

HALIFAX REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY

HALIFAX/HALIFAX COUNTY WATERSHED ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES

APRIL 17, 2002

PRESENT: Dr. Wayne Stobo, Chair
Mr. Walter Regan
Ms. Ellinor Williams
Mr. Ross Evans
Mr. Glen Williams
Mr. Barry Thomas
Dr. Walton Watt
Mr. Bill Ernst
Mr. Peter Murray

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Kurt Pyle, Planner
Mr. Jim Bauld, Diversion Planning Coordinator
Ms. Thea Langille-Hanna, Planner
Mr. Andrew Whittemore, Planner
Ms. Lynne Le Boutillier, Assistant Municipal Clerk

REGRETS: Mr. Manchester, Mr. Dwyer, Mr. Hope and Dr. Ray

TABLE OF CONTENTS

0.1 Resignation 3

1.01 Approval of Agenda, Additions and Deletions 3

2.0 Approval of Minutes 3

3.0 Business Arising from Minutes

 3.1 Wentworth/Bedford South Secondary Planning Strategy 11 & 12

4.0 New Business

 4.1 25 -Year Regional Planning Strategy 10

 4.2 Draft Secondary Plan and Land Use By-law for Sackville Drive 10 & 11

 4.3 C & D Waste Management Strategy - Two Proposed Requests for
 Additional Zoning Requirements 3 -10

 4.4 Sobeys Fall River 10

5.0 Concept Plans 12

6.0 Date of 12

7.0 Adjournment 12

The Chair called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., Training Room, 1st Floor, City Hall.

0.1 **RESIGNATION**

The Chair advised the members that Shalom Mandaville has resigned from the Board, until further notice, and his replacement, representing the Soil & Water Conservation Society of Metro Halifax was Dr. Walton Watt, who was in attendance.

1.0 **APPROVAL OF AGENDA, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS**

Mr. Williams requested an item be added to the agenda under New Business, Item 4.4 Sobeys Fall River.

Item 4.1 - 25 Year Regional Planning Strategy, Anne Muecke Project Manager was deleted, as she had a community meeting in Hubbards this evening. She indicated she would not be able to attend the April meeting, as she has a Workshop to attend in Truro that evening, but should be able to attend the June meeting.

Item 4.3 - C & D Waste Management Strategy was moved up on the agenda, as the proponents were in attendance. Also item 4.2, Draft Secondary Plan and Land Use By-law for Sackville Drive was moved up on the agenda.

The agenda, as modified, was adopted on motion of Mr. Regan and Mr. Ernst.

2.0 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the March 20, 2002 meeting were adopted, as circulated, on motion of Mr. Regan and Mr. Williams.

4.0 **NEW BUSINESS**

4.3 **C & D WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY - TWO PROPOSED REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL ZONING REQUIREMENTS**

The following individuals were in attendance for this item:

Representing Halifax C & D Recycling Limited were:

Dan Chassie, owner
Scott Kyle, Dillon Consulting Limited
Gerry Isenor, Dillon Consulting Limited

Representing RDM:

Barry Zwicker, Wallace, Macdonald & Lively Ltd.
Timothy Veinot, P. Eng., Wallace, Macdonald & Lively Ltd.
Roy Brown, owner RDM

Representing HRM:

Kurt Pyle, Planner
Jim Bauld, Diversion Planning Coordinator

The first presentation related to RDM's Harrietsfield location at 1275 Old Sambro Road. This is an existing recycling facility which would like to obtain a license for a C & D Disposal site.

Copies of their proposal had been couriered to the Chair and the Vice-Chair prior to the meeting, but materials were not available for the rest of the Board. It was noted that the deadline for submissions had been Monday, April 15, 2002.

Mr. Pyle outlined the process, which commenced in 2000, associated with the adoption of a HRM wide C & D Waste Disposal Management Strategy. To date, three requests have been made for changes in zoning to allow for these sites. In addition to the two companies represented this evening, a request has been made by Metro Construction Debris Limited, Dartmouth for a site off Highway 118, in the Burnside area. The latter request is on the Dartmouth Lakes Advisory Board's agenda for next week.

Mr. Pyle noted that while Council desires a public consultation process conducted in the area of each request, since the Board had strongly indicated its desire to review the proposals, since the proponents were agreeable and the process would not be slowed down, it was decided to bring them before the H/HCWAB and DLAB.

In response to a query from the Chair regarding deadlines, Mr. Pyle indicated they would like to hold Public Hearings at Council in June. The item is on the Solid Waste Advisory Committee's May 17th agenda. In the interim, staff has quite a bit of work to do in developing a recommendation for the May 17th meeting and Regional Council.

