

Councillor Eisenhower stated that he did not want to be in the position where he would have to discriminate as to where the money was coming from. Mr. Meech stated that it would not affect that program.

The motion was amended to read:

"THAT recipients of Provincial Family Benefits are not eligible for property tax relief from the Municipality as Family Benefits includes payment of property taxes, concerning the Tax Relief Program Only."

Deputy Warden Ball stated that this would not apply to the \$300 program.

Councillor Meade stated that most families are not aware that their benefits include taxes. He stated that there were approximately 100-125 families that would be affected by this. He expressed concern that those people whose application was not received and processed before July 1990 would not have the privilege of tax relief. Warden Lichter stated that this motion is applicable from January 1991 on. Councillor Meade stated that that is not what Chisholm MacKinnon told him earlier in the day.

The motion was amended to read:

"THAT recipients of Provincial Family Benefits are not eligible for property tax relief from the Municipality as Family Benefits includes payment of property taxes, concerning the Tax Relief Program Only, effective January 1, 1991."

Councillor Bates stated that what was happening is that the province is paying for example \$20 month for taxes in the cheque and then the County is coming along and waiving those taxes. He stated that when the province discovered it they decided they would deduct that \$20 since the County is waiving it. He stated that now the Province will be paying and not the County.

Councillor MacDonald stated that people won't have the money to pay and it will be difficult for everyone. He suggested that some may qualify for the \$300 program.

Deputy Warden Ball stated that we should ask the Province by letter to inform the recipients that a portion of their funds are allocated for Municipal taxes.

The motion was amended to read:

"THAT recipients of Provincial Family Benefits are not

eligible for property tax relief from the Municipality as Family Benefits includes payment of property taxes, concerning the Tax Relief Program Only, effective January 1, 1991;

AND FURTHER THAT Halifax County ask the province to inform recipients that a portion of their benefits is allocated for Municipal taxes."

Councillor Randall clarified that this motion would only affect those on Provincial Family Benefits applying for tax relief and not those on fixed incomes, ie. pensions.

Councillor Merrigan stated that we had better have a meeting with the province about this because this policy the County had was to help people with low incomes and now if they are getting family benefits, we can't help them.

Councillor Bates stated that the province is simply saying that they are paying for taxes and the County is not charging them. He stated that we are the only municipality in the province with a Tax Exemption Program. Mr. Meech stated that we are the only municipality that actually writes off the taxes. He stated that the program is intended to provide short term relief where circumstances present itself.

Councillor McInroy stated that people were getting paid twice for the same thing. He stated that it was morally wrong to duplicate payment, regardless of the income. He stated that no one would be any worse off. He stated that if it does cause some difficulty, the Municipality is there to offer supplementary income assistance. He stated that the duplication of payment is fundamentally wrong.

After much continued debate on the issue,

MOTION CARRIED

#### Sidewalk Construction Agreement 1-X

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Councillor Harvey:

"THAT council approve Sidewalk Construction Agreement 1-X."

MOTION CARRIED

#### Provincial Grants in Lieu of Taxes

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Deputy Warden Ball:

26...

"THAT this item be deferred back to Executive for discussion re: fire departments."

MOTION CARRIED

SUPPLEMENTARY PAC REPORT

Alvin MacDonald Appeal (Rezoning Application No. RA-24-20-88-04)

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT Council effect the zoning change from R-2 to C-1 on this property."

MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Boutilier asked if it was necessary to amend the land use by-law or if Zoning By-law 24 included everything.

Warden Lichter stated that Council has by the motion amended Zoning By-law 24. He stated that this particular rezoning was applied under Zoning By-law 24 and we just approved the rezoning by that motion.

Warden Lichter asked Council to go back to the motion and include the wording that we amend under the Zoning By-law 24 to the zoning of this property from R-2 to C-1.

Mr. Crooks stated that it is an amendment to the Zoning By-law and stated that he understood the motion to have been one that would when adopted have the affect of amending the zoning by-law.

Warden Lichter suggested rescinding the previous motion and then ask the solicitor for the proper wording and go from there.

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Deputy Warden Ball:

"THAT the motion be rescinded."

MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Crooks stated that he did not have difficulty with the form of the previous resolution, because it was simply a resolution which proposed or adopted an amendment to the Land Use By-law in the terms required by the Municipal Board. He stated that this is what Council is obliged to do under the Planning Act in this case - simply adopt a resolution which has the affect of amending the relevant land use by-law. He stated that if the practice of Council is to adopt a form of resolution in case of an amendment to the land use by-law which is drafted in advance and circulated

to the members of Council, he could prepare a draft amendment for the next Council Session.

Councillor Boutilier stated that page 2 included 4 items in an order and thought that if Council had a motion to that effect incorporating what has been ordered, that would cover any and all areas.

Mr. Crooks stated that the operative part of the order is number 4 and is just a question of adopting what is in number 4, but stated that he can put a form of by-law amendment together for the next meeting if that is agreeable.

Warden Lichter stated that this was delayed from the last Council Session and now we are delaying it again by 2 weeks.

Councillor Boutilier stated that he was looking at the deadline to have it incorporated of Feb. 28/90 and questioned if that was supposed to be 1991. Mr. Crooks stated that the date is 1990, but he assumed this was appealed to the Appeal Division of the Supreme Court which would have the effect of staying the order of the Municipal Board pending the outcome of the appeal and Council's obligation would be to move with reasonable dispatch to deal with the matter following the disposition of the appeal, which was what Council was doing in his opinion.

Warden Lichter stated that this decision was rendered Feb. 1/90 and asked why it took this long to have it come to Council. Mr. Meech stated that it was appealed to the Courts. Mr. Meech stated that all we have to do is pass a resolution incorporating number 3 and 4 of the order.

