



**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING
MINUTES**

Monday, February 26, 2024, 6:00 pm

Members Present: Mayor Robert Campbell
Councillor Sarah Colwell
Councillor Joe D'Ettore
Councillor John-Wiebe Dykstra
Councillor Jason Gallant
Councillor Nathan O'Blenis
Councillor Stephanie Thorne

Members Absent: Councillor Phyllis Bannister

Staff Present: Austin Henderson, CAO
Dianne Ayles, Clerk/Treasurer
Scott Landry, Assistant Clerk

Staff Absent: Lorie Paterson, Administrative Assistant
Trevor Douthright, Manager of Infrastructure and Public Works
Massimo Caracristi, Director of Recreation and Wellness
Bradley MacLeod, Fire Chief

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.

2. **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

MOTION: The Agenda be adopted.

Moved by: Councillor D'Ettore

Seconded by: Councillor Thorne

Motion Carried

3. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

No conflicts declared at this time.

4. NEW BUSINESS

1. Street Naming Request

Councillor Dykstra joined the Meeting at 6:07 pm.

The purpose of this agenda item was to seek Council direction through a formal motion of Council as to the request for a street name change for Lam Street, a future street off Briarcroft Street, in light of a recurring request from a resident. The most recent request was received on January 1, 2024, to change the name of the future street through his property from the current Lam Street to, instead, SS Wilmot.

Background:

In April of 2020, Council received a request from a longtime resident proposing a name change for Lam Street to have it better reflect the history of the area. Lam Street was created during the development of the extension to Briarcroft Street in Countryside Estates Subdivision. If eventually fully developed as a required future second exit as intended, Lam Street would extend south to the subdivision that would eventually extend to Main Street.

Regarding Council's Authority, while a developer typically proposes street names during development of the subdivision plans, it is completely Council's authority to approve or not approve a street name when ascending to the location of the street during the subdivision approval process. Council also has the authority to change a street name at any time, although this is not common.

Council of the day in 2020 did not object to the renaming, but felt that the developer should be approached first before deciding to rename the street. Council reached out to the developer looking for their thoughts on the change. After consideration, it was the desire of the developer to keep the name as is, noting that the name has a personal family connection. Council agreed to leave the name as is.

In 2021, Council received another email from the resident who was displeased with Council's decision, Council discussed his concerns at the March 8, 2021, council meeting and discussed the possibility of future naming opportunities. The matter was tabled pending further information and discussion.

Administration's recommendation is not to proceed with the name change request. However, other considerations could be discussed by Council. For example, the new fire hall lands were once owned by this resident, it is down the street from the lands he is requesting be renamed, and is along Route 106, the street that was surveyed by SS Wilmot. In light of 2024

being Salisbury 250, Council could direct staff to explore naming the private lane, and potential future street if an extension is made from Kay Street to the Fire Hall, using this name. However, it is important to note that the Fire Department has not been consulted on this and would be interested in naming the street as well. It could, however, be explored in a conversation with the Department if Council considered this worthwhile. Further exploration would be required as to whether or not the lane (essentially a driveway) that will be in place post-construction can bear a private lane name before the driveway/lane becomes a fully-developed municipal street (an extension from Kay Street).

MOTION: Council not rename Lam Street, but direct Administration to reserve the name SS Wilmot as a future street name with the NB911 Master Street Address Guide and consider using it for future naming opportunities.

Moved by: Councillor D'Ettore
Seconded by: Councillor Gallant

On the Question, it was clarified for Councillor Gallant that while reserving names on the NB 911 Master List may not keep an outside area from using a name, it would likely protect that name within the same emergency-coverage area.

Councillor Thorne suggested reserving both versions of the name, in case including the first initials is not preferred in the end.

Regarding the involvement of the fire department in all this, Mayor Campbell said they should be brought into the conversation soon.

Councillor Colwell stated her preference to not rename Lam Street because of its family significance to the developer, suggesting that instead saving it to be connected somehow with the fire station development would be a logical alternative given the Wilmot family connection to the land that the fire hall will sit on. Councillor D'Ettore noted that tying it to Main Street would give the name more visibility, making for a win-win situation.

CAO suggested reaching out to the fire department for their thoughts, while also noting that it is Council who will have the final say; and clarify with NB 911 the Town's intentions to bank the name for a private lane in advance of a possible street at the same location.

AMENDED MOTION: Council amend the motion to state that it not rename Lam Street, but direct Administration to reserve the names "SS Wilmot" and "Wilmot" as future street names with the NB 911 Master Street Address Guide and consider using it for future naming opportunities, including the fire hall private lane that may someday in the future become a street.

Moved by: Councillor D'Ettore
Seconded by: Councillor Thorne

Motion Carried

2. Water Exploration Update

The purpose of Item 4.2 was to provide Council with the latest memo/status review report related to the exploration of a municipal water source and seek direction on Council's preferred next steps.

Background:

In 2022, Englobe was retained to update a 2009 water feasibility study as part of the overall exploration of two options for a municipal water system: own-source well development or connect to the City of Moncton's system. This report from Englobe recommended undertaking a geophysical survey to better understand the conditions of the ground and its likelihood to produce and sustain a municipal water source. However, a Fall public meeting with landowners to discuss geo-physical surveying failed to produce the approximately 10 property owners that would have been required to consent. In fact, none consented. This is, in the opinion of Administration exclusively, indicative of the likelihood and receptiveness of seeking permission to drill test wells, since test wells would be the next step in municipal own-well source exploration.

