waste from entering the landfill.
"Proactive monitoring" doesn't happen
Bad smell and rats in Timberlea
Odor is already a problem so I lack faith in the reassurance that it will be monitored and mitigated.
There will be more downdrifting odors if these two parts are deactivated
Residents can smell the dump already whenever the temperature goes up. Why would you add to an existing problem that has never been managed properly.
If this is the case, why not send the stabilized waste offsite?
we have noticed increased odours lately. especially during foggy nights and temperature inversions
inadequate. this is bullshit porpaganda, not a survey
I have concerns about the whole change and once it gets screwed up then we deal with it!
Stuff rots, it smells
WSF stabilization process has worked for years and should continue
If front end processing reduces the time for materials to break down, it will take longer for I'll effects of its removal to be found. By that time it will be too late, even if front end processing restarts to deal with the issue.
Sorry. See my last comment as it applies here and not so much with the last question
Have you smelled it?
I just don't trust what is said here
Again too short term
Even with the current measures, we smell the landfill at times
You have no idea the effects more organics in otterlake will have.

Respondents within 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
I'm sorry but it's already pretty smelly around our neighbourhood on mornings that it is cloudy and rainy. I just find it hard to believe that we're going to increase the amount of food in the landfill and that won't have a negative impact on the smell. If the plan is to use existing measures, the smell will be worse because the existing measures do not take care of the smell as it is.
Deactivation will result in increased odours. Sever odours that once becomes an prominent will be next to impossible to get rid of. Their are dense communities within 1 km of the plant. Move it to a more isolated areas or keep the existing system in place
Dillon's study is flawed. It supports what HRM staff and Mirror want to promote as they are the ones who paid for it. An impartial study should have been performed for someone other than the two stakeholders whose only concern is saving money. Remember how Sackville ended up, a disaster.
Look at history! Our grandchildren will be dealing with this issue all because you want to save money!
More organic waste means more decomposition and more odour.
If odors do occur I have little faith that measures will be taken to combat them
We can already smell it from kilometers away on a hot day. And as days get hotter, it will get worse.
It already stinks
more decomposing matter, more stench!
Need to address odors quicker
The current systems do not mitigate the smell of he landfill. We can smell it at our place near exit 4.
The concern is that with the knowledge of no FEP more organic and/or chemical materials will find their way into the landfill and create odors and risks to water tables etc. How is this being mitigated?.. not addressed in report.
No removing these pre treatments will lead to increased odor as stated numerous times by consultants
It's still going to smell
not what we agreed to when we agreed to landfill
The removal of the FEP/WSF could potentially cause more odor from increased organic waste. We don't live close to the landfill but spend time in residential areas near the landfill.
I absolutely do not believe what Dillon consultants are saying regarding doors. Makes absolutely no sense. Why are there smells from every landfill? I have smelled Otter Lake, usually on foggy calm mornings when the breeze is in the right (wrong) direction I can smell it. Proposed changes would be horrific!
The woods are filled with garbage that was ment for the dump
On days when the smell can reach the surrounding communities, what will that do when the proposed changes happen? It'll get worse for us with no thought.
Have reported odours in the past and have smelled the landfill as recently as summer 2021. This issue will only increase or have the mechanics already been introduced and this survey is simply to make it appear that we have a voice?
I have lived here [redacted] years and do not want my property values affected. The worst thing about this neighborhood is HRM continuously refusing to honour their promises of closing this site
Dumps stink, regardless of what you are saying. Ive lived near and driven by dumps in far more financially sophistcated provinces than Nova Scotia and still smelled them. You people should be ashamed of yourselves.
Rotting organics stinks. More rotting organics stinks more.
Odour should be decreased by removing organic material before they enter the landfill
with the FEP in place i would expect the waste to be concentrated and the pipes would be able to control the gas collection. without the FEP the waste will be wide spread and collection will not be as efficient. plus i have no faith in any politician or the company to restart the FEP.
This is my main concern. If you actually can eliminate the odours, I would be pleased.
We already have odor problems with the right weather conditions
Deactivation not the agreement
mmitments.
hydrogen gas
I have to live in this area. Again you have a responsibility to the neighborhood to do what you need to do to keep the odour down. It's too late if things go wrong with the deactivatirong a
Not having it sorted will create more odours as compost items will be unnecessarily but in the ground instead of green bin
Because they're not really good ideas
We currently deal with sulcus smells from the landfill. This change will make the smells worse
I'm skeptical. More organic waste that is not separated means more odour.
Not sure about that
do NOT deactivate the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
Their are times in the summer months our area does get doors from this facility especially in a hot day.
We had odours before when there were problems at the landfill
As long as it's not an issue
There is no odours because the FEP and WSF is in place why deactivating FEP and WSF
More garbage more odor.
An increase in organic waste will smell. Period.
There is no guarantee there will be no additional ordors. For a $2 million savings, why risk it.
The mitigation measures seem to have their own environmental issues
this is hypothetical and unproven
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
Have you ever lived near a landfill? It sticks all the time and someone somewhere in the landfill area will be smelling it. We have been fortunate that the current process has minimized the "smelly" days but they have never been eliminated!
I am located in Glengarry Estates and have had to deal with odors from the landfill before. It is disgusting and will lower our home value if this happen!!! If this landfill odor returns, is HRM prepared to purchase my home at FULL market value BEFORE odors start to pollute our community again? if you think this won't happen, then your answer should be "yes"!
Won't work
You are attempting to turn the agreed on landfill into a new sackville dump. We're going to save money by deactivating the fep and wsp. We will have no idea what's actually going into the dump now, but no worries, we will just "mitigate" it all. Give me a break.

Respondents within 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 assumption that existing processes will be sufficient to handle the increase in organic waste deposited I believe is flawed.
More than current maintenance is required
It will still smell
N
I don't believe the measures planned will mitigate the smell in our communities
hasn't worked elsewhere
Deactivation will knowingly create odors that will effect numerous communities - how the fuck is that acceptable? Shame on you for being okay with poisoning our air! One of your solutions is to monitor it more? I can smell bullshit already
Unhappy with odors now which we were promised would never happen.
I don't believe that the changes will not impact the smell
The smell will get worse
Absolutely concerned. BIGGEST concern,, AND will participate and act by whatever means it takes to prevent these changes. Don,t know where you or WHAT your so-called "Enviromentalists " say.
Deactivation does not make any sense
Sounds like masking, not actually dealing with the issue of added odour
There will still be more smells
odours from this facility have been experienced in the past and they have had a great impact to the quality of life in the surrounding community. If it aint broke don't fix it.
This is untrue and in the past when the system went down there was a marked increase in odour in the neighbouring communities
There is no guarantee that the information you are providing is accurate
No matter what you do, you will not be able to control foul smells from the facility. You can't control them now, and there is less chance of controlling them if you change the current system.
I see no reason to change how the facility is run... removing any process changes the outcome and don't give that dribble shit you just trying to scoop some money out of somewhere.. stop wringing us out... we're dry!
We were promised the highest level of environmental protection as agreement to have this in our community. Any thing less is wrong!
If this is the case, why is there still so much odour around if the wind is in the right direction?
Sure hope it works if you won't listen to residents concerns. We are not happy.
Whatever yiu have done or propose isn't working
This is always an issue and always ends in a serious issue of odour!
Rotting orgnanics mixed with trash smells abolutely disgusting. Would you want to live near that?
Deactivation will not stop odours!!
Still dont believe you. Its all about lining pockets at the expense of tax payers
The FEP/WSF mechanism is in place for a reason. Stop trying to sell a line that there is no impact to deactivating it. A 'proactive' plan to monitor for odours does not prevent odours. They will still be in my backyard!
When moving to the area ove[redacted] ago, the odour that came from the landfill was intense and prevented us going outside on certain days. In the fast years there has been no odour due to the improvements made at the landfill
You can't put rose in crap and say there that did it
What are the proactive monitoring measures. Just saying you are going to be proactive does not exactly deal with concerns
It will definitely smell worse!!
As it is currently maintained, we are stable with reducing the amount of odour from the landfill. Eliminating any measure puts all of our quality of life, property values and pride in community in jeopardy. I am significantly opposed to trialling this and finding out that the mitigation efforts were inadequate.
It's not enough and I don't believe it.
There were incidents of putrid air emanating from the facility & I believe your proposals to mitigate this will not be affective.
More garbage that doesn't belong in the landfill will smell...like a few years ago when the rancid smell reached our house...
There are days in the summer where you already get a smell. Take away processing equipment that is reducing the smell to what we have now and it will only get worst
This will devalue my house, make more problems.
i don't believe it possible to mitigate all odours
Why would I take your word that there would be no more smells. At least at this point we know what to expect but what if it is worse...once this has been put into place good luck ever getting it reversed if need be
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
WSF output and organics should not be buried in the landfill
If these are removed..there Will be odors. Who wants to live next to this?
I find it hard to believe that with such a drastic change in processing there will be no increase in odour.
Works good now with ocasional odours. However we have no gurantee our site wont stink like others that do not have an FEP/WSF. Things work great now. "LEAVE OTTER LAKE ALONE"

Respondents within 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 can monitor the water for quality but in reality the damage is already done by the time you detect it. If something happens no one can predict how long it will take to fix the problem if it is even able to be fixed. Water is sacred and our community would be in huge trouble if we lost it.
You will not be able to keep the landfill disposal area as small as possible - more people more garbage more problems!
Sigh, just stop. It's terrifying having to address so many issues with this expansion. Makes me even more angry that this is even being proposed.
So it can be monitoring and controlled with the current use of the FEP/WSP system in place. Have a study been conducted to confirm with the added waste being dumped can the aging system still be able to handle the increase that will occur.
Not enough being done
I am worried about mercury in lightbulbs.
the otter lake facility had been charged with surface water contamination reaching the test well. There will be an increased leakage of foul liquids from the many trucks proceeding to the face of the cell. There is no assurance provided of increased test monitoring wells along this roadway. along this
Having visited the site I see what efforts are being made to protect environment. I am concerned that will change.
Insuffient evidence is presented. How can we decide whether there will be no change. Provide some data.
By not have a FEP/WSF we risk polluting the ground water and destroying places like the bluff trail.
Sceptical of these solutions
I do not believe, or have confidence in, the populace to properly care and separate their individual waste streams. The front end processor provides an extra inspection point to observe potential infractions and mitigate illegal or inappropriate dumping of wastes in the landfill. Once the front end processor is removed from service, it is foolish to believe it will ever be reinstated
I'm not convinced we can correctly forecast the impact and would prefer not to go the trial and error route
What happens when it is too late and this place contaminates all of our ground water. What will be the excuse then.
Contaminated water may still leach into nearby watersheds.
n
how come if I answer yes you don't try to change my mind
No collection system is perfect.
Broken promises
Without the added protection of the FEP/WSF these mitigation measures are no guarantee. Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill. Keep the FEP/WSF active.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
Too many lakes in the area to be affected.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
This is not an acceptable remedy
There will be seepage...there is always seepage. Unavoidable even with the best intentions. Once it starts its very difficult to stop.
Compromising the groundwater is a major concern. To date there has been no problem. No need for a change if things are woking.
Not screen what goes into the landfill will change what is deposited here, and a study should be completed.
It is fine to monitor but monitoring won't prevent a leak and an increase in what goes in to the dump will increase the repercussions of a leak. You cannot guarantee that there won't be a leak so you need to do everything possible to reduce the potential damage from a leak if one occurs.
With increased waste added to the landfill, in combination with climate change (increase in rainfalls etc.), the potential for a great increase in leachate is highly probable and may not be sufficiently covered by the current leachate system.
Otter Lake is beside a lake and river, so any contamination can go far and wide into wells.
Will there be additional leachate? This information is not provided.
Not enough being done
Your wells need to be set up closer to people properties to see how it's impacting the drinking water as well
Again, you are not able to quantify the impact. This solution monitors - it does not prevent. This is an unacceptable risks.
You are answering issues with your interpretation only
what was promised in the 1990 is not being followed i remenber the sackville dump and the foot draging on closeing it.
Trust is a big factor and I have very little
The FEP & WSF were critical components of the contract the communities accepted. The tactics used by HRM in attempt to remove the FEP & WSF are abhorrent and not in good faith. The format of this "survey" is a disgusting reminder of the lengths policy makers will take.
Increased organic matter in the landfill will cause an increase in leachate in ground water
Organic Organic waste should never be buried in a landfill. The FEP/WSF should always be operated at our landfill.
We don't want this in our community anymore
I have little faith in this system or the promise that it will always protect our ground water quality. How can I trust any of these promises given that these proposed changes are broken promises in themselves i.e. the landfill will never become a dump !
Organic waste does not belong in a landfill
You won't know until it's too late my water is tested on my dime therefore is not tested on a regular basis
This was not designed for the extra leachate that will be produced.
Must happen and continue to happen very often to ensure water quality
Great that it will be monitored, what will be done to remediate?
by allowing compostable materials and no sorting - you change the existing conditions. More risk
I've lived here [redacted] years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
Removing the current system increases the probability of contamination which may be handled by the the current system. Why take that chance