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer:

"THAT Halifax County Municipality so amend its Land Use By-law as soon as may be and, in any event, not later than its next ensuing Council meeting following February 24, 1990;

AND THAT the portion of Lot 104B of A. L. MacDonald and J. E. MacDonald Subdivision, Brookside, to be rezoned will consist of the lands described in the decision filed herein, namely;

- a) parcel 104, and
- b) parcel 104A, and
- c) that portion of parcel HL-B lying to the north of a straight line drawn between the north-east corner of a lot fronting on the side of the Prospect Road (abutting parcel HL-B) and lying to the north of parcel HL-B's 10' extension to the Prospect Road and the northwest corner

of a lot on the same side of the Brookside Road as parcel 104 (three lots south of parcel 104)."

Councillor Eisenhauer stated that he preferred this procedure and it was a more positive event.

Mr. Crooks stated that the procedure is unique in this case in that Council is responding to direction from the Municipal Board on appeal to amend its land use by-law. It has not discretion, no option as to whether to approve the amendment, consequently there is no necessity for notice and hearings, nor is there any further appeal from the decision that Council would make in respect of this.

MOTION CARRIED

Application No. RA-SA-17-90-19 - Application to Rezone Property at 1237 Sackville Drive

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT a public hearing be set for December 10, 1990 at 7:00 pm."

MOTION CARRIED

WATER SURVEY, LAKE VIEW ACRES SUBDIVISION

It was moved by Councillor Merrigan, seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer:

"THAT Council direct staff to examine the extension of the Municipal Water System to service this subdivision."

MOTION CARRIED

CHURCHILL ESTATES WATER UTILITY

Deputy Warden Ball stated that a notice went out for an 89% increase in fees charged to the users and the PUB ordered that a number of things take place with this. He stated that the water utility has not complied with any of the orders given by the PUB, although they are charging the 89% increase in fees.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Ball, seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT Council request the PUB to enforce the orders that were to be carried out by Churchill Estates Water Utility in June."

Councillor Merrigan stated that this item was also discussed at the Board of Health and they too have written letters to the PUB.

MOTION CARRIED

Deputy Warden Ball stated that this report also looked at the extending of water services from Herring Cove Road towards Churchill to serve the residents with water problems.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Ball, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

"THAT this item be placed on the list of capital projects for the future."

Councillor Bates asked if Council examines these all at one time and determines which ones get priority.

Mr. Meech stated that he was developing that list now to be presented to Council within a month and this could be added to the list.

Councillor McInroy stated that it may be more fair to defer this item to the December session. Warden Lichter stated that this motion would just put the item on the priority list so that it is not forgotten. Mr. Meech stated that the report recommends against the takeover of the utility under the present circumstances and stated that a long term solution would be to extend the water main when financially able. He stated that Council decides priorities in the end.

MOTION CARRIED

SACKVILLE MAINSTREET CO-ORDINATOR'S REPORT

It was moved by Councillor Randall, seconded by Councillor Morgan:

"THAT this report be received."

Councillor Morgan made reference to the Sackville Community Guide and stated that he wished to solicit the support of Council with regard to not paying for a product that was as shoddy as this. He stated that the Municipality should convey to the publisher its displeasure with the product and refuse to pay unless corrections are made.

MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Boutilier stated that the Sackville Community Committee and BIDC are scheduled to meet tomorrow AM.

Councillor Morgan stated that Council should not pay the \$1,500.

Councillor MacDonald stated that he has received a letter from the publisher stating that they are willing to talk with Mainstreet to overcome this.

Councillor Morgan stated that the letter stated that in the future they would provide proofs to avoid this situation again. He stated that he appreciated that, however, he was looking for something further for what has gone on in the past. He stated that the bill would be approximately \$1,750 for a product that is not worth it.

It was moved by Councillor Morgan, seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT the municipality direct a letter to the publisher asking for redress on what has already taken place."

Councillor Bates suggested that the Sackville Community Committee should handle this matter before getting this forceful.

Councillor Morgan stated that his concern is with the payment of this account. Warden Lichter suggested that Mr. Meech could take care of that matter.

MOTION CARRIED

#### EASTERN SHORE MAINSTREET PROGRAM REPORT

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Councillor Poirier:

"THAT this report be received."  
MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Boutilier asked why there was no one from mainstreet here to present their reports. Mr. Meech stated that he would arrange for presentations once or twice a year in the future.

#### APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL MEMBER TO REHAB CENTRE, BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

It was moved by Councillor Reid, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"THAT Councillor Merrigan be nominated as a member of the Rehab Centre, Board of Management in Councillor Baker's absence."

It was moved by Councillor Boutilier, seconded by Councillor Eisenhauer:

"THAT nominations cease."  
MOTION CARRIED

ADDITIONAL MEMBERSHIP - SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

It was moved by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Poirier:

"THAT David Wimberley (SMART) be nominated."

It was moved by Councillor Morgan, seconded by Councillor Fralick:

"THAT this item be deferred until the December 4, 1990  
Session."  
MOTION CARRIED

APPOINTMENT OF NON-COUNCIL MEMBERS - COMMITTEES AND BOARDS

Council agreed that these appointments would be dealt with at the December 4, 1990 session.

Councillor Meade expressed concern about the number of unnecessary items on the supplementary agenda and made reference to motions passed by Council that only urgent items be placed on the agenda while the rest should be placed on the next regular agenda.

URGENT AGENDA ITEMS

Councillor Randall - Paving

It was moved by Councillor Randall, seconded by Councillor Bates:

"THAT a letter be sent to the Department of Transportation requesting paving of Lakecrest Drive, Lawrencetown, under the 15 year paving policy with a copy to the MLA."  
MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Meade - School Area Rate

Councillor Meade stated that he attended a meeting last night at Tantallon Jr. High about the area rate. He stated that there are 480 students attending and it was built for 350. He stated that they approved an area rate for \$50,000 for districts 1 & 3. He stated that 125 of the students come from District 18, yet that district is exempt from the area rate.

It was moved by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Fralick:  
...32



"THAT a letter be written to the School Board requesting clarification of this area rate and exemption from paying."