Mr. Zwicker gave a presentation which dealt with the following:

- C An overview
- C Location
- C Site Plan of existing operation

- C History of the site's use, i.e. used to be a salvage yard. Since cars, etc. removed, it has been used as a recycling facility, with no disposal on site.
- C They would like to expand their site for use as a C & D Disposal site.
- C All the required information has been submitted to HRM and NSDOE&L.
- C The storm water drainage area (catchment area) was highlighted.
- C Shea Lake's location with respect of the site was discussed.
- C Separation distances were identified. It was noted that for a C & D facility, the distances basically double from those associated with a recycling facility, i.e. from 30 meters to 60 meters to the property line. A 150 meter set back from any body of water is required, in this case Shea Lake.
- C It was emphasized that the quantity and quality of clay in the area is excellent for use as a liner for the cells and cover.
- C If the disposal license is granted, materials which can't be recycled will be ground up and put into the cells. These cells will be built parallel to the property lines. It is estimated the site will have a twenty (20) year capacity.

A question was posed by the Chair regarding the use of an area in the lower left hand corner of the site outside the 150 meter line. It was indicated that the intention is to revegetate the area for use as a buffer to Shea Lake.

The Chair noted that although it is permissible to grind up asphalt shingles for disposal, he cautioned that more surface area is created and it would be better to bury them whole.

- C An engineering site plan was displayed which provided details associated with the construction of cells, i.e. a one meter depth of clay lining the cells, bottom and sides.
- C It is proposed to cut down six meters into the clay and fill upwards. The excavated clay will be used to cove the cells.
- C Work on cells to be done in a west to east pattern.
- C At any time only a 100 sq. ft. area will be exposed.
- C An Operations Manual will describe in detail how the work will proceed on a daily basis.
- C At the lower end, a catchment facility was identified. It was stressed that it is not anticipated that there will be much, if any leachate, because of the nature of the materials going into the cells. It is anticipated that they will actually absorb water rather than release it for sometime.
- C Details of how storm water will be handled on the site were provided. The slope of the site is 6 to 7 degrees.
- C Under the Licensing By-law there are targets set for how much of the material received has to be recycled or the license is lost.
- C Monitoring wells on site and on the perimeter were identified.

It appears the lake has not been negatively affected by the existence of this site over the

past forty (40) years.

C They will endeavour to maintain the gradient.

Questions were posed as to whether any residual hydrocarbons have been found on the site following its clean up. The Board was assured nothing has shown up in domestic or monitoring wells.

Mr. Regan questioned the name of the watershed above the site. It was noted that Long Lake is above the site and the Pennant River watershed was identified below the site. He also questioned if drinking water could be affected. The proponents noted that there have been a lot of community meetings and the problems identified in the area are associated with septic systems, resulting from the clay in the area.

Mr. Evans asked if pressure treated wood would be accepted at the site. It was confirmed this product will be accepted and ground up for disposal.

Mr. Regan questioned whether testing is done for heavy metals. Mr. Veinot referred to DOE&L's guidelines re groundwater which states what has to be tested for annually or on a quarterly basis. He noted there are rigorous protocols for both groundwater and surface water testing.

Mr. Regan questioned whether leachate will be tested daily. The Board was advised that these details are still being worked on with NSDOE&L, i.e. locations.

Mr. Veinot, referring to the issue to leachate, noted that materials entering the cells will be, for the most part, dry material, which had been turned into fine chips and compacted. They will endeavour to keep the materials from getting wet by covering with clay at the end of every day.

Mr. Regan referred to surface water. Mr. Zwicker noted there is some ponding on the site at present and confirmed there are no measures to deal with its disposal at present. Anything that is proposed in future will be a vast improvement. Mr. Zwicker also noted that there will be less exposed area under the new operation than exists today. In response to a query from Mr. Regan, the Board was advised that once the lifespan of the site is complete, the area will be grassed over.

Mr. Zwicker was questioned on the type of baseline testing done. He did not know if any biological testing has been done, but Mr. Veinot referred to testing conducted for coliforms and RCAP metals. Mr. Pyle advised the Board that DOE&L has also baseline data on the lake. Mr. Regan asked Mr. Zwicker for copies of the test results.

The Chair referred to sampling of test wells in the fall and spring. Mr. Zwicker noted that

there has been no reason to do any more testing, except for baseline purposes, as no disposal is going on. The Chair asked for copies of the test results of the wells.

The Chair reflected on earlier comments that a leachate treatment systems will be installed if required. Mr. Zwicker assured the Board that they will be monitoring for any leachate coming out of the cells, if necessary on a daily basis. A treatment facility will be installed if any leachate is detected.

