

Last updated on October 8, 2013

Questions submitted or raised at community engagement events held September 18-October 24, 2013 – including Town Halls and Regional Public Event Sessions – will be listed below. In an effort to ensure information is provided in a timely manner, questions and answers (Q&As) will be posted online that address common topics, issues and concerns. The Q&As can be accessed [here](http://www.shapeyourcityhalifax.ca) via the online community engagement portal (www.shapeyourcityhalifax.ca). Notes beside each question below indicate the corresponding Q&A to reference.

Questions from Town Halls

1. If there's a contract, why is this even being considered? (see Q&A #2, #37)
2. Why push to void contract with the communities? Not a good use of our tax dollars. (see Q&A #2, #6, #37)
3. Is the contract being broken because the city wants to use the savings for a stadium? (see Q&A #2)
4. If HRM breaks this contract, how can they be trusted to uphold future contracts? (see Q&A #2, #6)
5. The community agreed to host the landfill for 25 years. How is it fair of HRM to extend the life beyond 2023? (see Q&A #2, #8, #24, #37)
6. Why are we here when there is a contract in place. Why not just leave Otter Lake alone? Why 14 meetings? (see Q&A #1, #2, #6, #37)
7. Is it legal for the contract to be broken? (see Q&A #2, #6, #37)
8. Why did council decide they should break the contract? What did they see wrong with it? (see Q&A #1, #2, #6)
9. Why was the agreement with the community (contract between HRM and residents) not taken into account in the Stantec consultation? (see Q&A #2, #11, #12)
10. If HRM has no legal jurisdiction to make changes, why is all this money and time being wasted here and now to strong arm the citizens of this area to accept the Stantec report? (see Q&A #1, #2, #6, #37, #38)
11. What gives you the right to break our trust and contract signed in good faith? (see Q&A #2, #6)
12. How can HRM justify talking about extending the life of the landfill when the community agreed to only 25 years? (see Q&A #8, #37)
13. "Government: of the people, for the people, by the people." Who changed the definition? (see Q&A #1, #2, #6)
14. If HRM is going against their word to the community, how are we supposed to trust them again? (see Q&A #1, #2, #6)
15. Politicians should work for us, not for them. What has changed? (see Q&A #1, #6)
16. Why do HRM staff continue to misrepresent the operations of FEP and WSF? (see Q&A #2, #5, #16, #27)
17. What plan does HRM have to repair and restore the relationship with our community? We feel dishonoured. (see Q&A #1, #6)
18. What will the effect of the increased cell height be? (see Q&A #4)
19. How high will the landfill cells be raised to if the proposed changes are made? (see Q&A #4, #15)
20. What is the status of extending the life of the landfill?(see Q&A #1, #6)
21. Where would an alternative landfill be located? Are there proposed options? (see Q&A #8)
22. Why won't HRM council start looking for a new site? Our community did our part. It took 10 years to settle Otter Lake, why not start looking now? (see Q&A #8, #6, #15)
23. If there is no new site, what is the length of time HRM wants to extend the life of this landfill? (see Q&A #8, #24, #37)
24. Why are we not discussing the replacement to Otter Lake? This is our chance to take what we've learned and improve? (see Q&A #8, #15)
25. Beside alleged savings, what is the other benefit to making the facility a dump?(see Q&A #7)
26. Is it true that only 3% of the waste is prevented by the facility?(see Q&A)
27. How will property values be affected? (see Q&A #9)
28. How much will my property value go down?(see Q&A #9)
29. The concern to me is the proposal to bring all compost to Goodwood area to "try" compost. This area experiences a high putrid smell on many days as it is – will this not increase the problem?(see Q&A #5)
30. Why would we agree to having a landfill that smells, attracts birds in our neighbourhood and have it for another 100 years? (see Q&A #5, #29)
31. Will there be foul odors? (see Q&A #5)
32. Will the smell increase at the landfill, making homeowner value go down? (see Q&A #5, #9, #29)
33. How are you going to deal with the rodents like the ones near my parents' house, they live in a rural area with a dump a few kms away? (see Q&A #5)
34. Currently, several times a year there are strong odours from the landfill. What guarantee is there this would not become worse with the proposed changes? (see Q&A #5, #29)
35. The landfill did smell without sorting 1-2 years ago. Why do you think it didn't? (see Q&A #5, #29)
36. How will a waste campus reduce odors at Otter Lake? (see Q&A #5, #15, #24, #25, #26)
37. How does closing the landfill gatekeeper (FEP/WSF) possibly "enhance" or "evolve" the waste system? (see Q&A #1, #5, #7, #16, #22, #27)
38. Laurie Lewis stated that the WSF does not work as intended. Then why aren't we researching how to make it work better instead of scrapping it? (see Q&A #2, #19)