Respondents within 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 have not convinced me at all!
How quickly would it be known if these protections are not working properly? Is it worth risking our groundwater? It is not to me.
Given the dishonesty of the approach you are proposing and the fact that you are changing the terms of reference that was originally utilized to gain initial approval, I am not inclined to blithely accept your assurances about water quality not being impacted by your proposed changes.
What if there is a breakdown of this collection system? Will added contaminants result in higher costs for leachate processing?
Often to achieve adequate risk mitigation, a multi-pronged approach is needed. Where you see redundancies as a "waste of money" or an "opportunity to cut costs", as a software developer, I see redundant measures to protect critical systems as vital to stay protected. You are compounding risks by putting more untreated waste into the ground. It is unwise to do so.
It is ludicrous to assume that removal of the FEP will have no negative impact on the water and environment. Do you think we were all born yesterday?
Too vague to determine.
the photo of the monitoring system does NOT instill confidence in a state of the art monitoring process!
The existing landfill is already passed it's planned life span, so I still have concerns about impacts
na
Removing the front end processor will result in wrong materials going into the landfill and even hazardous wastes which could get into the ground water.
What difference does this make if you can change you mind. Trust is earned and so far you have little on this subject. Only going to be here 25 years should have none that was a lie! Now why should I trust anything you say
Again all your explanations are to decrease the risk. Not to completely eliminate it
I don't understand from your explanation how this will actually handle the increased risk of groundwater impact from the deactivation
Broken promise to the community.
I am on a well, with no other means for water.
If the above photo is a good example of the condition of the existing Groundwater Monitoring Wells, it doesn't fill me with confidence that these will do their job successfully in the future.
cute picture; electrical tape and a little plastic tubing. certainly professional and confident
BS lies
Close by rivers and lakes will be destroyed from runoff.
My question is how can you keep the landfill as small as possible if you are not going to do the sorting that is taking place today? Backup your statement to keep the landfill small statement. Exactly how do you propose to keep the landfill as small as it is right now without sorting as you do now?
Just because you say something will not cause issues doesn't mean it won't. The place I grew up is full of cancer because of gov lies about dumping
If things are dumped here that shouldn't be, it can create issues
There will have to be additional degradation of groundwater quality with your plan.
Just no. The proposed changes were not part of the agreement. Stop trying to justify it by conducting a Bias survey
I don't trust collecting or moving this liquid around
Please provide the actual.osodrwork on the ground water testing. Transparency please.
Can't trust the government's word, they say they're going to do a lot of things they break their promises on...this landfill is a low text example. It's not even supposed to still be up and running in this location yet here we are, legal contract ignored
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
Again, reducing the sorting of materials will impact the quality of the landfill.
There will be leakage into the environment with unsorted and increased amounts of trash.
I grew up near Harrietsfield... sorry if I do not fully believe that all measures will be taken to not screw up the groundwater
Duct tape and zip ties are part of the monitoring system?
Contract must remain in place.
How often is the groundwater being tested?
What is the composition of the leachate? How can we decrease the amount of leachate?
More infro
Any additional leachate will require additional transportation and additional costs. This results in more trucking in the area, more air pollution, more noise pollution and more wear and tear on our roadways.
If the system fails in the slightest there is a problem. Hazardous waste has ruined the water quality of Five Island Lake for years, some things are not worth any risk.
How often does the temporary holding pond currently get filled? What is its capacity? What is the plan when both current systems get overfilled?
More waste will have more leachate and cause more trucking to the treatment plant. More pollution.
Again. NO Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill". It should NOT be mixed. We change the balance which was very much researched, and we will have chemicals and toxins in our waters.
I'm not sure that I trust the monitoring that is being done
How can you possibly back up this information? There has never been a problem with the FEP in place. Now you want to take it away to save two million dollars while trying to reassure us that there's nothing to be concerned about. Do you think we're all stupid????
The site is elevated which increases the risk of contaminated groundwater affceting resdeints' supply. It's too late once it beomces problem. The recent issue in Iqaluit highlights how easily this can happen adn go undetected and unaddressed. The history of Shelbourne water supply contamination also highlights this concern.
It will absolutely affect our land water including polluting our lakes and streams we're going to see constant runoff from this landfill and no amount of pre-planning is going to stop it from happening all of your pre-planning for this project are unacceptable and not what we were promised just shameful
Same as my previous comment
Once again, a very one sided picture. What about discussing the "what ifs" of removing a sorting system to reduce the introduction of hazardous waste into the landfill system?
Can't trust government

Respondents within 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 pipe system cannot be guaranteed to not fall into disrepair and for leeching to occur in ground and in lakes surrounding the area
I know people in the area have high Iron levels and are not able to drink there water. This is an issue for sure with Lakes in the area.
Not a large enough survey zones
The best measure is not removing the measures that already work.
There is not a 100% guarantee that I'll effects from ground water would not affect our community. That is my concern
It has to go somewhere
Climate change is resulting in higher/prolonged rainfalls which will eventually overwhelm temporary holding ponds designed for high flows.
Shit runs downhill! It's going in no matter what you do.
Regular monitoring is fine but what happens when we have a massive contamination???
A promise was made the the comminity of Timberlea and now the city is trying to break it.
No. Please provide the details on what an upgraded solution would be.
We all know you are going to do it anyways and this survey is just to say you "consulted the public". So not even sure why we are waisting out time but no one in the community is supportive of it. Just a few government officials trying to balance a budget at the expense of the public. Next step is a class action lawsuit when these issues hit which will cost us you more than you save
I don't have confidence in the sincerity of a biased report, written with the purpose of justifying deactivation of this part of the facility. The residents of this area were promised by the council of the day that front end sorting would be a permanent part of the Otter Lake landfill.
Too many opportunities for mistakes. My kids drink well water everyday 5km from otter lake
I don't trust you
Worry about toxic substances entering into the waste system, not being detected.
How many months until you change this procedure? Shot yourselves in the foot as you keep changing things you say are protection. Cell height, extending how long the dump will be here, etc.
I'm not sure that is enough given the proposed chang
I'm not sure why we would be putting more waste in landfills than necessary. The FEP helps to prevent some recycling or compost waste from entering the landfill. Without this we would be adding additional strain on the systems already in place.
Deactivating the FEP/WSF will have no impact on protecting groundwater. HA! HA! HA!
Personally I don't believe the current approach is enough and so far we have been lucky.
The run-off and groundwater in the area are going to be flooded with leachate. Monitoring it doesn't stop it.
Inadequate monitoring
Because of climate change the term "No impacts have been identified" becomes a child like exuberance. The only way to ensure leakage is not to have it there in the first place.
I didn't think of this as an issue until now. What distance from the landfill is the water checked? Some areas are city but some are well
The by-products of solid waste deposited in a landfill has adverse effects on the surrounding environment and humans living closer to landfill sites. Sacrificing human living conditions, safety and the environment for money is WRONG.
No reassurance provided that there will be adequate measurement / containment of leachate from entering the groundwater and soils.
Just remember - putting not sorted garbage directly into the landfill in the disaster zone of Sackville resulted in a system that is still running at the Sackville site to this date after all these years. Removing the "unwanted" items through FEP/WSF works.
I don't trust HRM to be concerned about mine or Harriet's fields water quality
Monitoring is good -- but it finds the problem AFTER it is an issue. I have no faith in the prevention measures actually protecting the water systems in the long-term. If/when something goes wrong, the clean-up costs will be high, and the poisons in the groundwater could take generations to clean-up.
report does not indicate any increase of monitoring systems or related cost as a result of the FEP/WSF decommission.
The system is sound, but can it accommodate the change in composition of the waste that the leachate flows through. I'm concerned that the leachate will be more toxic and require treatment that the treatment facility will not be able to provide.
potential to contaminate ground water
More needs to be done to protect our water supply.
Monitoring will definitely let's us know when this project fails and who collects this information and post the logs for all to see. We don't want the potential for garbage leaching into our water table. We want the garbage sent somewhere else.
An increased bird and rodent populations, baiting program and blowing garbage will ALL negatively impact waterways.
No changes should be made
When you start taking shortcuts and cheaping out it makes it easier to do it again when the stakes are higher.
Im just not certain on this. Things don't always have the lifespan or as planned.
With the deactivation of the FEP/WSF, there will be more leachate runoff and more contamination
inadequate. this is porpaganda, not a survey
Ground water is constantly under attack and we are not doing this for the environment
Systems installed will fail, they always do over time. Nine Mile river is very close to sight
I have concerns that the proposed deactivation will harm the bluff trail and ground water in the area.
Again, the lack of use of the front end processor changes the original agreement. If things are working well, why risk the additional leachate causing problems in the area. Do birds from the overflow pond travel between it and lakes in the area with the potential of causing problems there?
I am very concerned about this issue as I do not want the quality of the water to be affected
Anytime you begin messing with safety protocols, our safety is at risk.
Is water being tested at nearby 9 mile river and the lakes in the surrounding areas
Like the rodents, you have no control over where this goes.
We should be burning out garbage like they do in Sweden and use that energy.
what is the predicted change in volume of leachate without the FEP/WSF process?
The landfill is very close to a lake and many homes are relayant on deep wells. Spills and leaks can happen, and if undetected, contaminants can leach deep into the ground, contaminating groundwater, putting our wells at risk.

Respondents within 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
My concern is that the sorting and removal of hazardous materials prior to entering the landfill will be compromised in the proposed process. When the liners ultimately leak in the future, and leachate is detected in groundwater analytical, there will be a greater impact to water quality and remediation efforts will be complicated.
What happens if there are illegal chemicals disposed of in the landfill? Will these affect containment issues of water or risks to folks handling during the process in the mitigation you describe above?
same as before
I do not believe the above statements. You cannot control ground water.
History of "we're sorry, we'll investigate and it won't happen again." Seriously, our water is our life, so don't mess with it.
You have built a dump in an area of lakes. Nobody wants to swim in Otter Lake and it connects to the Chain of lakes.
We've all seen the municipal and provincial governments "stringent" policies made to look dated and ineffective . Do better
Deactivation not the agreement
I live on a lake in Timberlea and the landfill will directly impact my quality of life of the landfill is deactivated
This will make its way in to surrounding ground watee
once you contaminate the ground water there is no going back
do NOT deactivate the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
Deactivating FEP and WSF will increased the organic material, banned and unacceptable substance to the landfill. No to another sackville landfill
The landfill should be closed by now. Bringing more unsorted garbage will not be a benefit to the groundwater.
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
There will be an increase in what is put into the ground due to the lack of sorting, both on site, and by households. The ground water will be impacted - period!
Concerned that it's not enough to stop the drainage
I would like to see high levels of waste sorting occur in order to ease my concerns.
N
can't afford to get this wrong
Still concerned with the quality of groundwater no matter what your promise is.
Not foolproof
Your not proposing to make any changes to the means of managing the run off, only that the current process will stay the same. How is it possible that the run off would not be affected by an increased volume of un segregated waste and thus not require additional resources?
More micro plastics
There are minimal impacts now. Again the system is working fine now why change it.
te to enter the landfill. You can never put the trust into the hands of the people that we will sort our trash properly... we never have, and we never will. The FEB/WSP is the filter the the massive laziness of our population in regards to trash.
If you are no longer monitoring what is going in the landfill you cannot guarantee continued protection of ground water.
Don't know enough about it to comment
You're spending money to fix a system that isn't broken.
I do not trust that regular testing is in fact implemented as.the water in my home has occasionally been.yellow, brown, and has had an odor already.
Already dealing with smelly water (no an expert the landfill may not be the cause)
I feel that the parameters keep changing so that the numbers always look good. In other words, I don't trust the reporting
Always going to be a concern
Landfill leaches into the ground, which in turn reaches our waterways.
Deactivation will not solve this!
Blah blah
Monitoring to validate effectiveness does not prevent impact. If it is found to be ineffective, it's already in the ground. Gross.
Hoseholds will not and cannot separate garbage to the level needed to prevent dangerous leaching into groundwater.
The groundwater that currently flows into our lakes rivers and our drinking water has enough chemicala
I am opposed to ending the FEP/WSF.
There has been proposals to increase the facility's cell height dramatically.This would undermine the existing measures.I have a marked distrust of HRM's future intentions pertaining this site ,which I believe will have it's life overly extended.
Only a matter of time before there is leakage. I don't trust HRM staff on this...
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
Organics create leachate and should not be buried in landfill

Respondents within 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
surface water can contaminated with extra rain etc. I 'm not happy with what we have now so don't reduce safety. I already drink too much bleachy water
With climate change and more severe storms and protential damage the surface water quality will always be a risk near a landfill site.
Just stop the expansion. Ugh!
Not enough
for the reason stated in the previous answer
If it not broke don't fix it. I have concerns the changes wii impact the water.
Given the increased amount of waste material under the new process, what is the data to suggest that current practice will be sufficient?
FEP/WSF will protect our water system and should remain.
I do not believe, or have confidence in, the populace to properly care and separate their individual waste streams. The front end processor provides an extra inspection point to observe potential infractions and mitigate illegal or inappropriate dumping of wastes in the landfill. Once the front end processor is removed from service, it is foolish to believe it will ever be reinstated.
Same as the previous question
What does regular monitoring mean once a month everyday? I suspect as little as possible.
I don't trust it.
n
I has do degrade surface run off... you're adding more garbage.
The Dillon report would be more credible if it provided actual information. I understand that erosion is being monitored. But how effective are current control measures?
We should not forget about all of these little storm events we have been seeing frequently!
Broken promises
Without the added protection of the FEP/WSF these mitigation measures are no guarantee. Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill. Keep the FEP/WSF active.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
Different days will yield different results and samples can be taken on days that will give favourable results only.
You don't know because it hasn't happened yet. This is just speculation.
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
Our lakes are too precious to risk, period.
Otter Lake has in international reputation for its waste management. To date, there have been no issues with run-off etc but why tamper with a successful system?
Has a 3rd party study been completed?
See answer to Question 26
As long as it is carried out and any problems are reported and addressed immediately.
How much contamination is released into Nine mile river? Explain the procedure and thresholds/limitations involved.
Seeing fish population feminism over the years since this site has been opened
I disagree
Again lack of trust
The FEP & WSF were critical components of the contract the communities accepted. The tactics used by HRM in attempt to remove the FEP & WSF are abhorrent and not in good faith. The format of this "survey" is a disgusting reminder of the lengths policy makers will take.
I am still in support of sorting out organic material at the front end of the landfill
Increased organic matter in the landfill will cause an increase in surface water contamination surface
Organic Organic waste should never be buried in a landfill. The FEP/WSF should always be operated at our landfill.
I don't trust the intent of this survey. It is plausible that the present approach to protecting surface water is affective but if the proposed changes are made all bets are off.
Organic waste does not belong in a landfill
Same answer as prev.
changes to the existing procedures put all of this at risk
I've lived here [redacted] ears. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
this shouldn't event be a concern.
Why remove a system that removes inappropriate item that may contribute towards possible contamination
I am not at all convinced!
It will be to late once the water being tested is dangerous.
Elimination of waste through intensive decomposition is a far better approach to mitigate or eliminate possible water contamination.
Employees will be busy with new duties of covering the waste at a higher frequency. I fear these less frequent tasks may fall behind.
Again, you are saying you're changing none of your current practices and yet putting more untreated waste into the ground. I remain skeptical that reducing quality of waste processing while changing nothing else will have the positive outcomes you anticipate.
With removal of the front end processor there will be hazardous wastes and improper articles being disposed of in the landfill
Same song and dance. Build it somewhere else and tell them how good it is!
As previously statesd
See previous comment
Broken Promise to the community
We have to protect the many lakes in this area