Councillor Eisenhauer stated that his district has an area rate. He stated that they are in a separate school district and stated that the real issue is not area rates, but that his district needs a school. He stated that for junior highs, 1/3 go to Sackville, 1/3 to Bedford and 1/3 to Tantallon. He stated that he needs a school built.

Councillor Reid stated that his understanding was that all area rates apply to the districts the school services and that the area rate should apply to that district. He stated that the letter should be sent to the Minister of Education not the School Board.

The motion was changed to read:

"THAT a letter be written to the School Board and Minister of Education requesting clarification of this area rate and exemption from paying."

Councillor Eisenhauer stated that there is a void when it comes to junior highs and stated that he disagreed with transferring this rate.

Councillor Reid stated that some districts pay three rates, an elementary, junior high and senior high rate.

Councillor Morgan stated that the area rates have to be approved by the trustees of each subsection. He stated that it has to be advertised in the paper to call the residents to a meeting and it should have advertised that subsection.

Councillor Meade stated that he spoke to Gary Smith and he stated that it was not uncommon for this to occur.

Councillor Poirier stated that she had this situation in her district and when the attention was drawn to it, it was given to the tax office and they dealt with it.

MOTION CARRIED

Councillor Meade - Department of the Environment

Councillor Meade distributed copies of the litter abatement act. It was approved by the Province on July 3, 1990 and went into effect August 1, 1990. He stated that concern is with the definition of an inspector who regulates it. He stated that this

issue is raised in reference to advertisement signs along public roads. He stated that 10% of the signs are Department of Transportation approved and the rest of the 90% fall under the 'hands off' policy.

It was moved by Councillor Meade, seconded by Councillor Sutherland:

"THAT Council send a letter to the Department of the Environment asking who will enforce the laws and if it is the County who pays for it, if the by-law enforcement officers fall under their jurisdiction."

Councillor Meade stated that there are over 500 signs in District 1 alone that are there illegally and it would require a lot of vehicles and man hours to take these signs down.

MOTION CARRIED

SMART PRESENTATION

It was moved by Councillor Bates, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"THAT staff provide a report relative to the recommendations made earlier by SMART."

MOTION CARRIED

ADDITIONS TO THE DECEMBER 4, 1990 COUNCIL AGENDA

None.

ADJOURNMENT

It was moved by Councillor Morgan, seconded by Councillor Reid:

"THAT Council adjourn."

MOTION CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

SPECIAL COUNCIL SESSION

8 NOVEMBER 1990

THOSE PRESENT:

Warden Lichter  
Councillor Meade  
Councillor Poirier  
Councillor Fralick  
Deputy Warden Ball  
Councillor Deveaux  
Councillor Bates  
Councillor Randall  
Councillor Bayers  
Councillor Smiley  
Councillor Reid  
Councillor Horne  
Councillor Merrigan  
Councillor MacDonald  
Councillor Boutilier  
Councillor Harvey  
Councillor Sutherland  
Councillor McInroy  
Councillor Cooper

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mr. Ron MacEachern, Metro Authority  
Mr. Mort Jackson, Metro Authority  
Ms. Leslie Griffiths, Griffiths-Muecke

SECRETARY:

Mrs. Twila Simms

.....  
Warden Lichter called the meeting to order at 4:00 p. m. by welcoming the Metro Authority Representatives and thanking Councillors for attending.

Mr. MacEachern stated that it was nice to see Council showing initiative and involved in the discussions. He stated that waste is as basic as eating and we shouldn't be timid about speaking about it. He stated that he would be going through some recommendations of the advisory report, and added that there are some 40 recommendations in all.

Mr. MacEachern reviewed the five scenarios and the base case.

Base Case

1% Household Hazardous Waste  
10% Diversion  
Baling - yes  
Pulverization - no  
Landfill - 89%  
TOTAL - 100%

Capital Costs: \$45 Million to \$67 Million  
Debt Charges: \$7 Million to \$10 Million  
Net Operating Cost: \$4 Million to \$6 Million  
Total Cost: \$11 to \$16 Million  
Percentage Increase over existing \$6 Million: 80-170%

### Strategy 1

1% Household Hazardous Waste  
10% Diversion  
15% Recycle MRF  
5% Backyard and Leaf Composting  
Baling - no  
Pulverization - yes  
Landfill - 69%

Capital Costs: \$66 to \$99 Million  
Total Cost: \$17 to \$27 Million  
Percentage Increase over existing \$6 Million: 190% to 340%

### Strategy 2

1% Household Hazardous Waste  
10% Diversion  
15% Recycle MRF  
5% Backyard and Leaf Composting  
Baling - no  
Pulverization - yes  
15% Mixed Waste Composting  
54% Landfill

Capital Costs: \$76 to \$114 Million  
Total Costs: \$21 to \$32 Million  
Percentage Increase over existing \$6 Million: 250% to 440%

### Strategy 3

1% Household Hazardous Waste  
10% Diversion  
15% Recycle MRF  
5% Backyard and Leaf Composting  
Baling - yes  
Pulverization - yes  
10% Central Organic Waste Composting  
59% Landfill

Capital Costs: \$71 to \$107 Million  
Total Cost: \$20 to \$31 Million  
Percentage Increase over existing \$6 Million: 240% to 420%

Strategy 4

1% Household Hazardous Waste  
10% Diversion  
15% Recycle MRF  
5% Backyard and Leaf Composting  
Baling - no  
Pulverization - no  
40% Refuse Derived Fuel  
39% Landfill

Capital Costs: \$73 to \$109 Million  
Total Costs: \$26 to \$39 Million  
Percentage Increase over existing \$6 Million: 330% to 560%

Strategy 5

1% Household Hazardous Waste  
10% Diversion  
15% Recycle MRF  
5% Backyard and Leaf Composting  
Baling - no  
Pulverization - no  
40% Incineration  
39% Landfill (10% ash)

Capital Costs: \$93 to \$140 Million  
Total Costs: \$18 to \$32 Million  
Percentage Increase over existing \$6 Million: 200% to 400%

Mr. MacEachern stated that of the five strategies, the committee picked strategy 3 as the one they would most like to see. He stated that it is also the most expensive because of waste collection costs (multi-bag and multi-pick ups). Mr. MacEachern showed slides of a waste composting facility, pulverization facility, and an incinerator as well as baling operations.