The Chair questioned whether they intend to install some kind of ditch or swale above the cells to direct surface water away from the cells. The proponents noted that it is their desire not to get any water into the cells, thus they intend to use an interceptor ditch to direct water away from the cells.

In response to a query from Ms. Williams, Mr. Veinot referred to the trench inside the clay liner. He indicated the collection system will terminate at a manhole so it can be checked regularly. If anything should be detected, as mentioned earlier, a treatment facility will be installed. Monitoring will still be required once the cell is full. NSDOE&L requires a bond to cover any remedial work.

Mr. Evans questioned whether NSDOE&L has given any indication of their monitoring requirements. Mr. Zwicker indicated that they would like one more test well. Referring to water quality testing requirements, the Chair wondered what NSDOE&L's specific requirements were. A copy of the requirements was provided to Mr. Ernst.

Dr. Thomas questioned if there is any requirement to monitor for fish. The Chair noted that there has been no biological survey conducted. Mr. Isenor indicated there is a requirement for baseline biology testing. An annual survey is required to compare to this baseline.

Mr. Regan asked for copies of the information be provided to Mr. Ernst, i.e. Schedule 1, page 12 of the above noted requirements and also the results of the fish sampling when done.

Questions were posed to the proponents re timing. Mr. Zwicker noted that after June 11th the Minister's approval of changes to the plan will be sought. This approval may be received by the end of June. He noted that both the HRM and Provincial review are running parallel. He reflected on the high level of cooperation between the two levels of government, particularly associated with information sharing.

After a short break, Halifax C & D Recycling Limited's presentation was given by Scott Kyle, Dillon Consulting Limited.

Handed out at the meeting were copies of the overhead presentation.

The following points were highlighted:

- C The proposed Three Corners C & D Materials Management Facility is at Antrim, in the vicinity of the Halifax International Airport.
- C The proposal is at the predesign level.
- C This is an undeveloped site, 5 hectares in total area.
- C An eighteen year life of the site is anticipated.

The proponents were asked if they have tested the bedrock. They had and it is granite with Lawrencetown Till (Sackville Clay) covering it. Sulphide bearing slates have been identified. It is not their intention to excavate near the bedrock. They intend to go no closer than one meter.

Mr. Evans expressed concern about the potential dust generation from both sites and what is proposed to control the dust. He noted it can travel a long way. The Halifax C & D Recycling Limited representatives acknowledged this can be a problem. When grinding or processing older types of demolition materials, they will be watered down. This is a requirement of the Labour Board for the safety of workers.

Questions were posed by Mr. Williams re Kaulbeck Brook where surface water is discharged. Mr. Isenor noted it is 4' to 5' wide and associated with a large peat deposit.

Mr. Regan stated the Board desires the proponents to bring a 1 to 2000 scale map. It was difficult to see if any other water courses would show, as the map provided was a 1 to 3000 scale.

Mr. Kyle noted that fisheries biology work will likely be done in May.

Reference was made to Porters Lake being used as a source of drinking water. The proponents were questioned on what extra measures are envisaged to ensure the safety of this source. Mr. Isenor felt the most effective means is to ensure there is a contingency plan in place, if there was a spill. A plan which would allow enough time to react.

Reference was made by Mr. Regan to RDM not putting in a treatment facility for leachate until it is detected. In this instance, Mr. Chassie noted it is their intention to do a leachate test for every 500 tons of materials processed.

Referring to the Sedimentation Control Pond, Mr. Isenor noted that a lateral diffuser system will be used rather than a ditch. Concern was expressed about the potential of freezing with this method. The proponents noted that silt loads actually go down in the winter.

In response to a query from the Chair, it was noted the site was essentially flat, very similar

to the first site's contours.

The Chair reflected that he did not see any catchment swale in the plans presented. The proponents indicated perimeter ditching is proposed to which any groundwater from the disturbed area will be directed. The Chair noted that they may have to consider putting in a treatment system, such as an engineered wetland. Mr. Isenor indicated their first choice would be a passive engineered wetland.

It was also noted that there should not be a leachate problem, given the materials certified for the operation. Any that don't meet the qualifications will be sent to the landfill.

If a flocculating agent is used, the Chair wondered what would be used. An alum based one was identified.

The Chair questioned whether they would be shredding asphalt shingles. Mr. Chassie indicated they can recycle 100% of clean shingles.

One difference identified from the first presentation was in this instance they will be starting at the top of the hill and working their way down, covering as they go.

Mr. Regan noted that it is hard to comment on the proposal when no specific details are available. The Board was assured that the item will come back to the Board during the site plan approval process.

Ms. Williams referred to the unloading pad area. It was noted that the surface would be typically concrete, with a controlled drainage area around the perimeter. A separate sedimentation pond would be established for this area, as well as another surface water monitoring point.