Respondents within 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
A dump with decompression changes everything and with an increase of animales and birds, it will end up in our water ways too and ultimately effects our Wells.
way too close to water (300m). mistakes happen, mechanical breakdown, deterioration, ever increasing larger storms or even the 50 year storm. i live on the river system and have seen first hand when these things happen , and usually the first to report, when the sewage treatment plant fails. when these things happen it enters the water and end up in the ocean just a few kilometers away.
Bs lies
Same answer for surface water as for ground water.
To many variables
Again test results please.
I don't like the use of the word "proposed ". Lots of things are proposed and sound great and then that proposed idea quietly gets scraped without thought or care to the people it directly impacts the most
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
Again, reducing the sorting of materials will impact the effect of this facility on the environment and communities
Increased trash that is unsorted will cause issues.
A landfill is a landfill water will always create runoff usually always downhill to nine mile river for instance
Your methods of ground water and surface water seem appropriate and enough. Regular monitoring is crucial, but my concern is trust in government at a time when I little to no trust. All I ask is that the waste water testing results be openly and transparently posted to your website so that the public can trust the process more.
Your word means nothing Do not break the contract.
How often is water testing completed on water runoff and how often is groundwater tested?
More infro
With additional waste comes with additional landfill cap resulting in additional runoff. Are the current measures able to accommodate the additional runoff?
I have a septic system that is used for household waste, it treats it appropriately. If I were to dump heating oil down my septic system I would be required to do a massive cleanup. Different waste requires different disposal measures. It is not ok to let toxic waste into our landfill. The current system won't appropriately handle it.
Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill". Run-off will be a most serious problem without all of the current systems in place or improved.
I simply don't believe that all these wonderful claims. YOU WANT TO REMOVE THE ONE THING THAT MADE THIS LANDFILL UNIQUE, SAFE AND ADMIRED THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.
Monitoring is not enough. Prevention is key.
while the statement does address the inspection process, it does not address what would take place if any of these things fail, other than to say repaired as soon as possible. A more definite time frame and process is needed.
This is going to affect the environment no matter what there is going to be the pollution to our lakes and our streams and once it happened it's too late there will be no stopping it an hrm's not going to fix it as once again they don't follow through with their promises so every plan for this whole process it's just a waste of time unacceptable we were promised no landfill
Same as my previous comment
It's not the monitoring systems in place that I doubt, it's what happens in the event these safeguards don't work as planned. Fish kills in nine Mile?
Same as before, can't trust government
Decreased professional sorting of waste will lead to increased runoff of detriment
Needs to be done constantly
Stopped fishing for trout the year after the Otter lake installation.
The best measure is not removing the measures that already work.
What about the animals that need the water to survive. I dont believe any of the information that is being touted by the city to get to their end game
If it is in the ground it will Go somehwere
Deactivation of FEP/WSF will generate an increase of future traffic both residential and commercial resulting in greater opportunaties of water quality
Is this monitoring done by independant monitors?
How do we know the history of the inspections. They should be public record to allow review of their methodology and results.
Closing the FEP/WSF will result in contaminating the ground water. Your report is wrong. When the FEP/WSF was put in this was one of the big areas that it was sold on that it would prevent. Now you say closing it won't have an impact. Funny how that works...
I don't have confidence in the sincerity of a biased report, written with the purpose of justifying deactivation of this part of the facility. The residents of this area were promised by the council of the day that front end sorting would be a permanent part of the Otter Lake landfill.
Insufficient measures
My kids swim in these lakes
Still don't trust you
Problems occur after changes are made, and then go undetected or Ignored, until a bigger problem is created. And then years pass until corrected.
Pretty sure you will lax rules as time goes on as you will complain about costs.
I'm not sure that is enough given the proposed chang
See previous answer
Climate change is happening and things are only getting worse, I don't believe the current approach is adequate to meet potential problems
Putting all that garbage in one area - especially unsorted garbage will have a negative impact on the whole environment
Again, climate change. Even the most learned scientists in the world cannot predict future climate events. Yet, bureaucrats within tiny Halifax, N.S. can do so with certainty.
Houses being built closer & closer to landfill
The by-products of solid waste deposited in a landfill has adverse effects on the surrounding environment and humans living closer to landfill sites. Sacrificing human living conditions, safety and the environment for money is WRONG.
Enhanced monitoring and mitigation strategies need to be increased.
Less items to the cells the better. Keeping the FEP/WSF in place ensures fewer items go to the cell.

Respondents within 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
I don't know what regular monitoring means.
Report does not document evidence supporting the statement of no impacts.
Again, the approach is sound. But the substrate over which the water flows will be different and potentially more toxic.
potential for contamination
I have seen erosion and segmentation control and the maintenance is never adequately maintained! The materials used are biodegradable and are never adequately replaced. We don't want the agervation of this dump and all that this entails send it somewhere else. This location is exhausted.
Increased Rodent and Bird populations, baiting and blowing garbage will ALL negatively impact waterways.
No changes should be made
Letting the facility relax regulations is the start of a bad habit and I don't trust the municipality to use good judgement in the future.
Our wetlands are precious and we need to do all we can to protect them, including keeping the FEP/WSF running.
There need to be more testings
inadequate. this is porpaganda, not a survey
All of otter lake is a concern to us residents and these changes are not good for us!
I am concern that proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF will harm the environment.
No control. There won't be a problem until the first problem. Then you will have to use more dollars to fix.
Burn our garbage for energy
I am concerned there will be too much excess run off with the planned changes.
Testing frequency not enough
Leaks and spills happen, often taking a long time to detect.
See comment related to GW monitoring. I'm not familiar with the hydrogeology surrounding site, but would anticipate GW and SW bodies are connected.
Same comment as per ground water..
not what we agreed to
Increased contaminate runoff from removal of the FEP/WSF is a concern.
With the proposed changes, I'm concerned that the run off will be more harmful to our environment
Will we expect an increase in stormwater management rates on our utility bills when we should be receiving significant decreases in our taxes?
I am concerned with the propaganda in this one sided survey....
I live on half mile lake. Leave my water alone
Deactivation not the agreement
I live on a lake and this landfill will directly impact my quality of life and property value
This will affect nine mile river over time.
run off is run off.
do NOT deactivate the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
Deactivating the FEP and WSF will increased the organic material, banned and unacceptable substance to enter the landfill thus more chance to impact surface water
The landfill should already be decommissioned. Then we wouldn't need to worry about the impact to surface water quality.
Toxic items will not be separated.
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
This does not cover the increase in bird and rodent populations and their activity both in and around the surface water. The current approach does not adequately address this area either. What about their excrement , increase in dead and decaying bodies, and the additional garbage that will get into the surface water?
Same as previous
The testing protocols are not described in adequate detail in order to ease my concerns about the discharge going into the Nine Mile River. I would like to see high levels of waste sorting occur in order to help ease my concerns.
N
No issues identified but that doesn't mean they won't happen.
I don't feel as it will work
Same response to the previous question applies to this one.
More plastics in water
Don't know enough about it to comment
Same answer. You're spending money to fix a system that isn't broken.
Again, the water in my village has already been yellow, brown and contained an odor.
Would prefer more preventative measures as opposed to reactive measures
The landfill should not be decommissioned
N/A
Again, more landfill means further contamination. It's just common sense. You can't mitigate it all.
...
Again, your testing mechanism aren't going to matter once the impact has already happened.
I am opposed to ending the FEP/WSF.
Once again I posit this facility will be enlarge due to HRM's future budget and these problems will only be exacerbated.

Respondents within 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
Again surface water quality will suffer if the FEP and WSF are removed.
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
The landfill should not be located near Otter Lake
We never know when the next 100year strom is coming. Sample all you want, once the damage is done it is too late. "LEAVE OTTER LAKE ALONE"

Respondents within 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 have lived near the landfill of [redacted] years. I did not want the landfill near my residendial area. Having the FEP/WSF there gives me confidence that I can sell my home in the furture at market value. Don't want my area to be a Sackville landfill comparison.
The community accepted this in good faith that it be run to the best possible standard. How is taking something away from the process going to still allow it to operate at top performance? I guess this will serve as a warning to other communities who are approached to welcome such a facility that things may start out well but could end badly.
The orginal agreement should stand. HRM made an agreement with the BLT community. The only acceptable waste agreed to by the residents of BLT was that processed by the FEP/WSF.
FINALLY, HONOUR the final agreement. This expansion proposal is just “dirty”. No pun intended!
Although our garbage separation is quite successful, I doubt that it removes all decomposable materials
To remove any system which was design to help the environment will always have a negative impact on the environment. The FEP/WSP was put in place to reduce the impact on the enviroment and reducing the effect to the residents in the area. If the FEP/WSP is stilling removing waste that isnt suppose to be dispose there in the first place.
It is always told to us in a manner that tries to pacify us but is never what actually happens in the long run. I need to think about the people,their children and all the community. It always comes down to the almighty dollar and not the benefit of the people living here and paying big bucks in taxes.
Lack of trust.
In the referenced agreement does it permit HRM , the other signatory, the discretion for them to decide that enough recognizable unprocessed organics is being processed. On the contrary, the agreement states that all recognizable organics be processed before entering the landfill cell.
All I know is whatever they are doing it is working. I have been on a tour f the site twice I have come away thoroughly impressed with how things are operating. Would hate to see that changed.
A group of professionals and volunteers that monitor the communities interest. You just have to look at HRM’s solid waste program and realize they are in it to save money and not look after the community or the cities interest.
Compliant is a term for adequate now, but the Timberlea community is growing and old standards are no longer acceptable.
Lots of claims but no proof. I don't believe you.
There’s always a loophole
It's a pretty simple agreement, and it would take "both side" of the agreement to remove conditions that were put in place to protect the community. It is very simple... honour the agreement.
I don't believe residents sort waste to a level that a successful operation requires.
Good luck trying to permit a future landfill if it is demonstrated that the city will try and get out of their permitting commitments as soon as it is convenient to them.
n
if that is the case why was It not run like that in the first place.
If the ‘spirit’ of the 1999 agreement was honoured, this would not be happening. The whole idea was to keep it clean, not save money.
Again government is not telling the truth. Rather they are manipulating words and intent. Please don’t ruin our community
The explanation above states “most” of the current waste is considered Inert. That is not ALL of the waste. That does not honour the original agreement.
the current tonnages HRM presents today are not stagnant. With the closure of The FEP/WSF, community growth, increased population, an aging facility... The numbers can and will change. What happens then?
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
Every question in this survey is biased to convince us as homeowners to just give support to the decommissioning of the FEP/WSP. Typical government - the bulk of the responses here could be NO but its all about $$.
I have lived here for over [redacted] years and when we were selected ted for the landfill we didn't want it as any other community didn't want it. We were promised it was a 25 year only so I said well we will have our turn and then it will go somewhere else so our property values will return afterwards. I , and my family, are still here and want the agreement honoured!
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
This does not excuse breaking the agreement
Enough is enough, the entire site should have already been decommissioned.
The intention was to have an innovative facility with the two successful garbage processing features. Why fix something that is working and the envy of many in the world?
By eliminating FEP it is understood that there will be an increase in food waste entering the site. The green cart program may have reduced the amount of food waste put in garbage bags but it has not eliminated it. Therefore shutting it down will lead to a degradation of conditions at the facility and a reduction of area residents protections from all the problems covered in previous questions.
According to the CMC, the actions taken by Mirror NS and HRM with the proposed changes result in a major modification of both the conditions of the operating permit and the terms of the 1999 contractual agreement between HRM and the Halifax Wastewater Resource Society.
The original agreement the residents signed off on was that the front end processors will be used. If the fep/wsf are taken offline and it becomes a detriment to my community, the politicians will be held to account. I don't like to take my scientific advice from politicians.
The agreement with the communities comes under pressure every few years and is changed.
You are not listening to the tax payers of the community and their concerns of smell, rodents, decrease in property values cause of the rodent problem. Would government officials be ok having rats running around their yards when their 2 year old is out playing ? Disgusting and not safe !!!
The way you have formulated the survey indicates you are untrustworthy
we as citizens are not being listened to big business rules the day.we are expected to pay and have no say.
A Promise is a Promise. Don't twist the words as you know the intent!
No it sounds like a lawyer side stepping in wording what was promised to the community by the politicians of the day. This is why the lack of trust! Leagal loop holes and playing on wording make this seem like we are dealing with a sleazy ambulance chaser rather than people we are paying.
Completely disagree with your agreement interpretation narrative. Honour the original intent of the agreement.
Screwing over the locals. Great job morons.
The FEP & WSF were critical components of the contract the communities accepted. The tactics used by HRM in attempt to remove the FEP & WSF are abhorrent and not in good faith. The format of this "survey" is a disgusting reminder of the lengths policy makers will take.
NO!! only "Acceptable waste" should be included therefore there MUST be a process to address unacceptable waste that arrives at the facility. Just because "most of the waste" that arrives at the facility is inert, does NOT mean we eliminate the processes and facilities to deal with the non-inert waste that arrives at the facility.