Ms. Griffiths stated that we would be moving from what is a simple system to a more complex system. She stated that the system we have now deals with all garbage as one thing to be collected, transferred and buried. She stated that all of these strategies are more complex as they are treating the components of the garbage and therefore need more facilities. She stated that the programs and facilities are inter-related and that they support each other. She stressed that the absolute deadline for this entire project is June 1994 because the present landfill is full and will be closing while the garbage will still be coming in.

Ms. Griffiths stated that the advisory committee has advised that by 1994 we will achieve a 34% reduction through recycling. She

stated that this will be done in three phases: options, decision and implementation. She stated that presently there is an overlap because the decision on strategy has not been made, but since some will be going to a landfill site so they are starting on that.

Ms. Griffiths circulated a chart of the Solid Waste Management Plan: Phase Two. She stated that there is a lot to be done between now and 1994. She stated that a lot of decisions have to be made as to what and where.

Mr. Jackson discussed the MRF. He stated that there had been discussions as to whether a temporary or permanent facility could be put in place faster. He stated that because of the rezoning process that would be necessary, they are now looking at permanent facilities. He stated that now it is a question of whether the facility would be labour intensive or mechanized.

Mr. Jackson stated that they have recognized that the siting of the landfill is the most complex and a decision has to be made about MRF in January/February of 1991 or earlier. April 1991 would be the deadline for the location of an incinerator or composting plant (depending on strategy chosen). He stated that a decision on a landfill site has to be made by the end of the summer of 1991.

Mr. Jackson stated that a MRF is a Material Recovery Facility where materials are sorted and prepared for market. He stated that each of the 5 scenarios assume 15% recycling of paper, glass and metals with some plastics. He stated that the method they are recommending is a blue bag system, supplemented by depots where collection of this type is not economically feasible. He stated that they would be looking at a central urban site for the MRF. Mr. Jackson referred to page 2 of the Porter Dillon Report. He stated that operators will not be involved in collection; the Authority would build the MRF and would accept the materials; the MRF would be designed to accommodate 68,000 single family homes; designed initially to accept glass, aluminum and paper with plastics to follow; one plant for Metro area and handy to the centre of Metro; designed based on hand sorting - thereby employing a lot of people; should be tendered - plant built by the Authority and operations, including marketing, tendered; assumed no cost sharing from the province; require industrial waste permit (one month to obtain from the Dept. of Env.); Authority elected not to put it through the full environmental assessment program; put landfill through that process as well as a composting facility.

Mr. Jackson then referred to the summary page, 29, of the report.

Option 1: temporary facility; existing building which could be adapted and used for 5 years without investing a lot of capital; after 5 years write-off or terminate lease and move into custom

designed facility; costs: \$3.2 Million capital, operating (after \$600,000 revenue from sale of materials) \$700,000; not including educational and promotional efforts of \$400,000 the first year and \$200,000 each year after that.

Option 2: interim facility for a few months while building a permanent MRF; constraint not in ordering equipment but with rezoning; only zone available in Bedford and only existing building is 30,000 to 40,000 sq. feet.

Option 3: permanent MRF; custom design and build in 10 months; cost \$5 Million in capital; labour intensive; important consideration in view of Health and Safety legislation in the county. He stated that the labour intensive plant in the U.S. would not be allowed in this province (grunt labour).

Option 4: (preferred by staff) tender the entire thing; let them take the commercial risk at a price competitive to anything that the Authority could build and operate.

Mr. Jackson stated that the best value for the dollar would occur if we tendered the MRF together with either the incinerator or composting plant (depending on strategy chosen).

#### QUESTIONS

Councillor Poirier asked about incineration and how well they are monitored. She stated that she thought she would be in favour of it but it is environmentally dangerous. She questioned that if it was so well monitored, why was it so dangerous.

Mr. MacEachern stated that just as we cannot landfill everything, we cannot burn everything. He stated that they will be removing hazardous waste and if that is removed, then the emissions will not create a problem.

Councillor Deveaux stated that Council is on record requesting the Authority to look at the feasibility of incineration. He asked that if approval is given for the MRF if that would rule out the option of incineration. Mr. Jackson stated that each scenario involves a MRF regardless. Mr. Jackson stated that the MRF would be the easiest to implement. He stated that it is exciting from an environmental point of view and that it would be easier to locate than a landfill or incinerator.

Councillor Deveaux questioned no funding from the province. Mr. Jackson stated that there was a limit to the fund and the fund would have to build up over a few years and spread over 66 municipalities. He stated that a lot would be paid for by the tipping fees that will be \$38/tonne in January of 1991.

Councillor Bates asked why we have to go through so much expense for the sake of 15% of the total amount of garbage. He asked who decided on the 10-15% MRF. Mr. Jackson stated that recycling by far is the most expensive because of the cost of collecting and suggested that it would cost \$110/tonne compared to \$27/tonne to landfill. Ms. Griffiths stated that this 15% will have to increase. She stated that the more that is recycled, the more costs go down. She stated that it was not just environmental, but that there is broad public support and it may be more difficult to site a landfill or incinerator without a commitment to recycling. She stated that there may be provincial legislation down the road to reach higher targets than 15%. She stated that pressure will increase for more recycling.

Warden Lichter stated that if the support is so widespread, why would the Authority have to spend \$400,000 on educational and promotional aspects. Ms. Griffiths stated that the support does not necessarily come from 90% of the population. She stated that groups still have to know how and what to recycle. She suggested that maybe the cost could be reduced. Mr. Jackson stated that the educational aspect would be a very simple one like whether to remove the paper label from a glass bottle, etc. He stated that the general rule is that 20% will recycle regardless, but 40% will if they are encouraged.