MOTION: Given hesitancy of landowner authorization for geo-physical survey(s) to explore an own-source well development, Council direct Administration to engage Englobe based on the standing offer of professional services for the exploration of municipal water as awarded in 2022, for a proposal on the completion of a Conceptual Design Study to initiate further discussions with the City of Moncton, at an appropriate time, to continue exploring a municipal water source.

Moved by: Councillor Gallant
Seconded by: Councillor Thorne

On the Question, lengthy discussion touched on funding, to which the CAO explained that for a project of this magnitude they are at the mercy of tri-governmental infrastructure programs such as the Integrated Bilateral Agreement (IBA), which is not expected to be renewed until 2028 and is currently exhausted. Tapping into a new IBA under a rural stream, for which the required municipal contribution would be significantly lower, would be the goal. Asked if Moncton should be approached about a potential connection in Allison, or at an alternate point if it was more cost-feasible, the CAO said the City had already indicated on a very preliminary level a willingness to take on Salisbury as a customer. Although, he said before any serious talks can commence the Town requires much more specific information on its end, ranging from a target level of service,

ie. domestic or fire flow capabilities, to determining priority areas of service, a phasing plan for implementation, etc. Council felt it prudent to continue on this path.

Motion Carried

3. Provincial Budget Priority Submission

Administration sought approval and direction from Council regarding a draft letter to send to the Government of New Brunswick related to the Provincial budget consultations, for which the deadline to respond is February 29. As detailed by the CAO, this provides the Town an opportunity to highlight the limited ability for municipalities to invest in priorities, and continue to request additional support from the Province. Finance Minister Ernie Steeves' pre-consultation document contains guiding discussion questions focusing on health care, the vulnerable population, an inclusive and innovative education system, and housing. The letter sent by Mayor and Council will also be copied to Salisbury region MLAs, as well as those who are currently incumbents and will be re-offering in the two ridings that will have portions of Salisbury in the next election. The letter will be on the consent agenda for the March Council meeting to formally have the submitted letter on record as being sent.

MOTION: Council approve the draft letter to the Government of New Brunswick for the 2024-2025 Budget Priorities and direct Administration to send the submission to the Province.

Moved by: Councillor O'Blenis

Seconded by: Councillor Dykstra

On the Question, Council agreed that transportation infrastructure is still underfunded, ie. roads and the bridges in Salisbury, this is a daily concern of residents, and needs to be stressed in the letter.

Motion Carried

4. Regional Waste Collection Contract Opt-In - Southeast Regional Service Commission

Councillor Thorne declared a conflict of interest and left the Meeting at 6:28 pm.

Administration required direction from Council related to opting-in to a proposed regional waste collection model, administered through Eco360/Southeast Regional Service Commission.

The Town is presently part of three waste collection contracts -- one for the former Village and two under the Province's contract covering former Local Service Districts. For the former LSDs, the Town has no jurisdiction

over the contract, price negotiations, etc. Throughout the Circular Materials EPR/PPP program, the Province opted-out of this (despite the EPR program being a Provincial program), but most municipalities in the Provincial contracts opted in. This has led the Province to notify Municipalities that they are cancelling their waste collection contracts effective November 3, 2024.

Over the last year, the discussion of a regional waste collection contract has been regularly discussed amongst CAOs. Other than the tri-community of Moncton, Riverview and Dieppe (for now, since they are in recently tendered contracts), most, if not all, municipalities have an appetite for a regional contract. This is especially prevalent given the fact that all municipalities that are outside of the tri-community have former LSDs since reform, meaning we are all affected by the Provincial decision to terminate their contracts. Prior to tendering for this work, the Service Commission is looking for Council authorization from each entity, by the end of March, to ensure they are willing to opt-in.

MOTION: Council direct Administration to inform the Southeast Regional Service Commission/Eco360 of their intent and willingness to opt-in to a regional waste collection service model and bring the formal resolution for official ratification at the March Regular Council Meeting.

Moved by: Councillor Dykstra

Seconded by: Councillor D'Ettore

On the Question, discussion touched on collection rates, how this development would standardize rates across the entire Town; and the contract, how the contract-holder would be Southeast Regional Service Commission (SERSC) and this would become one of the opt-in services that the municipality pays SERSC for.

Motion Carried

5. CLOSED SESSION

No Closed Session held this meeting.

6. MAYOR AND COUNCILLORS' STATEMENTS/INQUIRIES

Councillor Thorne returned to the Meeting at 6:44 pm.

Winterfest - Mayor Campbell thanked the Director of Recreation and Wellness and staff for their hard work in making Winterfest a success, noting the popularity of the Swedish Lantern Walk and Family Day events.

Salisbury 250 - Mayor Campbell also thanked Salisbury 250 Committee members and the Coordinator of Events and Strategic Projects for the Transportation Expo held at the Lions Club Pancake Breakfast on February 17.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Adjourn the meeting. (6:45 pm)

Moved by: Councillor Thorne

Seconded by: Councillor O'Blenis

Motion Carried

Chair

Clerk