Respondents within 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
It will be an experiment to see if the FEP/WSF actually will work. We don't want the risk of the negative outcome
Although it's not specifically noted in the agreement, this change goes against the spirit of the law where it's assumed that the dump operations are as originally designed. We again shouldn't be reverting operations to a less effective plan
I understand the logic of the argument against keeping the FEP but there is no actual proof that the situation will not degrade. Do you think the people who live close by the landfill are incapable of contributing to this decision? Why do they and so many others want the FEP to remain? How much money will wealthy HRM "lose" if the FEP cntinues?
Again the trust factor whatever the new plans may be ... what assurances are there they will be upheld and what is the plan for a go forward if the current plans fail?
The agreement has been in place for 20 years! The area is growing in the intresr of the neighborhood leave the things alone!
This entire survey is a sales pitch. Full of smoke and mirrors. I'm ashamed to be a member of the community that put this govt in power if this is the type of underhanded dealing they're OK with. Repulsive!
Move this out of the community - the contract is over
This is nothing more than a complete betrayal of the BLT community. This community made it very clear when the otter lake facility was proposed they did not want a dump. To imply that we misunderstood the promises made at the time are at best insulting and frankly a cynical declaration of HRM's intent.
Organic waste is not "inert", "stable" or "residual". It is not "acceptable material." It is not what this facility was designed for. Why does HRM want to go backwards in how they treat/handle waste?
HRM is continuing to go against all of the feedback from community meetings and community monitoring committee and remove safeguards promised and which were likely the only reason this was originally approved! Honour the original agreement!
The original agreement was made to protect residents
The community did not agree to this no matter how you try to twist words.
Pretty disingenuous logic. You skirted most of the rules by diverting institutional waste outside HRM where it need not be treated polluting other parts of NS, and now now want to avoid treating what remains in HRM. Extending the life of the dump by piling garbage higher violates the spirit of the agreement
If this way is working, why change it.
How does HRM know this statement (taken from above) is true: "While the FEP/WSF was designed as a mechanism to biostabilize putrescible waste (e.g., food waste), it provides little if any benefit to the environment today as the composition of waste and quantity has changed significantly since the development of Otter Lake in the late 1990s."
This part however, is VERY specific on how HRM interprets the agreement to be able to deactivate. Part of the agreement was also 25 years, has HRM found a new site as of yet?
no monitoring - how do you know what is acceptable waste - the concerns of the dump were addressed with this procedure. Changes add to the concerns. who defines acceptable - the company trying to reduce costs or the residents who will be impacted now and into the future.
I've lived here [redacted] years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
its dumb. just leave the community as it is.
Twist it around all you want; the community was made a promise. You want to break it.
Most of the waste currently delivered to and disposed of at Otter Lake is considered Inert Materials or Residual Materials, such that it does not need to be biostabilized prior to landfilling. I removed "most" of the arsenic from your drinking water. Here...take a sip. This proposed change is a departure from the original agreement.
Decreasing the existing process dishonours the original agreement. Leave it alone or improve the system
This change is unacceptable to the the community!
Broken promises for landfill sites, shame on you!!!! on you
Why change what was originally agreed and decided upon regarding the sorting of the garbage. It protects our priceless drinking water.
You have misled the public. This "survey" is biased in that in the various "explanations" you defend your choice and offer no countering arguments. I was troubled before I took this "survey" ... I am left feeling utterly outraged. Shame on you!!!!!
When this facility originally opened there was odour coming from the facility. That odour could be smelled throughout the community. If you are not going to honour the original agreement. I say shut the facility down.
I do not believe that making people sort out the garbage is beneficial
I think the green cart program is great, but I highly doubt compliance is as high as we're lead to believe. Especially from industrial, commercial, and high density residential sectors.
You don't really know what the outcome will be, do you? If you're wrong, the resulting damage may be irreversible! You are taking an awful gamble to save money, and that feels like you neither value the environment nor your responsibility to the people you serve who live in it.
I have no doubt that many people are trying to sort their waste. BUT YOU CAN'T USE THAT AS YOUR EXCUSE to remove the FEP. That is an unknown. Why, why,why do you to change a landfill that is on the world map for it's innovative technology????
Stick to the original agreement
the agreement for the town dump in "my backyard ie otter lake" was agreed to for 25 years back in 1997. although having a dump so close was upsetting, it was "our turn" to have it. how very frustrating to have that deadline extended AND changes made (ie. no longer will 4000 tons of decaying matter be discovered prior to burial, as in 2019). it's time to locate the dump elsewhere.
No hard evidence has been given that HRM will remain compliant. Data could easily be collected (decrease in food waste/non-compliant materials picked up by the FEP/WSF, as one example) that would go a long way in addressing concerns, but to the best of my knowledge, all assertations are based on conjecture only.
We are already passed the original timeline for the landfill from the initial agreement.
na
Removing the front end processor is against the agreement that the communities made with the HRM. The agreement stipulates that only 'Acceptable Waste' shall be landfilled, this will not be able to be monitored without the front end processing
Remaining compliant and doing everything possible to ensure that surrounding communities are not adversely impacted by the landfill are not the same thing. I expect that this facility operates at more than the minimum required to honor an agreement. The recurring "medium risk" concerns are not acceptable and could add up to a disaster.
Shame on you !!! Put the dump in the south end and see how they take it
As stated previously
Weasel words that hedge the underlying obligations with platitudes. While I'm happy that HRM citizens have 'stepped up' more than expected at the time of the agreement, the reality is that expectations have evolved and - most importantly - STANDARDS SHOULD NOW BE HIGHER
I do not believe that very little food waste goes through the FEP/WSF. why wouldn't you want to bio stabilize before putting in the landfill. Doesn't make sense to me.
What a joke
Break this promise with the community and create a municipality with no moral integrity to negotiate deals with any communities in the future. HRM should not be looking at the legal speak in this contract like some shifty, morally bereft con-man. Push this through and good luck with any future community deals.

Respondents within 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
More than twenty years have gone by and now it's another community's turn to take this process on. We did not agree to this forever.
That agreement is the only reason there is land fill in our community.
There is no community protection
GFY
Again bs lies. You had a contract to shut down 25 yrs and yet your still here I my community
Stop trying to go back on an agreement that was made to the surrounding communities to allow for a landfill to be out in just to save some money.
If it helps in anyway, the FEP should be maintained. No one wants a landfill in their community but when you have one, you want all measures available to be taken to make it a clean, odour free and environmentally safe as it can be. Every bit helps
Not true
Trends in waste treatment change over time and losing these positions set a negative precedence for future staffing of the landfill
I don't understand all that is proposed and the concerns but my hope is that we aren't risking animals, environment or unsightly smells and blowing garbage to save a bit of money. If it's working well, why change it. There's more to life than money.
I would love to save money, but history shows, this is not always the best approach. Double checking always keeps us safer from those who continue to not follow protocol
Thought we learned from the Sackville Landfill. Why were they brought in in the first place if it didn't matter?
An agreement is an agreement.
Stick to the original agreement. The public is not interested in these changes. Give up and move on already
I don't believe waste can be sorted to the same degree This is not an improvement
People will still throw out food waste in privacy bags and over time when that waste is not being treated rodents, birds, odours, etc will get out of control
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
This agreement with the CMC is like any other agreement that large business and HRM Council have, they don't follow the recommendations or support of these community groups. It's easy for other councellors to vote for the elimination of this precess as the facility doesn't impact their communities. Let's honour the original expiry date agreement of this facility.
More non stabilized waste than now is still more going into fill. Not an improvement.
The site was allowed to be built because of the sorting facility. To take it away is to stab this community in the back.
At the very least the FEP is a safety net to insure that all of the material being landfilled is "inert" or "residual". If the FEP is removed there is no safeguard in place and any future changes in the waste stream heading for landfill will not be detected or remediated. If the FEP is removed, the Otter Lake Landfill must be decommissioned.
With the inceease of residence and businesses will the system be able to handle the ongoung increase in disposable products
No support for breaking promises. Original agreement has already been altrted
The agreement that was made was in the best interests of our community in 1999. You are trying to change it to save money. That is not honouring the community by allowing this to happen.
An agreement is an agreement signed years ago to not allow food waste into the landfill is money and profit more important to those running otter lake
I do not care what you say in all the above documentation. Take the dump from our area. The sooner the better. We are tired of having it in our back yard. We have had our turn. It is up to another area to be dumped on.hve uiyiota
You need to honor your agreement.
If I recall correctly the public and the community were told the landfill would only operate for 20 years.
Why are you breaking the agreement
The agreement should mandate the FEP and WSF
Nobody wanted this dump in their backyard, nobody. WE were promised that the organics would be removed to deter an increase in the rodent population. If you want to change the agreement with us, CLOSE THE DUMP. Find another community to take Halifax's Garbage.
Honour the agreement. Otherwise you may as throw every thing here back into the landfill. If it's not honoured anything said going forward is useless.
To quote your own words "Most of the waste currently delivered"... Most of is not all. So some non acceptable waste WILL make it in. And that is against the agreement.
Green cart programs still rely on the households to follow the guidelines of what can go in to a garbage bag. The statement of most of the waste is a vague measure that indicates there is still an unknown amount or unreported amount. 51% could be considered a "most" measure.
"Acceptable waste" is too broad and the fact that it was originally poorly written is a problem
The green cart program could be so much more successful. Businesses put out all the sorting bins, but they all go in one once they are collected and leave the building - the bin marked Garbage which goes to Otter Lake.
This is one of the most skewed surveys I've ever seen. Nothing impartial about this. I have no faith in HRM's ability to manage this.
We don't want a non sorted landfill
It's not cool to look for loopholes in the agreement to fit your own agenda
Again. Organic waste should not be buried in the landfill".HRM is not providing any alternate solutions and appears to be committed to breaking the promise made to the public by retiring the FEP and WSF and not honouring the contractual Agreement that HRM signed with the public's agent (HWRS) in 1999.
It seems this survey is designed for you to justify forcing us to proceed with a bad bad idea. I will be there protesting at the landfill entrance. We,ve had the landfill in outer backyard for the last 20 years and to say there is no negative impact is not true. You can smell a stink when you pass the Timberlea exit on many days.
By your own admission, the agreement stipulates that only waste bio-stabilized through the FEP is acceptable. You are putting the safety of our communities at risk for the sake of saving 2 million dollars. That is a pittance in the budget of HRM and it makes zero sense to me to remove something that has been working so well for 20 years.
Referencing terms of an agreeement from 1999 is insuffuicient given we are now living in a different world, with different materials being disposed of. Be current and be proactive and honor the intent of this agreement - to protect the local people living near the watse facility. The response of HRM in this regard is completely disheartening.
There is still a large amount of food waste going to Otter Lake
If the process was deemed necessary originally, to say that "The agreement does not specifically mandate" sounds more like a cop out than a scientific reason why it would no longer be needed.
If the system we have is not the best in the word why do governments from all around the world come here to see the system.

Respondents within 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
Sad working their way around not honouring the promise of not making it a landfill it's supposed to be a waste treatment facility not a landfill you are ruining the community there's going to be an increase in pollution air water land and increasing infestation in rodents and birds and then an increase again in-depth just due to poisoning from your baiting practices
Same as my previous comment. Also what happened to the 20 year agreement?
Once again, qualitative commentary for a quantitative issue. Show us the numbers. The raw data. By passing the community monitoring committee's role in the operation of otter Lake is a misuse of power. It's almost as bad as this thinly veiled PR scheme you're trying to pass off as a survey.
Seems that the current interpretation of the agreement is different than what the community was led to understand when otter lake was under development
There are still many houses that I never see green carts in front of, suggesting there is a portion of organic waste going to the landfill. I would want to see data supporting the amount of organics delivered, which is not in the mitigation plan.
Getting to the details of this is beyond the fact that residents of this area were told otherwise. Of course you can analyze this agreement and make your statements but ultimately, this is not what the public was told.
Can't trust government
Landfilling compostable materials is not acceptable. As residents we're asked to do our part and separate, HRM should do theirs
Without FEP/WSF oversight, compliance cannot be maintained. This is in contravention to the spirit of the initial agreement
Even if you are not breaking the original Community Agreement by letter, you are most certainly breaking it in spirit. This is nothing more than a cost saving measure being introduced to the detriment of the surrounding area of Otter Lake.
The agreement very clearly was intended to have the FEP/WSF as part of how they were going to make this site a well run and safe site. Removing it would be breaking the commitment made to the local community that this site would not be turned into an old fashioned landfill with all the problems that come with that sort of facility.
Great job legal team looking for wording loopholes
Using a loophole in an agreement that was meant to protect both the environment and the residents is deplorable. There is still waste being brought in that creates horrible smells and rodent issues. The problem still exists
Should have been gone years ago
the legally binding "acceptable waste" has been achieved though biostabilization with the FEP/WSF; what scientifically proven eco-friendly alternative can replace it?
If the dynamics change it should be moved somewhere that is further away from a population
HRM cannot gaurantee current tonnages will not increase as our population continues to increase.
If it ain't broke don't fix it.
A deal is a deal. You honor it or you lose the respect of the people not just in our community but the entire HRM.
The agreement said stabilized waste. You say above organic material is not stabilized, therefore this is still a violation of the agreement.
So you are saying in the fine print this is how we plan to try and screw over the CMC. Then asking the question does this information address your concerns. Slow clap for whoever designed this survey and we will see if it holds up in court.
I don't have confidence in the sincerity of a biased report, written with the purpose of justifying deactivation of this part of the facility. The residents of this area were promised by the council of the day that front end sorting would be a permanent part of the Otter Lake landfill.
This agreement was made to protect the community and the proposed changes will have a negative impact and go against the original agreement.
"Most of the waste" is very different than ALL of the waste. "Most" is not good enough
You are only concerned with saving 2 million dollars. Things have been working well all this time and now you are going to screw it all up. this why people don't trust government.
You keep brining up changes every few years. How can you ask this question and not think people are unhappy?
I'm not sure that is enough given the proposed changes
I do not believe the green bin system is 100%. Why take away the added protection of the FEP.
Seriously? I also remember that we were promised that the landfill would only last 20 years.
Government loopholes to screw the community and benefit a budget. Best way to lose any respect. The committee was formed for a reason, people fought for their community's best interest and it is not being honoured.
Specifically speaking the city is trying to wiggle out of an agreement, unless they are prepared to have the landfill operation in their back yard they should be grateful to the people of this district.
No one would have build more than half million dollar homes here if they knew this agreement wouldn't be honoured and that this system would be shut off
It's not right that you make an agreement with a community to put something that nobody wants and then come back and try to save money by reneging on your part of the deal to make it a clean solution
will the drivers be looking closer at the bags going into there trucks to make sure people are following the rules
https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/residents-otter-lake-council-changes-1.6118189 A long court case may provide the clarification needed.
Whereas you state, if needed, equipment can be reactivated. This an indication your recommendations may not work.
I didn't know there was an original agreement to worry about, but it brings up the subject of relying on the residents to properly use their green bins and garbage sorting. Are you really relying on that? After the increase in public dumping?
Trying to make changes to original agreement
The by-products of solid waste deposited in a landfill has adverse effects on the surrounding environment and humans living closer to landfill sites. Sacrificing human living conditions, safety and the environment for money is WRONG.
There is no defendable reason for altering the agreement that was put in place when the Otter Lake facility was out in our neighborhood. There have been numerous reports that indicate that there is still a large proportion of the population not managing their waste properly thereby increasing the tonnage of waste to the landfill.
Basically what you are saying is that the concerns of residents is secondary and that since you don't live in the area it doesn't matter
The agreement is a contract. FEB/WSF is part of the contract - honor it!
HRM can spin this anyway they like. Honour the agreement!!
Otter Lake has already caused numerous problems in our community, including odours and a terrible rat problem. Any proposed changes should be focussed on making things BETTER, SAFER, MORE environmentally friendly, not the other way around. It is time to find a new site.
Stop being lazy, no one cares about "technically". There was an agreement with the community and you know you'll have trouble implementing a new site due to NIMBY. Rather than standing by the deal you're counting on a lack of participation during covid so you can be a lazy ass civil "servant"
My greatest concern going forward is that the type of waste which has changed, will change again, and while there is a plan to keep this FEP in place, ready to work, what will happen in the meantime?
Along with the written agreement, there were verbal agreements at the time that the processor and stabilization facility would remain as long as the landfill was open. organic waste is down to 44,000 tonnes but that is still a significant amount of odorous organic waste for the local community to deal with the ramifications of.
If the waste it not gone through then you cannot advise that only acceptable waste it being put in the landfill