Councillor Bates expressed concerns about the markets for these materials. Mr. Jackson stated that over time the markets will stabilize as more uses are found and more people get involved. Mr. Jackson stated that the municipal tax payer should not involve themselves in the collecting and marketing of materials. He stated that there are companies who have international markets that can stand fluctuations in the markets. He stated that the private sector should take that risk.

Councillor Meade stated that in the report 15% recycling is referred to as 150 tonnes, although under revenue only 75 tonnes are accounted for. Mr. Jackson stated that what could happen the first year is 7.5% rather than the 15% and they have accommodated that.

Councillor Meade asked what formula would be used in the county. Mr. Jackson stated that the cost would be based on assessment.

Councillor Meade asked about the capital costs and how that would be paid. Mr. Jackson stated that the Authority would borrow the funds and amortize it and recoup the money through tipping fees to the municipalities.

Councillor MacDonald stated that the original cost of the MRF was



much higher and asked if the surplus in the tipping fees would accommodate for the facility. Mr. Jackson stated that the figure was \$8 Million originally, but added that collection was not included in these figures as it was in the advisory committee's report. He stated that the \$8 Million MRF would be mechanized and the \$5 Million would be labour intensive. Mr. Jackson stated that the beauty of incineration is that we would go to the private sector, they would borrow the money and run the operation and charge the tipping fees. He stated that the more we can avoid putting up the capital costs, the better.

Councillor MacDonald asked if the GST would be charged. Mr. Jackson stated that if it was done by a private company, yes.

Deputy Warden Ball stated that there is a rush for a decision by November 13th. Mr. Jackson stated that the decision for a MRF was deferred to the 13th and stated that there was no panic relative to the long term calendar, but that it was important that the Authority make a decision on the MRF next Tuesday.

Deputy Warden Ball stated that the rezoning would take a few month anyway and that a decision should not be made at this time. Deputy Warden Ball stated that the Advisory Committee is recommending Strategy 3 and stated that the Authority can choose any of the five or any variations thereof. He stated that we should not make a recommendation on the MRF before a strategy is chosen. He asked when the Authority would make a decision on a strategy. Mr. Jackson stated that a decision would be made by the end of the year, but deferring decision on the MRF would mean lost time.

Deputy Warden Ball stated that there is a great deal of public support, but asked how informed they are about the cost of recycling. Ms. Griffiths stated that they have not "pulled punches" about the costs involved. She stated that we have been getting away very cheaply for the last while and it is inevitable that it will cost more.

Warden Lichter stated that he would like to have direction from Council as to how the three Metro Authority Reps should vote on November 13th about the MRF.

Deputy Warden Ball stated that we should not endorse anything until a strategy is picked by Metro Authority.

Councillor Bayers stated that deciding on a MRF now is premature. He asked if Metro Authority approached the provincial government to put legislation in place to reduce the amount of refuse. He stated that it is a matter of legislation. Mr. MacEachern stated that the province has been given a copy of the report and they met with the N.S. Dept of Environment and they have indicated that they

would be willing to respond. He stated that they will be getting back to the Authority on the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Bayers stated that he has been in the waste disposal business for 16 years and gave an example of the cost for recycling. He stated that if the public was aware of the cost of recycling, there would not be overwhelming support for it.

Councillor Reid asked about the comparison between the blue bag system and volunteer depot system. Mr. MacEachern stated that the more convenient you make it, the more people that will participate. Mr. Jackson stated that the method that is used to transport the materials to the MRF would be up to the county to decide.

Warden Lichter circulated data re: recycling as part of the garbage collection operation.

It was moved by Councillor Bates, seconded by Councillor Meade:

"THAT this session move in camera."  
MOTION CARRIED

Committee agreed to come out of camera.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Ball, seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT the Municipality's members of Metro Authority be directed to encourage the choosing of a strategy before any process takes effect."

Councillor Cooper stated that if the scenario is considered and they accept incineration, then the possibility of recycling will disappear. He stated that then the reason for the whole scenario will have changed. He stated that we have to look at the cheapest one for the municipality.

Councillor Harvey stated that he understood the financial concern. He stated that we would have to show leadership and line up with the group that was saving the planet. He stated that it may be cheaper to burn paper, but if you cut down all the trees there is no benefit. Councillor Harvey stated that he would support the motion, but that would not mean opposing MRF altogether.

Councillor Bayers stated that provincial legislation was needed and that we don't know the costs involved. He stated that he would support the motion.

Councillor Horne stated that the MRF and recycling is important.

He stated that it may start off at 10-15%, but estimates are now up to 25%. He stated that recycling has to be part of any strategy for the County and Metro Authority.

Councillor MacDonald stated that we have to be careful in lagging behind and stated that we could be out of the picture but still committed to the costs.

MOTION CARRIED

Warden Lichter stated that this council, of some years ago, delegated waste management and transit to Metro Authority and it does not matter how hard we fight over the issue. He stated that if Metro Authority decides to go with a MRF or decides on scenario 3, they have a right to all components of scenario 3.

It was moved by Councillor Harvey, seconded by Councillor Reid:

"THAT this session adjourn."