A discussion followed on the time frame for the Board to comments on the proposals. The Chair noted that for the Antrim site, there appears to be adequate time, however the Harrietsfield plans are much further ahead and more detailed.

Mr. Pyle referred to a meeting with the Solid Waste Advisory Committee being May 16, the day after the Board's May meeting. If this were to be an item on the Board's agenda May 15th, he would attend and jot down comments to take to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee's meeting the next day. The Chair felt the Board will be essentially making generic comments, i.e. type of water testing, locations of water testing sites, etc. Mr. Pyle noted the Board may wish to raise the issue of lack of leachate treatment.

The Chair canvassed the members on whether any of the members felt the two areas were not suitable for this purpose. No objection was expressed to their locations, although it

was acknowledged that the Board might be requesting further controls.

The Chair felt it desirable that copies of the maps be provided to the members before the next meeting.

Mr. Williams referred to a third application for a site associated with the former Whebby Quarry in Dartmouth.

Reference was made to DOE&L Guidelines. Mr. Pyle indicated they had been circulated to the members sometime ago. Additional copies could be provided by staff. They are also available on the Provincial Government's website.

Mr. Ernest cautioned that the recommendations the Board makes could conflict with the NSDOE's, thus putting the developers in a difficult situation. The Chair noted that in the past if the Board felt more stringent requirements were in order, they were recommended. If HRM disagrees with the Board, they override them and go with the NSDOE&L. It has been found that the Board's requirements are higher than both HRM and NSDOE&L.

4.1 **25 YEAR REGIONAL PLANNING STRATEGY**

Ms. Muecke could not attend tonight's meeting.

4.2 **DRAFT SECONDARY PLAN AND LAND USE BY-LAW FOR SACKVILLE DRIVE**

The Board received a memorandum from Mr. Whittemore on February 12, 2002 for information purposes. Staff had provided the draft policies they felt the Board would be most interested in. At the March meeting, Mr. Regan indicated his desire for the planners associated with the item, Mr. Whittemore and Ms. Langille-Hanna, to attend the April meeting.

In his update, Mr. Whittemore noted that since February there have been a number of revisions. He noted that Regional Council set a date for a Public Hearing May 2, 2002, at last weeks Regional Council meeting. It was noted that whatever happens to Sackville Drive will have an impact on the Little Sackville River.

At the meeting they circulated a handout which was extracted from the Sackville Drive Land Use Bylaw related to General Provisions: Environmental Protection. The Policy is essentially implemented through Land Use By-laws. The Board was advised that staff had used the WAB's Guidelines as a basis for developing the LUB requirements.

Staff presented a quick overview of what the policy is trying to do. Particular attention was

given to the Sediment and Soil Erosion Control portion which relates to any development of a vacant lot or change in grade of an existing lot requiring an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, except where the total disturbed areas is less than 1.0 acres. It was explained that through meetings with Legal Services and Development Services staff, the list of twelve (12) items was proposed for inclusion in the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. The Development Engineer will be able to go through and check off the requirements met. It was felt this approach was a start in the right direction.

Referring to Section 13, which allows for an extension for an additional six months at the discretion of the Development Officer related to Flood Proofing, the Chair wondered if such extensions would come before the Board, before the Development Officer approves. It was agreed that this provision opens the door for this kind of comment, but there are time constraints.

Ms. Thomas questioned if there was anyway staff could report annually to the Board on the changes, so the Board will be kept in touch. Staff suggested that once a year the PAC could focus on and place in a document form.

4.4 **SOBEYS FALL RIVER**

Deferred to May meeting.

3.0 **BUSINESS ARISING FROM MINUTES**

3.1 **WENTWORTH/BEDFORD SOUTH SECONDARY PLANNING STRATEGY**

Copies of the Board's recommendations for Chebucto Community Council were circulated in the agenda package.

Mr. Ernst, upon reviewing the recommendations, noted that in a number of instances the recommendations are not really specific and leave much to the discretion of the interpreter.

The Chair noted that if they are too specific, the Board runs into issues of liability, thus the recommendations are so phrased. The Board just alerts the community council to the fact that there are issues associated with various matters. By being too generic in nature, Mr. Ernst felt they were almost useless to the recipients.

One change was required to point 8, the words 'directed towards high flow events' was added to the last sentence.

5.0 **CONCEPT PLANS**

None.

6.0 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held Wednesday, May 15, 2002.

7.0 **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m. Due to time constraints item 4.4 - Sobey's Fall River was deferred to the May meeting. There was also no time to deal the information items. Before leaving, the members were advised that there were four handouts to pick up.

The subject of an alternative meeting location will be placed on the May agenda.

Lynne Le Boutillier,
Assistant Municipal Clerk