Respondents within 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
You say the amount of organic waste sent to the land fill is 10% but you do not say 10% of what amount so it is unclear how much organic waste is actually sent to otter lake. I think all organic waste must be separated and treated before going in the land fill
Rather than defunding the facility, if we truly believe that the FEP/WSF is no longer necessary, we should be investing funds required for its operation in newer and better tech. Otter Lake was world-class. Make it world-class again.
we need to stay with the original plan
I feel that once council begins to make changes that will be it. They will never reinstate the current measures if problems arise.
Why should we have to deal with this and be taxed the same as everyone else. We shouldn't have to fight for clean air in our own backyard. We want this dump shut down. Fall river is a good spot for a dump send it there.
Putting a community and the environment at risk through loop holes in an agreement that the community entered into in good faith, trusting the municipailty is despicable behaviour and 100% is eroding trust. ALL eyes from ALL communities are intently watching how the Municipality respects this agreement and treats the community that is DIRECTLY affected by these changes.
No changes should be made
Do not agree with this Interpretation
It is easier to turn off restrictions than to turn them back on if the trends in waste diversion change.
Why would we believe this? When will the next change be?
Things have worked well as a direct result of the current process. Please don't mess with his process. It's working.
Even with the long history of green carts in HRM, I don't think you can trust the residents to properly sort
This dump was never suppose to handle organic material, as a life long resident of the area I remember being assured at communityeetings and communication that this type of change in functionwould not happen. It is disgraceful that this is being proposed and it threatens the health and safety of residents.
I don't see the logic. How is having 10% of waste going to the landfill not "acceptable waste" keeping the commitment/promise to the community?
the city always dishonours agreements. we were promised an end date and now you talk of an extension to the closing of the site. another broken promise
Without the sorting in place, there is no way to make ensure the system works. You don't live here, you don't have to deal with it!
I understand that there is still significant levels of putrescible waste that FEP/WSF was designed to biostabilize, and will no longer be biostabilized.
inadequate. this is porpaganda, not a survey
Honour the original agreement and do not change it
Start putting organics in...what is next?
I am concern that proposed deactivation of the Otter Lake FEP/WSF will harm the environment.
Multi-unit buildings are increasing rapidly. These are potential sources of unseparated waste. The current landfill seems to be working but now HRM will start tinkering. If front end separation will reduce the risk, it should continue. If it costs extra money, it should be a small price for the whole of HRM to not have the landfill in their back yard!
The community is thriving and growing. In my opinion changes to the agreement should not in any way enable an increase in waste not any negative effects be allowed to be increased even if only marginally.
I flat out do NOT trust Mayor Savage and the council.
A commitment was made to the population of the impacted area. Honour it
Typical government double speak employed when budgets are difficult.
A deal is a deal. Risking an environmental disaster to save money is unconscionable.
I think there's a "letter of the agreement" and "spirit of the agreement" issue here. I know people who give their free time to sit on the monitoring committee in the spirit of community benefit. I think it's a betrayal to those people and the community to change the operations of the landfill to add more waste to the landfill.
The agreement must be kept in place as that is the nature of agreements.. and also why the facility was allowed to be place here in the first place. There most certainly will be blockades and class action lawsuits if any changes to the agreement are made the will cause an negative impact to the community
HRM staff and councilors are naive to think that once the front end processing is removed that people are not going to throw organics back into the waste stream
The agreement was signed as is and should be honored
We had to live with it for all these years but the measures gave us some reassurance that you cared. We currently get a sulfur smell from time to time but they take care of it. With all of the current is in place, there is no hope.
Personal sorting is not nearly as successful as indicated, and without sorting and oversight significant organic waste will go to the landfill.
We need more capital in our community like a new fire hall and community Center
I am still concerned about the impact of increased residual material if the FEP/WSP is deactivated.
HRM should not strive to be simply compliant, but rather, like the citizens RRR's we should strive to do better.
Even though it is not specified, changing the process goes against the intent of the agreement
Citizens are not sorting their waste properly. I know this because, every week, I clean up the mess left behind by my neighbours' waste. I've found organic in black garbage bags and blue recycle bags that have been ripped open by crows. Without the FEP/WSF, a significant amount of organic waste will end up in the landfill. In 2021, that is entirely unacceptable.
Again, if the process for removing hazardous waste prior to landfilling is compromised, so too will be the commitment to landfilling only inert material.
Again, without the FEP/WSF how do you know waste is Acceptable? This is not addressed in the report. Are we assuming there will be no delinquency in what is being discarded in black bags in future? This should be added as a potential risk in the report as well as what impacts increase in organic waste as well as chemicals would have ...
This sounds like trying to weasel out of an agreement by getting technical with terminology. This is HRM blatantly trying to go back on contracts and promises to save a buck at the expense of the community. Plain as day.
According to HRM staff, 4,097 tonnes of putrescible organics – organic matter liable to turn putrid with decay – were found in the residential garbage that arrived at the Otter Lake facility in 2019. The tonnage represents 10-12 per cent of the residential waste received that year.
Why change a system/process that is working for one that could have negative results. I think the community has been more than understanding in putting up with this facility in our backyard.
if this agreement changes, then we were duped
There is a purpose for the FEP/WSF and we don't need to be an experiment for removing it to see what happens. We need to remove as much organic materials as possible
Proposed changes break the agreement. I was here and at the public forums. I do not care what was in the contract/agreement. The Community was told (by Mirror and Dillon if I recall correctly!) that the FEP/WSF would be in place to prevent all concerns in this survey. Now they are saying that the FEP/WSF are not required? Not buying that!
The dump already should of been closed looking at the original site plan it was never ment to run this long

Respondents within 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
To cut a process just so that it will save money and make it more profitable. This will put the health and quality of the people who directly live/work/go to school at jeopardy
Wordsmithing does not cut it here. We were also promised a connector highway from Timberlea to Hammonds Plains for closer access to airport....where is that?
Why does HRM keep going against the agreement and extending the life of this dump. If the Fep/WSF system isn't necessary why have so many articles talking about how it's cutting edge been written about it.
Government trying to back out of promises made to tax payers. Shocking.
You are mischaracterising the agreement with the Halifax Waste/Resource Society.
Honor your commitment to the residents of the area
I'm still concerned. There are many people who still do not use the green bin and put all their garbage in the black bag. Even when they are reported nothing happens.
Splitting hairs to save some money at communities' expense
Having listened to the concerns raised by the other members of the Otter Lake Monitoring Committee, I am not convinced that the information being presented here by the city is accurate. I am not an expert in waste management systems, but trust that those who are familiar with the agreement believe it needs to be upheld.
You will not know the impact until it's too late. It's unacceptable to go back on your agreement to save dollars. This facility is within very few kilometers of my HOME
Still think it's needed to ensure proper sorting
Honour what you signed with the neighbouring communities.
The green cart is fine as long as you have compliance, but I think the compliance rate is not as good as you are saying. It's similar to COVID vaccination compliance. People try and skirt the regulations, especially "anonymous" apartment dwellers who throw everything onto their green bags and toss it into the building's dumpster. THIS is why you need separation processes.
it is just more dumping on us.
I appreciate the current system
do NOT deactivate the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
It is appear to that HRM is looking to save a buck, and Mirror group really does not care in that they get paid anyway. It would give them the right to close this facility with job loss
The landfill was to be removed from our area after a period of time not to go on indefinitely
The original agreement signed with the public in 1999 was in principal to ensure the landfill would be and remain essentially an inner landfill, The FEP and WSF should be upgraded or replaced with something better but never should be retire . The output of WSF was never meet to be burry in the landfill and without the FEP the operator cannot diver banned and unacceptable material
Why would we try to get away with just"remain compliant with its commitments"? Shouldn't we be trying to make things even better, not trying to save a few pennies.
We were promised the landfill would only be in our community for 25 years. Another location should be chosen, as promised. People are not always composting properly at source.
For the sake of a savings of $2 million & taking a risk that the community where I live will be negatively impacted, is it really worth taking the risk?
unacceptable.
Legal jargon..no proof existing arrangement isn't needed
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated. Without the FEP more unacceptable materials will enter the landfill and nothing will be monitored. The reason that people don't put unwanted items in the garbage is because they know it is being monitored.
The original agreement was and still is inadequate!
honour original agreement
We will see you in court to decide exactly what is in the agreement and what isn't, I guess.
I am not confident that the removal of FEP/WSF system will not result in the placement of only "Acceptable Waste" within the landfill. There will likely be an increase risk of 'unacceptable waste' getting landfilled if this is done.
The original agreement also specified that the landfill would be closed by now. Please begin the process of looking for an new site.
It doesn't add anything to decrease my concern
I expect there will be more likelihood of people mot bothering to compost if they know they can get away with there being no front end inspection of dumped materials.
This survey is biased. Leaders are not responding to emails and letters from the community.
Put this facility in your back yard
Lesson learned for residents - if it is not in the contract in writing; and was a "gentlemen's agreement" it can be invalidated when required. Disappointing approach and explanation, especially given CMC public opposition to these changes.
N
This will only work if people commit to sorting their own garbage correctly, which will not happen.
If a better system.is desired then come up with a better solution than just turning it off and thus creating other problems for 5site and surrounding communities. Non solutions are not acceptable
We were promised in meeting after meeting before this site was selected that no changes would happen to the front load processing. This is a fight by the residents that should not have to be taking place. Period!!
If you lived in this community would you want the change? No you wouldn't and stop thinking we want it changed
You say that now MOST of goods being delivered to landfill CAN NOW BE CLASSED AS INERT MATERIALS. Nice sly. None of this information is verified and is just more garble. Our community has doubled in population and you can't start now to tinker around with what has worked so well for 20+ years to save a few bucks!!!
The additional processes of sorting and treatment have no negative effect on the waste management process, if thier removal has no positive impact how can it be justified
Again, disregards concerns
Changes to the original agreement are not okay
The original agreement and program should be honored and followed to ensure compliance with the hosting agreement. Even though the green cart program is in place this should be looked at as a multiple barrier approach to maintain and perhaps enhance the protection measures for the landfill.
You are just using vague words to try and save some money. Trusting residents with the assumed success of the green cart program is foolish. We are lazy and careless people, the FEB/WSF is our safeguard against our inherent stupidity.
Speculative and lobbying to save money. This is going back on commitments to the communities
There is no guarantee that the information you are providing is accurate
You're basing you position on a dubious reading of the agreement and proceeding in BAD FAITH with the intent of the agreement.
Not all people properly dispose of or separate waste.
I've been told they had to fight hard to secure the agreement, and the current procedures get national recognition, I would like to see what they fought so hard for to stay in place

Respondents within 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 agreement is a contract... breaking the contract will cost
Proper community consultation is required, and there seems to be a constant request for change without notice. This is our community, the landfill is a tenant. Stop trying to save money instead of the environment and our community
People do not sort properly. The current system ensures things go to their proper place
The system is working beautifully the way it is now. Changing it will be a huge detriment to our community. We never would have agreed to it initially if we thought that they would go back on their word. You can put certain other procedures in place, but the fact is there will be more smell, more rats and more damage to the enviroment by changing how this is currently run.
You still get such waste, and it still needs to be treated
Need to stick with original agreement and close it and move it somewhere else
Nice try at playing playing words. An agreement is an agreement.
You're interpreting a document to suit your needs. Absolutely disgraceful.
Blah blah.
This deactivation is driven my cost and not by what is right for the community. The right thing to do for the community is to meet the obligations that were previously agreed to. If not, go put this facility in some rich white neighbourhood.
Unacceptable waste will go into the landfill onceFEP/WSF is removed. As stated earlier relying on hoseholds to sort their rubbish has been shown to not be reliable
This is using a technicality that should be implicit in the spirit of the agreement
These terms were Agreed to as a condition of siting the landfill. You can't break the terms of the agreement and there is precedent for the department of the environment to not allow these measures to take place. It was unanimously passed in the legislature. Nothing has changed ancestry 2013.
I want the original agreement to be upheld, protecting the investment I made in property in the area and protecting my quality of life living in surrounding communities.
We were part of the community in 1999 when this all took place, so we are well aware of what went on. We have done our part by taking on this facility for 25 years, and now it's time the Municipality lived up to its side of the bargain.
The city is nitpicking the wording of this agreement and that is not okay
This is simply an obfuscation to cover a Peninsular HRM betrayal of a promise & eco-racism .Beechville's proximity to this facility has the stink of Africville.Yeah,that dump was next door too.Shame.
I am so upset that this is even being considered...I don't believe the "sunshine and lollipops" information on this survey. My understanding at the time was that the FEP/WSF is included in the agreement. Without this agreement the project would not have been approved. I could not open the link for the agreement.
Beachside you are still not adhering to what was agreed upon originally. If you are taking out the equipment, the agreement is broken and the landfill closed
Agreement is an agreement
Let's ensure any hazardous waste is identified
You say commitments are being met but in 2021 there should be more stringent requirements not less. Despite what you say the dump still stinks off and on. I don't believe that what you are proposing will benefit the residents/ businesses in this area
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
If organics arrive at Otter Lake, the FEP/WSF are required
I am opposed to this changing. Keep it intact don't endanger the health and property values
I believe that the agreement reached in 1999 addressed many concerns of those that live close to Otter Lake and that by trying to invoke perceived loopholes in order to bring major changes to an agreement is unacceptable. The original agreement and its intent should be respected, if not it brings HRMs credibility in question.
You cant pick and choose what parts of the agreement you want. We do not want this added risk. A promise was made to us when we allowed the land fill to go here. Why do you keep asking PLease stop. Keep your promise, honor ALL of the agreement. Leave Otter Lake Alone.