MOTION CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

MINUTES & REPORTS  
OF THE  
THIRD YEAR MEETINGS  
OF THE  
FORTY - THIRD COUNCIL  
OF THE  
MUNICIPALITY OF THE COUNTY OF HALIFAX  
DECEMBER COUNCIL SESSION  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4 & 18, 1990  
&  
PUBLIC HEARING  
DECEMBER 10, 1990  
&  
SPECIAL COUNCIL SESSION  
DECEMBER 3, 1990

INDEX

December Council Session - 1990

Armcrest Estates - - - - -	6-8
Building Inspectors Report - - - - -	31
COLA Increase - - - - -	16-17
Crosswalk Painting - - - - -	17-18
Committees and Boards - Non Council Members - - - - -	19-20
Churchill Estates Water Supply - - - - -	29
Committee & Boards By-Law - - - - -	31-32
Dutch Settlement Vol. Fire Dept. - Loan - - - - -	15
Development Officer Report - - - - -	31
Eastern Passage Servicing - - - - -	24-26
Grants - - - - -	16&31
Letters & Correspondence - - - - -	11-15&28-30
Motion - Recording Secretary - - - - -	1&21
Motion - Minutes - - - - -	1-2&21
Motion - Millbrook Indian Reserve - - - - -	2-6&24-28
Motion - Armcrest Estates - - - - -	6-8
Motion - Sidewalk Snow Removal Tenders - - - - -	8-10
Motion - Letters & Correspondence - - - - -	11-15&28-30
Motion - Sidewalks, Old Beaver Bank Road - - - - -	11-12
Motion - Policing, District #5 - - - - -	13-14
Motion - Woman's Action Coalition - - - - -	14-15
Motion - Date for Public Hearing - - - - -	15&30
Motion - Loan, Dutch Settlement Vol. Fire Dept. - - - - -	15
Motion - Sheet Harbour Elementary School - - - - -	16
Motion - Grants - - - - -	16&31
Motion - COLA Increase - - - - -	16-17
Motion - Water Extension - Old Beaver Bank Road - - - - -	17
Motion - Executive & PAC Meetings - - - - -	17
Motion - Crosswalk Painting - - - - -	17-18
Motion - Meetings - - - - -	18
Motion - Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee - - - - -	19
Motion - Committee & Boards, Non Council Members - - - - -	19-20
Motion - Adjournment - - - - -	20-34
Motion - Eastern Passage Servicing - - - - -	24-26

INDEX

Motion - Churchill Estates Water Supply - - - - -	29
Motion - Bill C-337 - - - - -	29
Motion - Temporary Borrowing Resolution - - - - -	30
Motion - Property Tax Exemption - - - - -	30-31
Motion - Development Officer Report - - - - -	31
Motion - Building Inspectors Report - - - - -	31
Motion - Committee & Boards By-Law - - - - -	31-32
Motion - Rehab Centre Board of Management - - - - -	32
Motion - Standing Committee on Environmental Issues - - - - -	32
Motion - Taxes - - - - -	33
Motion - Causeway Road, Three Fathom Harbour - - - - -	33-34
Policing - District #5 - - - - -	13-14
Public Hearing - Date - - - - -	15&30
Property Tax Exemption - - - - -	30-31
Rehab Centre Board of Management - - - - -	32
Sidewalk Snow Removal Tenders - - - - -	8-10
Sidewalks - Old Beaver Bank Road - - - - -	11-12
Sheet Harbour Elementary School - - - - -	16
Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee - - - - -	19
Temporary Borrowing Resolution - - - - -	30
Woman's Action Coalition - - - - -	14-15
Water Extension - Old Beaver Bank Road - - - - -	17

SPECIAL COUNCIL SESSION

3 DECEMBER 1990

THOSE PRESENT:           Warden Lichter  
                          Councillor Meade  
                          Councillor Poirier  
                          Councillor Fralick  
                          Councillor Adams  
                          Councillor Randall  
                          Councillor Bayers  
                          Councillor Horne  
                          Councillor Merrigan  
                          Councillor Morgan  
                          Councillor Eisenhower  
                          Councillor MacDonald  
                          Councillor Boutilier  
                          Councillor Sutherland  
                          Councillor Richards  
                          Councillor McInroy  
                          Councillor Cooper

ALSO PRESENT:           Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk  
                          Ms. Ann Muecke, Griffiths Muecke  
                          Mr. Stewart Hattie, Porter Dillon Ltd.  
                          Mr. Gerry Isenor, Porter Dillon Ltd.

SECRETARY:               Mrs. Twila Simms

.....  
Warden Lichter called the meeting to order at 6:00 p. m.

It was moved by Councillor Cooper, seconded by Councillor MacDonald:

                  "THAT Twila Simms be appointed as Recording Secretary."  
                  MOTION CARRIED

Mr. Isenor reviewed the agenda with Council stating that the presentation would consist of project status and slides, siting requirements which are premised on which system is decided on by the Authority and right now between 39-69% of waste will have to be landfilled, siting principles (9), siting process, siting criteria and timing to the June 1994 deadline.

Mr. Isenor stated that this is the first step in finding a new facility. He stated that they are working towards developing siting criteria. He stated that one component of waste handling will be landfilling regardless of the other technology used. He stated that all strategies proposed by the Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee require a portion to be landfilled at some point, which will be between 39 and 69%. He stated that this meeting will deal only with siting criteria for the landfill, other elements will come when Metro Authority makes the final decision

on the ultimate disposal scheme on or before they meet in January 1991. He stated that a decision has to be made and right now that means that some elements of the presentation will have to be flexible.

Mr. Isenor showed slides of various forms of waste management, which comprise the five strategies proposed by the Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee: reduce/reuse/recycle, household hazardous waste disposal, commercial diversion, central composting, incineration and landfilling (including leachate treatment).

Mr. Isenor stated that even with composting and incineration, there is a residue/ash left over that would have to be landfilled. He stated that public consultation is part of the siting criteria which could be done in the form of a mall display or some way of conveying the information to the public.

Mr. Isenor reviewed the nine basic principles that the new landfill siting process will be based upon: 1. There will be a thorough and open public consultation process at all stages of the site selection process. 2. All areas in the four municipalities will be assessed. However, land adjacent to the existing Highway 101 site will not be included in the shortlist of candidate sites unless the adjacent community decides to opt in. 3. Waste reduction programs including recycling will be a part of the new waste management system. 4. A household hazardous waste management system will form part of the new waste management strategy. 5. Wastes sent to the landfill will be pre-processed either by baling, pulverization or incineration to minimize landfill space requirements. 6. The landfill and the leachate control system will be located and designed to meet or exceed all the requirements of regulating agencies. 7. The landfill will be registered with the Province for assessment under the Environmental Assessment Act. 8. A siting agreement will be negotiated with neighbouring residents likely to be impacted by the existence of the site. The agreement would include items such as community benefits, mitigation of impacts, operating procedures, performance guarantees, procedures for redressing grievances, and ongoing community involvement. 9. A monitoring program, including the collection of baseline data, will be developed to track changes to the surrounding environment. This program will meet or exceed regulatory requirements.