39. Are you saying that the state of the art waste management facility is mostly due to the cells and not the front end processor? (see Q&A #2, #16, #27)
40. How are the proposed options going to protect the environment in a facility that was not designed for these extra years of operation? (see Q&A #4, #8, #22, #24, #37, #43)
41. What changes if HRM keeps the Otter Lake landfill site open? (see Q&A #6)
42. If the province has already said they won't close or change the facility, why are we here? How can these changes still be made? (see Q&A #6, #38)
43. If the province is refusing to okay these changes what is the point of HRM continuing this process? (see Q&A #6, #38)
44. Is this a ploy to force the province to contribute more money to the city for waste processing? (see Q&A #6)
45. How do you plan to overcome the province's objection to your proposed unilateral action? (see Q&A #6, #38)
46. Why is HRM proceeding in the face of opposition from the province? (see Q&A #6, #38)
47. Why is HRM doing this if different levels of government oppose the change? What is the percentage chance of HRM succeeding? (see Q&A #6, #38)
48. Why are we wasting the time and money if the province isn't going to change what is in place? (see Q&A #6, #38)
49. If Otter Lake is world renowned, why are we discussing change? (see Q&A #1, #33)
50. Why are you changing a system that works? (see Q&A #1)
51. Why not leave the present system in place and treat those "new" green house gases as a new project, or extension of present system? (see Q&A #1, #6)
52. Why are there town hall meetings in areas that don't have anything to lose? (see Q&A #6, #10)
53. Has this decision already been made, or are we really going to be listened to? Does our opinion count? (see Q&A #6, #10, #35)
54. Why are we here? Who started this idea? The deal was 25 years – was it working too well? (see Q&A #6, #10, #11, #12, #37)
55. What triggered the desire to change the agreement since you indicated it wasn't for money? (see Q&A #1, #2)
56. What happens to the current employees at Otter Lake? (see Q&A #3)
57. How many jobs will be lost? (see Q&A #3)
58. What would the proposed increased employment mentioned by HRM look like? (see Q&A #3)
59. Why would anyone reduce recycling to save money and cut jobs? (see Q&A #3, #13, #15, #27)
60. How will non source separated items be flagged without the FEP? (see Q&A #15, #16, #18, #22, #27)
61. If cells are built higher, will noise of trucks and equipment be more of a nuisance? (see Q&A #43)
62. What are the dangers of increasing cell heights? What is the environmental impact of the vertical cell increase. (see Q&A #43)
63. If cells are built higher, will noise of trucks and equipment be more of a nuisance? (see Q&A #43)
64. If this is an effort to save money? Has the city done an analysis of the cost of defending a class action lawsuit and the payments to the community for damages and diminished property values? Have this estimated the cost of reporting the environmental damage? (see Q&A #13, #14, #15, #22, #27)
65. How do we know that the environment will be protected with the proposed changes? (see Q&A #15)
66. Without a sorting facility, will hazardous waste go into the landfill? (see Q&A #17, #18, #31, #45)
67. We know harmful material is diverted on-site so why shut those safe-guards down? (see Q&A #17, #22, #45)
68. Are there any environmental issues or laws to protect this from happening? (see Q&A #36, #38)
69. Why are some environmental checks and balances being raised in some areas but lowered at site A (otter Lake)? (see Q&A #15)
70. Does WSF/FEP produce more GHG or the same amount but faster? How much GHG produced without? How can we improve? (see Q&A #16, #19, #27)
71. Without the FEP/WSF protections in place, would all organic material go to landfill site? (see Q&A #15, #19, #20, #22, #27)
72. Why can you not produce useable compost? (see Q&A #43)
73. What is the future of HRM composting and garbage? (see Q&A #39)
74. Where will the organics go? (see Q&A #20, #41)
75. Where does the raw potato peel go if it gets to Otter Lake? (see Q&A #20, #41)
76. What model of landfill will Otter Lake be if these changes are implemented? What is the vision? (see Q&A #15, #44)
77. Why are we looking to save money short term? Not looking to make more ethical environmentally responsible choices? (see Q&A #13, #14, #15, #27)
78. Is there any truth to the statement that millions can be saved and no harm to the environment by closing the FEP? (see Q&A #14, #15, #22, #27)
79. The cost per year of the FEP is about \$10 million, but did you know that if you divide by the number of households (near 200,000) the cost per household would be minimal? About \$60. (see Q&A #16, #27)
80. Local businesses will suffer. Home owners will suffer. How does anyone think this will be okay?
81. Is HRM embracing bad/incorrect consulting reports? (see Q&A #11, #12)
82. Why did HRM take it upon themselves to approach Stantec? (see Q&A #11)
83. Which version of the scientific evaluation is correct? The rosy view presented by HRM or; the contrary perspective voiced by CMC and the scientist mentioned vis-à-vis the Stantec report? (see Q&A #11, #12)
84. What does HRM (major and councillors) plan to do about the Stantec report? What do they want to implement? (see Q&A #6, #10, #11, #12, #35)
85. What happens if you change the landfill and it doesn't work? (see Q&A #22)
86. Is there a guarantee that there will be no leachate? (see Q&A #42)