Respondents within 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
Leaving the FEP/WSF there in case it's needed in the future, does not give confidence that it's not needed.
I am concerned that if anything should happen the repairs to fix the equipment would be too great and then the government would just look at us and say sorry for your luck. That really sucks!
If you need to keep the FEP/WSF 'just in case', obviously what HRM is trying to do is risky and shouldn't be done! Keep the FEP/WSF.
Just honour the original agreement!
It should not be deactivated to begin with.
To have the system in standby kind of show that everyone currently do not know the total degree of impact the deactivation will have. Giving more reason to keep the FEP/WSP in operation
I don't trust them.everything said is usually sugar coated.
There are always promises that aren't kept
the affected community does not trust HRM's discretionary powers it grants itself as to when the fep and wsf is reactivated. Moreover, the dillon study in their assumptions did not provide approval for the absence of the fep & wsf should the ICI return. In fact, their stated assumption was that the FEP/WSF would continue to be exported.
What is the decision process that will lead to deactivation? What would be the trigger points to start deactivation?
Once it's gone and the city staff save their money from firing the staff, it will be used for downtown projects. Since this project started the city has tried to destroy it with cheaper options. I am tired of the city forgetting about Timberlea. It's time we start dealing with our waste and stop trying to cut corners.
The people will be gone. The money to restart won't exist. Excuses upon excuses will be provided to not restart. It'll interfere with the bottom line which is why the want to shut it down
What are the costs to store and maintain unused equipment and what lengths would the city go to to avoid reinstating it? It's always easier and less costly in the long run to maintain and use something than discard and subsequently reactivate it
It shouldn't be inactivated ever and be built some where else beside a shopping district.
I don't trust that it will happen. Not in a million years.
n
you say you're going to keep the equipment but believe as time goes on it will disappear and you all play ignorant and say "I don't know what happened to it"
If there are issues, they will need to be considerable in order for the facilities to be put back into service. Once staff is gone, it's gone.
All of these precautions sound wonderful but how long can this be continued? Once you shut it down, the possibility of a restart becomes more remote with each passing cycle.
Government will lie. This survey is prof in itself of the deception
Ridiculous. Makes more sense to keep it active. If it's not broke, why fix it!
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
It would be another fight to reopen and the damage will have been done too long by that time!
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active"
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
Dormant mechanical equipment doesn't last for long. By the time you decide that it needs to be turned on again it will all have to be repurchased and that cost will serve as another deterrent to turning it back on to fix what's gone wrong by turning it off in the first place.
There is nothing to indicate how much reactivating the system would cost. If problems arise, it could cost more than two million to fix things and/or reactivate the system.
I am less concerned with the ability and more concerned with the willingness of HRM Council to restart it even if that would be in the best interests of area residents.
There is no way to retroactively correct what has already been buried. All of the extra loads of waste that was added to the landfill daily, since the shutdown of the system, will not be removed and put through FEP/WSF System as it would have been done if the syste was not deactivated.
This is being implemented as a money saver. Everything listed above is basically what is going on now but without the operation expense and paying for labour. This seems like an opportunity for some money to be, instead of paying for labour, to instead be pocketed by someone who is doing just fine already.
After a few years, if not in use, I suspect we shall hear it was too costly to maintain.
What is the testing schedule? This is not mentioned.
You are making assumptions that are not true
we are given a rosy picture of the landfill and no real way to address the closure of the facility.
I do not fell that this will be brought back once removed
No because their is no proof it will be maintained? Trust is low
It will be much more difficult to return to the existing system than you are proposing. Very difficult to turn bad and more costly to fix, so will be too expensive to do so
I want to know who is monitoring and checking that these procedures are performed to the letter of the agreement. There doesn't appear to be oversight of these procedures. If rather spend the money to use the equipment then maintain it as it was put in place as an effective component of the process
Why are you not specifying under what conditions the FEP will go back into operation? If the FEP is not needed now, why are intelligent HRM citizens upset? Why the non-transparency?
Organic I have ever confidence that our govt will never reactive the the system, unless there is enormous pressure form the community. Something they seem to be willing to ignore. Organic waste should never be buried in a landfill. The FEP/WSF should always be operated at our landfill.
Just another promise that will be broken. 2 years from now we'll hear how the costs to reactive will put too much strain on the HRM's budget. This community is angry ! We have been lied to ! There is no trust and this survey illustrates why !
HRM does not negotiate in good faith or honour agreements as evidenced by multiple attempts to remove the fewp whenever they loose
The damage that can occur will be done reactivation only proves you shouldn't have deactivated it.leaving it as a reactive plan is not OK. We need to be proactive
We all know that once somethingbis shut down to save money, it never gets restarted.
If not in used there will be problems reactivating.
Finding people with the skills and knowledge to operate the FEP/WSF may not be easy. Also, the technology for FEP/WSF-type processes has almost certainly improved since 1999 and the Otter Lake facility should incorporate improvements if/when reactivated.
We all know this will never be reactivated, great due diligence on throwing a survey monkey out there to make it look like community engagement though.
bottom line is money - once gone it will be more difficult to reactivate - as you are experiencing in trying to deactive!
I've lived her[redacted]ears. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.

Respondents within 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 that much work is required to keep it on standby then leave it running. Let's be real with each other once removed it won't be back
How much is the environment worth to you? Hazardous waste as poisoned the streams and rivers in this area already and we have learned nothing! and we have learned nothing
Once discontinued, you will offer arguments against reinstating it. Better you simply keep it in place.
Honour the original agreement
This helps, but what priority will regular maintenance see once the equipment is shut down? Just because its off doesn't mean it can't fall into disrepair. Bearings may settle, rust may form. Will this maintenance be defunded next year?
Pardon my language, but this is BS. You've focused on the operational side, but it's far more difficult, politically, to undo mistakes we've made with the environment than it is to protect the environment in the first place!
And when would you determine all these wonderful things could be done? Before or after the environment is polluted
the damage has already been done by burying slow decaying material. restarting may be too little too late/
There is no time line given for how long the equipment will remain in this state, and if there is a requirement to activate, is there a budget to address any additional costs incurred in correcting any deficiencies that will have occurred during the inactivation period.
I am not confident that facilities will be kept functional should they need to be put into production
na
Equipment is rarely put back into use, especially if it is saving the HRM money. This removal goes against reducing our footprint and sets us back years. If HRM goes ahead with this it will destroy the trust of the communities and that will be difficult to regain. This is the wrong thing to do
Once the system is shut down, although maintained, I have very little faith that the municipality will ever run it again. What degree of degradation to the conditions surrounding the landfill is acceptable to HRM? I suspect it is much higher than what those of us living here would choose to live with.
If it is reactivate it will be too late and everything you said would happen did and destroying my community in the process
Broken Promises. Hollow facts especially promising something on the foundation of a broken promise. Shame on this council for even considering this.
Plan is very shortsighted. Any savings will be eaten up by mitigation strategies if they even happen. Will set back environmental efforts. Reactivation of FEP/WSF will never happen when this is found to be disastrous. Very disappointed in HRM's ST thinking. Questionnaire is biased; only presents positive, neglects to share disadvantages if proposed mitigation strategies are not fully implemented.
My concern is that in the short term, maintaining facilities and equipment will be tolerated. I have no doubt that after a short time the costs associated with this maintenance will be scrutinized as a potential budgetary savings. It will be abandoned and the equipment sold off to offset costs.
We're concerned as to how long the above measures will remain in place - is this for an indefinite period, or is a deadline date being considered?
staffing during pandemic is brutal. even if it was opened, presumably an emergency, where would staff come from? i work for the government...standby doesnt really exist. this mechanical equipment will just sit there and it will not work without expensive price to reinstate. you are trying to save 2 million and i expect it would be half that price just to maintain equipment in proper standby mode.
The maintenance will not be done on this as said and when the time comes to have to use FEP again it won't work like it should. Just keep it in operation like promised!
Once it is decommissioned, it will be very difficult to convince operators and government agencies to reactivate.
Once the damage is done, it is harder and more expensive to come back. We need to look after our environment
These facilities can deteriorate if unused for any period of time.
This should be upgraded no idea on how to restart the FEP/WSF
Fine, minimal maintenance but when or if they decide to start it up again means they wait until it stinks so bad it will will still take a long time for it to clear the air. Starting it back up again won't fix the issue overnight
The residents of the surrounding communities agreed to the placement of Otter Lake with the understanding that the FEP and WSF would be active throughout the lifespan of the facility. This move by the city is in blatant disregard of the original agreement, and while maybe not in violation of the specific provisions, is made clearly with disregard to the spirit of the agreement.
Sorry, but once shut down, it will not be reinstated. This will be dismantled before we know about it. This facility is already past it's promised expiry date, we don't need more changes or possible impacts to the communities.
All this extra work and cost to maintain a system not in active use could be better used in continuing to use it as in past successfully.
If this facility is shutdown, it will never be reopened.
If we have to put the measures back in place someone will have to admit they were wrong, which anyone with the power to make decisions has a very hard time doing so I dont believe it would actually happen
It sounds like a very expensive plan to mothball a working and important part of the system. It seems to me to be highly unlikely that the FEP would ever be returned to operation if it was taken offline as proposed. It seems more likely that the equipment would eventually be scrapped or sold.
For the money saving, its giing to cost more to maintain in storage and if have to reactivate. Its a system that is working, why stop.
Keep all controls in place
Once you take something away and use that money for other things that you deem more important, it will unlikely ever be brought back. You are not thinking about our community and the agreement that was placed originally. If that information was given then that things may change, our community would never have agreed to have the landfill placed there.
Usually once a system is shut down that is that an operator always can come up with a reason why it cannot be put back into operation history shows such in NS
You have already made up your minds to break the contract. Your word is worth nothing. Government can not be trusted.tdn
These things cant just stop and start on a dime. If it is shut down for any length of time, it will take time to hire and / or retrain workers to run the machines if you ever needed to restart it again.
See previous comments please
More infro
How long would the facilities be maintained if needed?
Cities always need revenue, budgets are always stretched. If the front end is deactivated the city will never find that money to reactivate down the road. Also when you don't operate machines they won't work properly when you need them. The cost to reactivate facilities are always greater than forecasted.
Once it ends there will always be an excuse to restart it.
There is no indication how long money will be spent to maintain an area that is not being used.
Once deactivated it is unlikely the HRM will reinvest money into re-commissioning this equipment
I am sorry, but I do not trust that this will be honored if any large cost savings are reported. And again the Timberlea area will suffer because of it all.
What measures are in place to decide when to turn it on if needed?
Nice try. You will never reactivate this if you get permission to stop.

Respondents within 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
We don't want a non sorted landfill
I cannot understand that you can activate the FEP/WSF without adjustments, repairs or upgrades which I am certain the city of Halifax will not want to add to the cost of operating Otter Lake Landfill Site.
By the time you realize and admit a mistake was made , it will be to late. The damage will already be done.
Why is this question even here? Do you think we're all stupid enough to believe you will maintain expensive machinery "just in case"??? Is THAT supposed to comfort us when you system fails and our wells are poisoned?
There are no monitoring or security systems in place. It is insufficient to completely rely on "walk through" inspections to maintain the integrity of this facility.
Ageing unused equipment will not be maintained to the same standards as currently operating equipment
Because you don't know the answer and don't care about the community or the people in it.
It shouldn't be deactivated so there would be no need to reactivate later when this fails because at this point it will be too late just keep it running the way it is bad enough we have to deal with the treatment facility it is unfair to make it a landfill now
As we all know it is difficult to reverse a project once changed. As numerous examples already established ie. the 20 year promise
Government will go back on its word
What about the employees working in the wsf?
When saving money is the key focus. The reactivation will be so hung up in Bureaucracy it will never happen or it will be to late
If the facility responsible for the front end work is not being used , is it maintained so it can be used there or at some other location?
All equipment if it isn't used degrades. Once it is off there is no chance you would turn it back on or that it could even be turned on. Do not turn it off.
I think it's all a load of crap intended to cover wolves in sheeps clothing. The almighty dollar does not trump human lives and livelihoods.
I have low confidence that once stopped, that to restart the FEP/WSF may take more effort to get everything in running order quickly and effectively again as the process to restart may need a long community and interagency consultation, if this research/survey is any indication for future changes
I am fearful that the reactivation of FEP/WSF will be delayed or may not be capable of restarting should the closure be extended
We need to keep the system.
It's easier (and often cheaper) to keep a system running than it is to start and stop it.
It sounds like reactivation would not be possible.
When you realize all of these risks hit and become issues and you should have never deactivated it in the first place. You will just say it is too expensive to fix the problem to reactivate it.
I don't have confidence in the sincerity of a biased report, written with the purpose of justifying deactivation of this part of the facility. The residents of this area were promised by the council of the day that front end sorting would be a permanent part of the Otter Lake landfill.
Once the current process has been removed and money saved from doing so the government and heads of the Otter Lake waste facility will not go back to the original way of doing things if necessary due to the cost savings and politics.
If you anticipate having to reinstall the program, the research must not be 100% sound in its conclusion of removal
We will have to fight to get it back.
Once changes are made, they seldom become undone.
Would you bet your life that this will easily happen? Doubt it because you have no clue if it will.
It may be too late. Damages may be irreversible
Once removed it will never be re-established!
Historically, it is much more difficult to implement systems that have been shut down after the fact especially if they cost additional tax dollars.
This is a city that doesn't fill pot holes, repair sidewalks and make a mess out of snow clearing, and you think we should have faith in the city that is trying to get out of its agreement with this district? Shame on the city.
This is a purely financial decision and once you have turned this off, you will never have 'enough' money to turn it back on. Leave it on!!!
should be some kind of plan if this one doesnt work the way it should. An effectiveness check needs to be done and if it doesnt pass a process needs to be in place to control the issue
Every year the first snowstorm in HRM is not properly serviced because of equipment breakdown due to inadequate maintenance - and this is a yearly occurrence.
I suspect there will be much opposition from HRM and Mirror to reactivate.
This survey is giving me more concerns than I had to begin with. If it doesn't get used, it'll develop problems. That's common knowledge with machines.
Still a negative impact on community
Machines are meant to be in use. They do not age well sitting around and getting rusty.
Information provided does not give any parameters for how/when the facility would or could be deactivated. History has shown that once something like this is changed, ie in this case deactivated, there is never the objective will to evaluate and "change back" to the previous way of functioning.
My understanding is that there has been no by getting allowance for the reactivation
There is no accounting in the proposed changes of the cost of keeping assets idle. There is also no accounting of the cost of reactivation of 23 year old equipment, if such aged equipment can be reactivated at all.
Once HRM deactivates this, it will NEVER be activated again. There will be no going back
It should not be removed at all, so discussing how it can be reactivated "if necessary" is foolish. IT IS NECESSARY. Our environment and our community deserves better!
TIMING is the biggest question -- if there is a change in the waste arriving, will the re-start be within the week, the month, or the year following? How will the waste arriving be monitored if the system is deactivated?
When equipment sits idle for years, reactivation is not sustainable
Report should include reactive criteria, process, critical success factors, recovery mock tests (disaster recovery).
We all know once it stops it is really hard to get it started again, too much red tape
What is the turn-around time and cost for de-mothballing the facility if required?
time to reactivate
FEP re-instatement will be based on a decision by council, and I feel they will be more interested in saving the money than they will be in restarting the FEP.
What does this cost of decommissioning and starting up again. If we don't have the incinerator going we are going to get smelled out of our homes. The rodents will increase and it will be a terrible place to live . Send you garbage somewhere else if is how you want to manage it