Ms. Muecke stated that for No. 8, they would identify how the facility will be sited, managed and monitored and what would be done to deal with the concerns of the local community wherever the site is. She stated that the openness of the process issued is for the people to look at before anything is finalized. She stated that the agreement would deal specifically with items identified.



Past problems with landfill shows that local concerns were totally ignored, such as, truck traffic, property values, well water, etc. She stated that we have to make sure that concerns are addressed directly. She stated that without knowing what the whole system is, they do not know what an agreement would contain as there are a number of relating factors.

Mr. Hattie stated that landfill siting objectives are to apply a systematic process to select candidate landfill sites, involve the public in the identification of siting criteria, and minimize risk to public health and safety and impact on the environment. Mr. Hattie stated that we have to find a landfill. He stated that all four municipalities are included. Mr. Hattie reviewed the landfill siting process on page four of the presentation report, the siting process (page 5), and factor groupings (page 6-14) which included avoidance factors, minimization factors and desirable factors.

Councillor Morgan questioned social avoidance of provincial/federal Parks and park reserves when that is what they could do with the land when it is finished. Mr. Hattie stated that park reserves have intricate legislation now to protect them and there would be no opportunity to go in there. He stated that public concern would also be too high. Mr. Isenor also stated that the existing landfill was not picked using criteria. Mr. Hattie gave background information on the selection of the present sight and the political will involved.

Mr. Isenor stated that we must work with the public. He stated that siting is not easy, but everyone should be able to participate.

Councillor Merrigan stated that it appears that the landfill will end up in Halifax County and he stated that the property should be big enough to include the technological aspect of waste management (ie. the composting facility, incinerator, or whatever) so that the community that gets stuck with the landfill will get the other part too and then they can be duly compensated, rather than spreading it all out over different areas. Mr. Hattie stated that Metro Authority would consider this seriously. Councillor Merrigan stated that it would be better to have it all on one and compensate the people accordingly rather than have to deal with everyone. Mr. Hattie stated that it is broader enough to consider having them all on one site. He stated that there is a lot of investment, infrastructure and jobs created.

Councillor MacDonald stated that the MRF is supposed to be close to the Metro area to eliminate carrying costs.

Councillor McInroy questioned how all four municipalities could be considered for sites when one considers the size of the facility.

Mr. Hattie stated that last time a site in Bedford was selected and added that municipal boundaries are not a consideration so it would be possible to have it crossing two municipalities.

Ms. Muecke reviewed the time schedule and stated that June 1994 is the absolute deadline and therefore to comply with that, the other deadlines will have to be met or there will be a crisis come 1994.

Councillor Richards stated that if we come to the end of December of 1992 and three sites are recommended and studied environmentally, and then not approved, what would happen. Ms. Muecke stated that since they are involving the regulatory agencies from the beginning, they would be able to comply with the regulations and be confident that all three sites would be approved environmentally. She stated that this is the reason that they have been incorporated in the process from the start and they will be kept involved.

Mr. Isenor asked that Councillors either individually or as a whole give feedback on the siting requirements. He stated that in the end, the final decision is made by the elected representative to the Metro Authority and it will be a political decision and it is best to be involved from the start.

Warden Lichter thanked them for the presentation and suggested that Councillors react individually the way they see fit. He also suggested that the public will have to be made aware that at the time of the selection of the three sites that will have to undergo environmental assessment, that this would be more or less a formality as they would all expect to pass the assessment.

It was moved by Councillor Morgan, seconded by Councillor Eisenhower:

"THAT this meeting adjourn."  
MOTION CARRIED

Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

**COUNCIL SESSION**

**4 DECEMBER 1990**

**THOSE PRESENT:**

Warden Lichter  
Councillor Meade  
Councillor Poirier  
Councillor Fralick  
Deputy Warden Ball  
Councillor Deveaux  
Councillor Bates  
Councillor Adams  
Councillor Randall  
Councillor Bayers  
Councillor Reid  
Councillor Horne  
Councillor Merrigan  
Councillor Morgan  
Councillor Eisenhauer  
Councillor MacDonald  
Councillor Boutilier  
Councillor Harvey  
Councillor Sutherland  
Councillor McInroy  
Councillor Cooper

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Mr. K. R. Meech, Chief Administrative Officer  
Mr. F. Crooks, Municipal Solicitor  
Mr. G. J. Kelly, Municipal Clerk  
Ms. V. Spencer, Director Planning  
Mr. E. Wdowiak, Director Engineering  
Mr. B. Newman, Engineering  
Mr. J. Sheppard, Engineering  
Mr. T. Tam, Engineering

**SECRETARY:**

Mrs. Twila Simms

.....  
Warden Lichter called the meeting to order at 6:00 p. m. with the Lord's Prayer. Mr. Kelly called the Roll.

It was moved by Deputy Warden Ball, seconded by Councillor Meade:

"THAT Twila Simms be appointed as Recording Secretary."  
MOTION CARRIED

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

It was moved by Councillor MacDonald, seconded by Councillor Deveaux:

"THAT the minutes of the November 6, 1990 Council Session be approved as circulated."  
MOTION CARRIED

It was moved by Councillor Harvey, seconded by Councillor Adams:

"THAT the minutes of November 8, 1990 Special Council Session be approved as circulated."

MOTION CARRIED

With the permission of Council, the agenda was changed to allow staff reports to be presented first.