87. If you want to pick up everything in one truck to take it to Otter Lake to dump into one hole, do we stop using green bins? (see Q&A #15)
88. If organics end up in the landfill (from restaurants/workplaces) are they separated and collected for composting, or treated on-site? (see Q&A #20)
89. Was the FEP/WSF designed to separate the waste, or to process it to make the material inert? (see Q&A #16, #19)
90. If a large amount of items arriving at Otter Lake have not been separated should we not be looking at how we could reduce this amount? (see Q&A #15)
91. How can removing one of the two barrier layers in the liner system provide the same level of protection. By definition it can't. (see Q&A #23)
92. Will the liner be reduced from double to single? What happens when that change is made? (see Q&A #23)

Questions from Regional Public Event Sessions

1. Isn't this all just a waste of time since HRM staff has already made up their minds to close the FEP/WSF? (see Q&A #35)
2. How can HRM break the contract it signed with the community and the operator stating the Otter Lake site will only be in operation for 25 years? (see Q&A #37)
3. The recommended changes are contrary to the Environment Act. Why bother? (see Q&A #36, #38)
4. People come from around the world to see the Otter Lake facilities so why would we ever consider stopping what we're doing if everybody says we're the best? (see Q&A #33)
5. Isn't it true that clay was used as a daily cover material during the WSF shutdown in 2010 to suppress potential odours? (see Q&A #28)
6. The Stantec report doesn't identify ways to increase source separation. Why isn't HRM focusing on education, especially at businesses and in apartment buildings? (see Q&A #22, #32)
7. Were there any odour complaints during the timeframe of the WSF shutdown? (see Q&A #29)
8. What types of hazardous materials are pulled out of the garbage on the sorting line? Why would we remove this safeguard that prevents this material from entering the landfill? (see Q&A #16, #17, #27, #31, #45)
9. Why is HRM suggesting that hazardous materials are not sold on store shelves? (see Q&A #30)
10. Why are the reports commissioned by MIRROR NS not being addressed in the public meetings? (see Q&A #10, #11, #12, #34)