Respondents within 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 have been involved with a number of decommissioning projects. It is extremely naive to think that this equipment can be restarted with little to no cost at some time in the future. What funding has been set aside to restart/replace this equipment as part of re-starting/recommissioning?
No changes should be made
How long will the equipment be maintained?
It would have negative impacts
Idle machinery tends to become garbage
They already are needed
Once the funds in the HRM budget have been reallocated it will be almost impossible to get them back.
I do not believe that it will be maintained and even if it is the ramifications of the change in function will effect residents for decades.
Sounds costly. Why not just run it. I also read that it won't come online at least for the first 5 years for any reason. Is that true? What conditions need to exist to trigger powering it up?
a typical bureaucratic response; there will always be some lame excuse for re-activating difficulties.
I don't trust that it would be re-activated in time to mitigate any issues that arise.
do not shut it down
Once it is done and money is being saved , it won't get changed if it doesn't work
Will cost $$$$, what if budgets are tight? Won't happen.
This isn't about looking after HRM waste it's about saving money. I don't trust HRM staff care about my community or what they place in the ground. They care about reducing cost and we need to start dealing with our environment and protecting it.
Although I am not concerned that it can be restarted, I am concerned that the effects of not using it will not be realized until later and it may be too late. The ability to restart may be a red herring that misses the benefit that it's continued use has.
How about an independent source reassure us rather than those invested in proving their own agenda
This addresses the technical concerns - I'm concerned about political will and inertia. I do not foresee any municipal government adding to its costs if things are "good enough" regardless of what that means in the future.
Hrm and Mirror will never reactive these once stopped. They will always come up with reasons, starting with cost and no doubt eventually claim the systems are no longer viable due to "unforeseen circumstances"
Stated that inspection will occur but what timeline
What are the metrics to regenerate it? Is there a financial penalty?
I am concerned not with the INABILITY to reinstate but the UNWILLINGNESS to do so due to cost
Without the process to track the percent of non-sorted waste, how will you monitor if it needs to be restarted. Like closing the gate after the cows left the barn.
Realistically once off it will not be restarted
If the FEP/WSF in unnecessary, why maintain it? Clearly deactivating the FEP/WSF has to do purely with financial considerations when it is the environment that is important.
I don't believe these measures will happen.
No information is provided on timelines required for a restart of operations. If data shows a change needs to be made, how long until it can happen?
Without equipment maintenance contracts equipment could easily fall out of being able to be returned to service
And what will it cost to re-activate the system once it has been disabled.
should not be deactivated in the first place
There will be a large cost to recommission the FEP/WSF processes and will be a justification to keep it decommissioned even if there is an identified problem due to increased organic matter in the landfill after the FEP/WSF is removed
This does not prove the items above will be done. Are there financial penalties is a neutral 3rd party SME finds the above is not being done?
It doesn't need to be take out of the process. It was put in place for a reason and this will effect the surrounding communities directly. All to save a profit, shameful
No faith based on previous history and experience with such entities.
Stop experimenting in our neighborhood and hold up your end of the bargain.. how long does it take HRM to do anything useful. Look at the state of the VG. And you've been building the hospital for 3 years in Bayer's lake and it's still just a hole...
Why even offer this if you are so confident the FEP/WSF are no longer needed?? This is so obviously a cost cutting measure to trim expenses just in time to raise management bonuses and salaries.
I don't believe the FEP/WSF would be restarted under any conditions. HRM cannot be trusted to live up to its commitments.
Honor your commitment to the residents and taxpayers
i have no faith in the politicians . restarting the process. they will come up with all the excuses as they usually do.
Lack of trust, we have to keep coming back to fight cuts
If we are continuing to pay for regular maintenance and upkeep, what is the actual cost savings going to be?
There is no experience in out there to compare to this situation. How long will deactivation last? Why are you keeping it, if you feel your process will improve things?
Once it's turned off, noone will turn it back on. It's your responsibility to keep our neighborhood safe from garbage, odour rodents and to keep our water clean.
If you decommission it, it will be harder to put back in as staff, maintenance, etc would all have to be done which would be more costly and you would deem it too expensive to put back in to service
These measures sound fine but I'm not convinced that they'll are be implemented.
Too mush BS.
do NOT deactivate the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
Job losses
Once the FEP is remove I don't believed it will never be deactivated. Cost of operation of the FEP should not trump the environment and the future of my kids
No, no, no. If you deactivate the FEP/WSF then it will never be reactivated. Maintenance will be scaled back, over time and then will stop. The land will be considered too valuable and eventually sold.
Sounds good but I'm not sure it will all be folliwed
It may equal the cost of maintenance. This part of the proposal indicates to me that the experts are not even confident their proposal is going to work.
Cost
The proposed efforts are to save money, I don't trust that you'd spend realize the error and commit to refunding the original process
this does not answer the concern.

Respondents within 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
Do we wait until the rats take over and then reactivate?
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
Current activities minimally address all areas of the landfill. We could do so much better.
If it's not used for a long time. It could not work right when needed
I believe the FEP/WSF system is currently "needed". As such, my concerns are not addressed if the system will only be activated "as needed" - the system will be needed on an ongoing basis.
Staffing the unit is not addressed in the plan.
While it sounds like facility will be mothballed and monitored, there is no information on how quickly it can be brought back in line, or what circumstances would indicate how you will know if it should be brought back on-line.
You have no actual idea of the cost of this
If there is a chance it would need to be reinstated why are we taking that chance
Clearly a failure in models and recommendations for shutting them down if they need to be turned back on. So what are penalties/enhanced controls and reporting expected as consequence. Given reliance on documents to control narrative to shut them off, it needs to be fully documented as part of plan to switch off.
N
if it goes, it won't come back
Cutting cost is all you people see and want to see! This is going against anything that was promised in the past and what we were all afraid of happening. Again this shows us how government continues to operate and doesn't care about the people.
I feel it will still affect my community
If you are trying to save $2 million, what is the cost of the upkeep? And if these need to be put back into operation, where will the money come from to reactivate them and consistently keep them running?
UNACCEPTABLE to de-activate, hence no reason to worry about re-activation. FULL STOP.
Equipment not being used for an extended time will ultimately fall into disrepair. And the recommisioning will almost always cost more than replacement
This is a money saving decision, at the expense of the neighborhood - money saved will not be willingly spent again
I believe that if the FEP is shut down it will never be reactivated as it has a financial impact to HRM to reactivate.
Sorry... I just don't believe any of this. Your decision to shut down the FEB/WSF makes anything you promise suspect.
Because my version of necessary and your version of necessary, may not be the same
Once a 25-year old system as elaborate as the FEP/WSF is taken out of mothballs, its reactivation will cost more than the original system.
If it can so readily be reactivated how about we leave it intacted
The landfill should not be deactivated.
I have lost faith in the powers that be and do not trust that they will follow through correctly with any of this.
I still do not agree with your doing away with this.
Deactivation does not solve the issue
If you will be maintaining it.use it
Once HRM has the monetary savings from deactivation they will find excuses to not respend the money needed to reactivate it..Also i have concerns on the length of time it would take to reactivate.
Relying on all of these extra measures, instead of honouring the original agreement, seems unnecessary. If we can't keep the FEP/WSF in place, why would we maintain the many additional measures described? Too much faith for me to place in the municipality.
I simply have difficulty trusting HRM.
Don't deactivate to start with. Save $2 million that will cost many times that down the road.
If you are already committed to going back on one agreement why should anyone in the community believe that this will come back if needed. Once you save the money you could care less about those in the communities dealing with aftermath.
mothballing the FEP/WSF will be expensive.
I believe it will depend on the length of time deacivated. A prolonged period could be a concern
First off if it's not going to cause any issues, as you say, then using the ability to be reactivated if needed is a strange argument. Are you sure or are you not? Secondly, we all know that saying it's easy to reactivate and actually getting it done can take a long time. Trying to get simple things like crosswalks and street lights can take years because of all the paperwork and red tape.
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
The FEP & WSF must remain active thoughout operations
I am opposed to the removal of the fep and wsf
Once it is deactivated it stands to reason that it will be very difficult to reactivate. There is a substantial cost involved in reactivation and that will certainly be the main deterrent brought up by HRM.
You are in a dream if you thing reactivation a mothballed system 5,10,15 years from now is financially viable. Industry experts would disagree across many many less corrosive and inert environments. Keep it working, keep it maintained. Let it do the job it is meant to do.

Respondents within 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
The original agreement should be kept in place. The residents of the BLT community deserve no less! We cannot trust any agreement HRM makes in future!
That there is an original agreement in place and now the proposal goes back on that. Just dirty. What's the point of agreements, even the proposals in this expansion if down the road their broken.
The FEP/WSP currently works to reduce waste that isnt suppose to be dumped in the first place. The environment does not have a price tag and all measures should be used to protect it and its residents . The FEP should be kept as per agreement. Until rules/ monitoring can be added / increased to reduce the waste from arriving to the site in the first place the FEP/WSP is required.
Disease and exposure of unslightly smells and odors.
All of them
Raising our taxes due to some unforeseen problem.
The betrayal of HRM to the letter and spirit of the 1999 Agreement
The FEP/WSF is a process that has been working well and exemplary globally. It seems that a cost-saving of what sounds like 10% is not worth the risk of failure of dismantling the process. There is an implicit assumption that the public will do a good enough job at sorting waste which is likely inaccurate.
The city staff do not seem to understand or care about protecting the Enviroment. The HRM's solid waste program is a failure, just look at the garbage on the side of the road and the waste residents place in bags. To know we need the FEP/WSF program.
Property values will drop as the smells and rat infestation continues
everything was put in place because of the Mount Uniacke landfill. It is from what we learned. Now they want to deactivate it.
The potential for more waste materials to be diverted from other facilities to Otter Lake
HONOR THE AGREEMENT... and in case I wasn't clear... HONOR THE AGREEMENT. Make as many changes as you like, when the current facility is shut down and you can find another community that will agree to a less effective system.
This process should not be allowed to go forward.
The report that was commissioned was inconclusive and HRMs claims cannot be substantiated. A deal was made, now stick to it!
Why can the city not take no as an answer? Also this survey is designed to skew responses and is more propaganda then it is consultation. Please do effective consultation.
if you get this what will be next on you list. besides I thought this dump was supposed to be relocated after so many years?
The Dillon report indicates that a significant amount of hazardous waste is currently being sorted out. With the sorting facility gone, it would go in the lansfill. The report does not address this consequence.
Most concerning is the depth of government manipulation to get their desired outcome.
Property values of residents homes nearby
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active.
This was a very biased survey that most HRM residents don't care about as long as it keeps the landfill out of their back yards, therefore this survey should have only been sent to the residents in the surrounding area within 5 Klms.
Safeguard to ensure that hospital, industrial and commercial waste will be eliminated
noise pollution, Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/WSF active
Organic waste material should not be buried in a landfill, keep the FEP/ WSF active.
Leave it as is or decommission the entire site. It's time for some other area to take a turn.
Since you will be adding 8 to 10 additional truckloads of waste daily, will you have to increase the landfill capacity? It seems like this can have a great impact on residents, as you will be moving closer to residential areas.
Do not deactivate.
Mainly, that it will be expanded and expanded and end up contaminating many wells.
Value of our homes/properties in Timberlea
Rats in the area ! Since moving here the rat issue has been increasing steadily ! I can't even take my 2 year old out to play in our backyard without seeing rats running around. I'm sure if this was in a government officials backyard this would be ok
The agreement with the community for having a landfill in our area includes a FEP/WSF. I believe this part of the agreement should be honored as long as the landfill exists.
Tourist use of the Bluff trail system and other outdoor activities on the area
Overall this is reverting on a process that is working and is effective. There is not outline in the plan as to who will be monitoring and where the oversight lies. Further clarification of how changes will be analyzed need to be communicated. Overall we seem to be moving backwards.
If removing the FEP is a good deal for the people of HRM and especially the good people who live near the facility, HRM should be making this issue a non-issue, not me.
This survey is a sham and our govt should be ashamed of themselves for creating it. Organic waste Organic waste should never be buried in a landfill. The FEP/WSF should always be operated at our landfill.
This survThis survey is not a consultation, it's a sneaky attempt to influence people ! HRM needs to keep it's promise to the BLT community !
This changed is only targeted at saving money. There is no good reason to deactivate FEP/WSF. HRM should be leaders in this area, not go backwards. This survey is an attempt by HRM to justify their actions.
Organic waste does not belong in a landfill
If it's not broken don't try to change/fix it
You asked prev to increase the height and extend the time of closure. We agreed based on smart processing. You are changing that. I want to cemetery shut it down now.
The value of my house going down!!!
I am dismayed that council only wants to pay lip service to the environment and the commitment they made to residents. Imagine if this facility were in the south end. Bet the bait and switch would not be happening.
1. Re-establishing a budget for operating the FEP/WSF once de-activated may not be easy or possible. 2. HRM's population is growing at an increased rate, and waste production will also increase. Otter Lake's FEP/WSF should be upgraded to current technology during the "paused" phase.
When will a new landfill location be announced? The agreement which was so eloquently explained earlier also had a timeline. Kindly advise
age of the dump - promise to discontinue as promised
I've lived her[redacted]years. We didn't agree to a dump. We've been lied to and are being manipulated to accept this.
its going to ruin our community. its a nice community and up and coming and this will ruin it. leave it alone
Why would we agree to removing part of a system even if it only removes a small part of unacceptable waste it should not be removed. If there is better technology then add it
I have noted my concerns in previous answers.
I have little faith in the general public (Especially Industrial, Commercial, and High Density Residential sectors) to follow waste sorting guidelines. I believe the most effective way to ensure waste goes to the correct facility is on-site sorting.
What will you do if you're wrong? I predict you'll drag your heels and resist putting the equipment back into service, and years will drag on with the environmental impacts compounding. I dread this outcome.