EXTENSION OF MUNICIPAL SERVICES - CALDWELL ROAD - RESERVE 30

Ms. Spencer presented the report stating that this report was placed in Councillors' boxes and that they would have had an opportunity to peruse the report from the Departments of Engineering/Planning with respect to servicing along Caldwell Road between Astral and Atholea Drives and in conjunction with that a request by the Millbrook Indian Band to service the lands of Reserve 30 which is located in the same area.

This report deals with two issues, one in context with the other. She stated that in 1988 when the service boundary was expanded there was some discussion about the shortcomings of transportation and servicing between Astral and Atholea along the Caldwell Road - that there were needs to loop water systems, upgrade roadways, to complete storm drainage systems. Since Council made its decision in 1988 and expanded the service boundary in Cole Harbour, most of the land that is available to be developed has proceeded and this report is suggesting to Council that it is now time to place on Council's capital program to do the planning and budgeting for some major water, sewer and storm drainage works in that vicinity.

One of the major parcels located along this stretch of the Caldwell Road is Reserve 30. That particular Indian Reserve is controlled by the Millbrook Indian Band which has its headquarters at Millbrook near Truro. It is largely undeveloped at the present time, about a dozen homes on the reserve, and those homes are served by septic tanks and wells at this point in time. The servicing request by the Millbrook Band would contribute to the general recommendation which the staff is making to you regarding considering extension of services and completing the infrastructure in the whole Atholea/Astral area.

With respect to the general matter of Astral/Atholea, maps on pages 6-9 of the report and she referred to the specific areas in question. Most of the development in this area on the north side of Caldwell Road is in our service boundary and some was put in in 1988 when we made adjustments with expansion of the sewage treatment plant. Development in that area is largely using the trunk sewer which exists along Astral Drive and development is proceeding quite quickly -preliminary, tentative and final

approvals in the vicinity. She stated that what does not exist in this area is the completion of pipes along Caldwell Road, the pipes come down Caldwell and are rerouted in the vicinity of Astral. What that means is that the areas water system is not looped, that has some effect in ensuring domestic flows and an effect in ensuring fire flows for the area. The sewerage is not available along Caldwell Road so that even some lands that are currently within our service boundary, they cannot be accessed. In general, when we talked about the expansion of the Eastern Passage Sewage Treatment Plant and upgrading needed in this area, the Caldwell Road is itself under some pressure. Because of development in Cole Harbour and also because of pressure in Eastern Passage. She stated that this is a major roadway that is taking a lot of traffic in and out of these suburban areas every day. She stated that this report is suggesting that the Caldwell Road needs improvements, not just minor resurfacing but sidewalks, curbs, gutters, resurfacing, and piped storm drainage. The report suggests that it is not a matter of if but when. She stated that development pressure in this area will have an effect on the Caldwell Road.

She stated that Map 3 identifies the subdivisions which have been allowed to develop since original decisions were made to extend the service boundary in the Cole Harbour area (Willowdale, Kenwood and Carlisle). Lands identified along Caldwell Road as undeveloped portions of those subdivisions, the developers of these particular blocks are diverting all of their services back to the Astral trunk. In order to service those remaining frontages, the developers would have to build a duplicate set of services out on Caldwell Road, and for the costs of doing that for the limited number of lots which any one of them may gain, it is not cost effective. In addition, you will see areas that are potentially serviceable, if pipes were completed along Caldwell, and existing residents have submitted some requests for hook-up. There is also a potential area, which could hook in if the link was completed.

She stated that the staff report is suggesting that Caldwell needs upgrading, because of development in Cole Harbour and Eastern Passage. In particular it needs storm drainage services, to have water and sewer services linked. It is not cost effective for local land owners to do this on their own, even though they are within the serviceable boundary and this is something that this should be a matter of capital programs and that Council should try working with the Provincial Government, Department of Transportation, to get some cost sharing in terms of public roadway and storm sewer in the area.

She stated that with respect to the Millbrook Indian Band and the land which it owns, identified in Map 2. Reserve 30 is just under 50 acres a portion of which is inside our service boundary a smaller portion of which is outside. The Reserve has about a dozen homes, all serviced with septic tanks and wells. She stated that residents are experiencing problems with arsenic, high mineral content and there is concern of the Band Council with respect to health problems with those existing homes. She stated that this is a valuable resource for the Millbrook Council in terms of members of the Band and their families coming to the Metro area, particularly to work and to have an opportunity to have housing provided for them in this area. It is of obvious concern when at this stage, there is little development and already concern about health problems and the Band has determined that it would be in their best interest to pursue central servicing. By that the Band means full services, sewer, water and piped storm drainage.

Ms. Spencer stated that in 1975 entered into a legal agreement with the Millbrook Band Council in order to allow the installation of a trunk sewer (shown on Map 4) at the Northernmost boundary of the reserve. She stated that there is a trunk sewer, part of the major system, located on this reserve property. She stated that what the Municipality essentially obtained from the Band was a permit to enter, install and maintain this sewer. In exchange for that, the Municipality offered to the Millbrook Band the possibility of entering this sewer to service its property at some time in the future. To this point, that option has not been exercised.

Ms. Spencer referred to Map 4 showing the location of the trunk sewer and the two portions of the reserve split by our service boundary and by the Caldwell Road. She stated that the northern portion of the reserve is located in the service boundary and is the location of the trunk. She stated that that is uncleared property and not the location of existing homes. She stated that existing homes are located on the south reserve property which economically would not be serviced by access to the trunk sewer located on the reserve. She stated that it can physically be done, but is uneconomic and does not make technical sense for them to access the service that way.

She stated that the Millbrook Band has suggested that it would pursue a phased development, the first phase of which would be to take care of some existing homes located at the very southernmost portion of its south reserve property. She stated that this would be 8-12 homes maximum. She stated that that would be a minor connection to existing trunk along Caldwell Road. In order for the Band Council to complete servicing the property, it will have to start constructing sewer services up Caldwell Road. She stated that the recommendation of the bigger picture, in terms of making the loop and connecting the services, the Millbrook Band will be