Respondents within 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
the agreement for the town dump in "my backyard ie otter lake" was agreed to for 25 years back in 1997. although having a dump so close was upsetting, it was "our turn" to have it. how very frustrating to have that deadline extended AND changes made (ie. no longer will 4000 tons of decaying matter be discovered prior to burial, as in 2019). it's time to locate the dump elsewhere.
We have had industry from all over the world come to NS to see what we have done with our landfill because we are leading the way for the environment. To walk this back because it costs too much is not the message we should be sending to the world, especially given the heat and light the environment is being given around the world.
Once when things change the government never give it back. Taking away the FEP will allow for the dumping of garbage with no one watching. I'm old enough to know when people are not watching employees do what they like and so do the three level of Government.
This goes against an agreement with the communities and it is not an environmentally sound decision. This is a money driven decision. The HRM has no right to go back on its word about protecting the communities around the landfill.
The level of trust from the beginning. But you will do what you are going to do anyway. Thanks for wasting my time
Keep your promise to this community. Integrity is important. This survey clearly designed for the results to be skewed in favour of deactivation. Shameful display. Do better.
Just want the site gone
When this facility was opened, it was leading the way when it comes to waste disposal and now you want us to go backwards especially with everyone's concerns around the environment.
just honour the original agreement. i suggest that a new set of eyes be brought in. these lifelong partnerships get complacent. how about the opinion of a different operations group and especially a different consulting firm. Dillon seems to do an awful lot of work the HRM...
Its something we didn't want a landfill site in the first place but you and the goverment ignored the tax payers and communities and then you deactivated the one thing you know helps the process of shit in the landfill but you ignore it because you cheap and rather line your own pockets with the money. It's time for workers to speak up to tell exactly what is the truth
It's disgusting what your trying to do to our community! Imagine if you lived here
I'm concerned this survey itself is not meant to actually change any outcome and it's just to make people feel like they've been able to voice concerns.
The environmental output planned is concerning
This survey is clearly designed to minimize and dismiss concerns of community members. The survey data obtained is basically useless from a statistical standpoint due to the extreme bias of the survey design. I have forwarded a link to the survey to the province for review and context around the data collected.
Why don't you cut the salaries of overpaid politicians and government employees instead of reducing the quality of services you offer for ever increasing taxes.
The development within our community may be greatly impacted by this decision. Our community is strong and growing. Also this survey is not a good survey- this is not how you collect data on a topic. It severely worries me that your biased survey making skills is proof that you have no idea what it means to properly communicate and be a part of a community
Aside from HRM looking to walk away from their responsibility to protect the environment and the community that accepted this landfill, the market value for homes will be negatively impacted by this move.
People are notoriously lazy, and their will always be those that will continue to put Items that should not go in garbage into to the black bag hidden from view.
Reduction of my property value! Air quality for those who already have breathing problems, impacts to our environment, pest increase (not just birds and rats), etc.
Residents are not being listened too.
As I have previously stated, you are taking away something that was agreed upon. It will be worse for our community. You are being greedy trying to save money at a communities expense.
What about the employees? Where are they going?
Contracts are not meant to be broken. The residents would not have agreed too the dump if you had not lied to us.
Methane, groundwater contamination and the source of organics in the landfill
The betrayal of our community by the City of Halifax
Any future sites are at risk if the original agreement isn't honoured.
As a resident of the area I feel that HRM does not have a long term plan and is taking a trial and error approach. Unfortunately it is the residents who lose when assumptions are incorrect.
I am concerned that this is politically motivated and that if the city is looking to save money, there should be other areas that they should look at.
10% is a significant amount of food waste to ignore and is not setting and example for future generations
I am concerned with HRM's near total handoff of municipal responsibilities to the private sector in general. Profit will always rule. One group of companies in particular. And don't give me your public tender BS. You can skew a tender like you can skew this survey.
We don't want a non sorted landfill
You are proposing breaking a contractual formal agreement from 1999 and am again quite certain that if you do this change at Otter Lake. That it and we, will never be able to revert to this state-of-the art facility.
Negative environmental effects. This is an extreme step backwards
HRM is doing less waste management and adding more waste. I am concerned about the health of the local residenst and the health of the environment. HRM needs to do better.
The city made an agreement when this was opened. Honor the agreement! Stop trying to fix what isn't broken. It works pretty good, so stop thinking you are so much smarter than the people that designed it.
History shows the inability of HRM to fulfill promises made to the community prior to the opening of landfills. We only have to remember the landfill of Middle Sackville/amount Uniacke. Additionally when the landfill in Otter Lake was first operational our community remembers the smell of stench which was very prevalent depending on the wind direction.
You have a duty and commitment to the surround community that was established when otter Lake landfill was agreed upon by the community. Now you're bypassing the CMCs role and doing what you want, regardless of the original agreement. Shame on you.
While the survey addressed how the equipment would be maintained if it needed to be put back in service it did not address what conditions would lead it to be put into service, or whether personnel would be available to operate the equipment.
Job loss
It all stinks
This may discourage residents from sorting and sets a bad precident with regards to knowingly landfilling organics
Recently bought in Timberlea and had concerns about being so close to Otter Lake, luckily after some initial research found out that the process at Otter Lake is very well done and has little concern for human health. Worried that by changing this, our initial concerns could come true.
Keep it running as it is or because we are recycling and sorting more instead of running the Processor full time run it half time and save one million. Be careful with this. Our Community and Enviroment are #1.
The undercover way this was done is sickening. The public is only engaged at the end stage so you can pat yourselves on the back and say we did a good job. Meanwhile the residents of the community are Fubar. Thanks again hrm
I am concerned with all of it. It is working fine, let's not break an already working system.
Plan is very shortsighted. Any savings will be eaten up by mitigation strategies if they even happen. Will set back environmental efforts. Reactivation of FEP/WSF will never happen when this is found to be disastrous. Very disappointed in HRM's ST thinking. Questionnaire is biased; only presents positive, neglects to share disadvantages if proposed mitigation strategies are not fully implemented.

Respondents within 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
An agreement was made between the city and the community. This agreement needs to be honoured.
I believe this survey was biased with loaded questions. This makes me feel like everything about this change has ulterior motives and should be resolved via third party.
This whole survey is ridiculously biased. You waste all of this money on consultants, lawyers etc. When the only problem is how can we save a couple million a year. Then overbuild a solution. The results are it cripples the surrounding community and loses all credibility as you went back on your promises to the CMC. The option should still be on the table to not deactivate the FEP/WSF!
I don't have confidence in the sincerity of a biased report, written with the purpose of justifying deactivation of this part of the facility. The residents of this area were promised by the council of the day that front end sorting would be a permanent part of the Otter Lake landfill.
Just don't do it. Enough said.
I am concerned that the communities concerns will not actually be taken into account. I fear that this is all to decrease the budget and does not have the communities best interests at heart.
There will be more things changed, more promises made and we would be crazy to trust you.
Your desire to continuously make changes to save costs. Who knows what you will do next and then next. We did our time with this facility. Time to give it to another. If so confident, put it in your community.
I am proud of the leadership role Halifax had taken If anything we should be enhancing the FEP:WSF
Overall all I am concerned about the environmental impact of removing the FEP. This is not the time to remove layers of protection. The environment needs us to do what we can to ensure we are doing everything we can to compost and recycle anything that can be rather than place it in land fills.
I do not trust the city to have the best interests of this district in mind, they are serving their own wants and finding an easy way out of doing the right thing.
It is abundantly clear that this decision is a financial one and not one that is based on science or the environment. You made an agreement to operate a clean facility and now are trying to back out of it to save some money.
The community members that have been unemployed fue to the slowdown of the facility
This area is growing rapidly therefore the amount of garbage generated will increase ie diapers, how will the facility cope with all the garbage without impacting the pristine environment that surrounds it?
The agreement with the residents of BLT was a necessity because of the difficulty finding a site. This backpedaling on the agreement seals the fate on future site selection. It will be impossible.
I strongly suspect this will have a negative impact on the value of home prices.
I've never had issues with the landfill there, never noticed it beyond the truck traffic. No smells, no complaints. I think that's a good thing.
The by-products of solid waste deposited in a landfill has adverse effects on the surrounding environment and humans living closer to landfill sites. Sacrificing human living conditions, safety and the environment for money is WRONG.
Increased garbage, odours, leaching into groundwater and especially the expected amount of rodents in the neighbouring communities.
If we move to this proposed system, we are abandoning the use of a precautionary approach where measures are put in place to prevent damage. We will be placed in a circumstance where we can only react to bad outcomes after they have happened. This is a clear violation of the spirit of the agreement and especially the clause that allows only 'acceptable waste' to be deposited in the landfill.
Will continue to devalue the environment.
My concern is the laziness of it all, and attempt to cut costs and save time and effort by making everyone's garbage the problem of Timberlea residents. Under no circumstances should our government be cutting costs at the expense of the environment, even in marginal amounts.
Do your damn job and find a new site, then build it however you want. We've done our part.
When this area is "filled" completely, will there be a plan to expand further? Will the expansion be a simple landfill, or will the sorting system which has kept Otter Lake so good be implemented elsewhere?
Concerns regarding environmental racism, that the policies in place are not in the best interest of the surrounding community, and that the policies put in place are discriminatory
The report is incomplete with regards to evidence of known issues at other facilities that do not have FEP/WSF facilities. The report does not give evidence estimated cost of increased monitoring and testing functions due to the FEP/WSF decommission
We still have along way to go with our separation program in HRM, I see everyday, apartment building which are supposed to separate not doing so, the same for businesses. Reality is not everyone is complying with protocols so it is important that Pre sorting continue.
The deactivation feels like a short-sighted budgeting exercise. The facility should either be upgraded if we anticipate using it for many years; or it should be wound down and replaced with another, newer facility at a different site.
Respect your commitment. This is short sighted.
The savings being proposed are much to small to warrant breaking trust with a community and putting the community and environment at risk. VERY DISAPPOINTED TO SEE HRM MOVING IN THIS DIRECTION.
No changes should be made
Will theis lead to the Otter Lake site being extended? Any potential effects on land values in the area?
HSW
our community shouldn't even have the dump anymore and this deactivation is only going to make it worse. It's disrespectful to the BLT community
Pleas honour the agreement from 1999 to the residents of Timberlea.
This is a really misleading and one sided community consultation process that does not address concerns adequately or constructively seek to engage feedback.
We have a formula that works. Why is this being put at risk. If you proceed and then have to revert back to the current process the cost of that could be significant. $2m is what percent of the current budget.
I am concerned that the healthy and safety of residents is being sacrificed to save a few dollars and facilitate a quick fix for our waste disposal problem.
I'd be more open to innovation. This approach simply feels wrong and the risk is too great.
loss of jobs and increased risk to the environment. 2 million dollars is a small amount when considered to the total budget for HRM
promote less consumption and waste.
Don't change
City deceived the community, will continue. I guarantee that if this was in a high tax paying area this would not happen
HRM staff do not have our communities best interest in mind. They only want to save money and we need to look after the environment.
Related to this survey, the field provided are not conducive to thoughtful and thorough responses. This was completed on an iPad and rereading my comments was not possible and were limited in the number of characters. Therefore my responses could not be reread or completed thoroughly to provide all of my concerns.
I'm concerned that there may be adverse effects. Although there is a chance to get the agreement back in place, the time it would take to get the government to act on enforcing it is scary
Have. To really think about this
I am disgusted with HRM staff and councilors for going back on the original agreement made with the community. We had a world class facility but now it will be shameful!
My largest concern is the non transparent way that the risks are being managed

Respondents within 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 think this is very disappointing and disheartening that this is even an issue. We deserve more. We deserve as tax payers to have this agreement honored. What is your plan when our property values decrease.
Economic impact of lost jobs.
The flagrant disregard to honoring the contract by the city should be a warning to the next district required to have it in their backyard!!! Lake Echo-Preston, Sambro, Bedford-HmdsPlains, Musquo.Hbr, Hubbards
It represents a major be away from the original intent and design of the system. This “after the fact” change does not honour the original promises and assurances to the surrounding neighborhood
The landfill is too close to a vastly growing residential area.
I'm concerned with the Dillon reports (2020-11-30) methodology. No rationale is provided for how certain activities were deemed "none identified". Justifications should be made for why risks were included or excluded.
I am concerned not by increase in rodents and birds in the facility but also impacts of them in the community. We see a far amount of rats and rodents now in the area ... this will only increase if organics etc. increase and are not treated before landfill. The report does not address this as a potential risk..
The BLT community is the fastest growing area in HRM. I don't think the new home owners, especially Brunello Estates or the golf course, want additional odours or birds or rodents in the area.
HRM breaking their agreement...this area has been built up in a big way around this landfill(Brunello for example) and these people dont have any idea what this change will make to their neighbourhood, but the inrease in smell and rodents will be enough for property values to plummet.
HRM and the province should be implementing measures to reduce incoming wastes to the landfills, especially organics but also other consumer waste. It is costing us too much to allow these wastes into our disposal streams - environment, climate change, cost of management
Concern with the removal of a step that was put in place in 2014. My question is why? It always has and always will come down to money. This will save mine for the company, not for the surrounding communities. This will attract more rodents and will affect the surrounding communities more so then it already does. Do not change the process!
Increased traffic, contaminants, smell, rodents and decrease in property values with no compensation to residents.
What happened to closing this in a time frame that has already passed???
My concern is that at times like this, with what we have gone through in our society, that the greed to cut costs to funnel to the top of the ladder is still the number one priority for government. Disgusting.
HRM made commitments to the community in return for hosting the landfill. It intends to reneg on them. I have lost all trust in the staff and elected officials. I hope that the Province has the integrity that HRM lacks.
That no matter what this will go ahead even though a commitment was made to the residents and taxpayers
todays youth have no interest in recycling. therefor i expect more waste in the garbage.
I am concerned that the city it not upholding it’s agreement, and that the proposed changes will negatively affect our property value.
height of cells
Going back on your agreement to the community
Property values will be impacted, the environment of my area will be affected. Honour the agreement that was signed
we were given a deal that we agreed to. You tried to change the deal and we said no. why the Hell are you still trying to shove something down our throats when we don't want it?
do NOT deactivate the Otter Lake FEP/WSF
With these areas being shut down and in time the landfill area will result in a climatic mess all for a f
If this landfill will remain in operation for the next 40 year the FEP and WSF is presently the best option we have to protect our environment and ensure the proper stewardship of this facility and our environment
We already went through this process a short while ago. What has changed? Certainly nothing for the residents of the area. Stop trying to save money for absolutely no benefit to the area residents. We have something that works. Leave it alone. This survey leaves a lot to be desired. One sided doesn't begin to describe it.
Why is there no plan to move the facility to another community, as promised.
Quality of life as a resident. Decreased property values.
lowers housing market desirability. These "answers" are insufficient.
Decline in Property values
I do not want the FEP/WSF deactivated
You have provided inadequate space to cover all items of concern. This is unacceptable reporting.
illegal dumping
How long will it take to bring systems back up, if necessary. How will you be monitoring the landfill yo know if it will be necessary to bring facilities back online?
Leadship's lack of response to direct outreach from community members
N
If it's not broken, don't fix it. This is a functional facility and should remain as is. Preventative rather than reactive.
Decrease in property values continues to be a huge concern. Who wants to live close to a dump that the government refuses to honour the agreement they made to the residents in the past! Who knows what will come down the road?? Disgraceful is the only word I can think of.
It would appear that any study conducted to examine the efficacy of the removal of such systems was rushed, and poorly conducted
Overall harm to the eco system
I sincerely believe that the services provide a critical environmental protection and thus are immune to political interference. The environment takes precedence over economy, politics, healthcare, welfare, etc.
It goes directly against the agreement with the communities and I do not agree you will be able to maintain a high level of standards of the landfill if you remove these two systems. No amount of lobbying or posturing is going to change my opinion on this
Not interested
I have expressed my concerns and the questionnaire has rejected my comments as invalid? Why?
This will drastically decrease the value of homes in the area and should not be altered when the community fought for it to remain in place
I have lost all trust. If they want this new type of system then they can put it somewhere else. Put it in their own backyard and see how they would like it.
Our properties values decreasing due to a stench of a dump to close to home!
Quality of life, value of property and pride in my community with in an in odour, rodent populations and litter that are likely if the agreement to maintain the FEP/WSF is broken.
If the Municipality goes ahead with this, I will have lost all of my trust in the organization and its people. Please keep your word.
Expansion & over extension of this site.

Respondents within 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
When Otter Lake was placed in our community (a done deal) even before the options went to Council. The entire survey etc is not transparent/council is in conflict of interest - NIMBY....I pray the DOE turns it down. HRM will not save money in the long term.
No one seems to care about those who live here and KNOW what we see smell and deal with already with this equipment in place. Stop listening to financials and book keepers and listen to the communities that elected you!!
Rodent and odour control is an absolute must
I'm not interested in "mitigation". HRM promised to maintain the waste facility at a very high level, and I expect HRM to keep its promise to the community. We will not need "mitigation" if HRM does not downgrade the quality level with which it has been running the facility. I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS.
The landfill would not be here today without the FEP & WSF. Why are no other solutions being presented?
I oppose the removal of the fep and wsf
Mainly the integrity of HRM in introducing other such projects within the Municipality. If they are not able to honour this agreement there will certainly be concerns/ trust issues for future agreements.
If you keep doing this and pusing the community in this way. You risk further eroding any trust the public has with our electyed bodies. You will also prove you can not be trusted to ever site another waste facility ever again. Or any other environmentally sensitive facility. A promise was made. Do not break this trust. LEAVE OTTER LAKE ALONE