



## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES**

**Meeting #:** Special Committee of the Whole - SCOW-08/2019  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 23, 2019, 6:30 pm  
**Location:** Meridian Community Centre - Accursi A and B  
100 Meridian Way, Fonthill, ON

**Members Present:** Marvin Junkin,  
Mike Ciolfi,  
Lisa Haun,  
Bob Hildebrandt,  
Ron Kore,  
Marianne Stewart,  
John Wink

**Staff Present:** David Cribbs,  
Nancy Bozzato,  
Bob Lymburner,  
Marc MacDonald,  
Jason Marr,  
Teresa Quinlin,  
Vickie vanRavenswaay,  
Barbara Wiens,  
Holly Willford,  
Sarah Leach

**Other:** Paul Robertson, Trees Unlimited  
Interested Citizens  
Media

---

### **1. Call to Order and Declaration of Quorum**

Noting that a quorum was present, the Mayor called the meeting to order at approximately 6:30 pm

### **2. Adoption of Agenda**

Mayor Junkin provided an outlined of the meeting format and decorum guidelines.

**Moved By** Marianne Stewart

**THAT the agenda for the October 23, 2019 Special Meeting of Committee be adopted as circulated.**

**Carried**

**3. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof**

There were no pecuniary interests disclosed by any of the members present.

**4. Opening Remarks: Mayor Junkin**

The Mayor provided meeting process and decorum guidelines for the persons present as printed on the agenda.

**5. Department Reports**

**5.1 Public Works and Utilities**

The Director of Public Works provided an overview presentation of the Gypsy Moth infestation alternatives that have been developed for consideration. In company with Mr. Marr, Mr. Ryan Cook was also in attendance, together with Paul Robertson of Trees Unlimited. Questions by Committee were addressed.

**Moved By** John Wink

**THAT Committee receive the Gypsy Moth Public Meeting Presentation dated October 23, 2019, by J. Marr, Director of Public Works and Utilities Department.**

**Carried**

**6. Public Input - Gypsy Moth Infestation**

**6.1 Request to Reopen Gypsy Moth Funding Options**

Ms. Pilzecker outlined the points raised in her delegation request, included as part of the agenda.

**Moved By** Bob Hildebrandt

**THAT COMMITTEE receive the delegation by Jen Pilzecker, regarding Gypsy Moth Funding for information.**

**Carried**

**6.2 Suggestions for Effective Gypsy Moth Spray Control Program**

Mr. Feeley provided an historical overview of the gypsy moth issues that have been occurring in Pelham periodically for a number of decades. His presentation culminated in his recommendations, as follows:

- Establish a committee composed of senior staff, Councillor(s) and informed citizens;

- Develop and recommend to Council an effective gypsy moth spray control program;
- Committee to retain oversight for this term of Council.

Mr. Feeley provided points for consideration, to be undertaken by such a committee. He submitted his written comments to the Clerk.

**Moved By** Lisa Haun

**THAT COMMITTEE receive the delegation by Frank Feeley for information.**

**Carried**

## **6. Public Input - Gypsy Moth Infestation**

### **6.3 Public Input - Not Pre-Registered**

During the course of presentations, the CAO advised that Council will continue to receive feedback through an issue-specific email address: [gypsymoth@pelham.ca](mailto:gypsymoth@pelham.ca).

Throughout the presentations, members of the public were encouraged to focus on the alternatives presented, to assist Council in the next steps.

1. D. Nicholson: Suggested that if there is to be an RFP issued for a study of the intensity of the egg masses, volunteers be considered, being a project of civic participation.
2. J. Jeffs: Expressed preference for the municipality to fund the spray program throughout the Town similar to how the snow plowing budget is allocated.
3. R. Tiffin: Suggested that Council review the White Paper prepared by Mr. Feeley to inform future decisions. He noted that addressing a gypsy moth infestation will be more costly in some years, but suggested that this is a community issue and, like education and health care the costs, should be distributed among all ratepayers.
4. V. Coffey: Raised questions about the 2019 billing process, noting that some people on one side of a street paid, while if on the opposite side they did not. Mr. Robertson explained that the spray boundaries were based on property lines and susceptible trees.
5. M. Sowden: Also had questions about the 2019 billing process and the process for spraying. Noting he previously lived in an area affected by the gypsy moth, he indicated they had programs to supply owners with traps and tree banding and it was up to the homeowner to manage the insects. He suggested the Town consider providing traps and banding in an attempt at prevention. Mr. Robertson informed Council that the best prevention is wet weather because the fungus then keeps the

infestation under control. He cautioned that traps can draw more male moths. Tree banding is a good method, as is removal of egg masses. He offered to meet with individual property owners if need be.

6. K. Ker: Having professional experience in pest control for agricultural purposes, Mr. Ker suggested that applications are effective but control alternatives should be also explored. He suggested that a citizen education program could also be effective to include information about when hatching occurs and when to apply control sprays, options for ground applications, etc. He also suggested that some of the work, such as tree banding, could be done by students through volunteer programs.

7. D. Boksa: Some Pelham properties abut Carolinian forests and Ms. Boksa described the initiatives she has taken to protect her property, being one that backs on to such a forest ravine. She did not support how the charges were levied by the program, noting that because the ravine was already receiving a spray that properties abutting should be given a discounted rate.

8. K. Newman: An ecologist with expertise in pollination ecology, Ms. Newman raised questions about underlying ecology noting that every moth or butterfly would die on contact with BtK spray. She also noted that other animals rely on caterpillar larvae for sustenance and when sprays are used, the food web is depleted for songbirds, etc. She noted that trees are good at bouncing back after defoliation. Mr. Robertson noted that the spray time-frame for gypsy moths is very limited, and the only caterpillars present would be tent caterpillars and gypsy moth. Others are larvae in the summer months.

9. F. Martinago: Noting the main concerns appear to be the history of managing gypsy moth infestations and the costs to do so, he suggested that Council learn through the past experiences. His preference was to manage this issue as a community-wide effort.

10. D. Moody: Referencing the alternatives presented, she suggested that Council not consider the notion that would cost millions of dollars as this is not viable and should not be considered. She advised that although she was billed, she did not give consent for the spray. Mr. Robertson advised that a change in the mapping occurred just days before the spray, with an increased boundary as several trees had been missed in the initial assessment. He also noted that following a Council presentation by Mr. Feeley, Council opted to ensure entire properties be sprayed.

11. M. Hughes: Questioned how the budget will be properly informed if the survey work is completed after the budget review, and he also questioned how to lodge complaints about the 2019 process.

12. G. Ashdown: Noted that there appeared to be different rates applied to rural properties and questioned the method used to calculate the costs. Mr. Robertson indicated that the cost to spray was \$500 per acre, and costs in the urban area included all costs such as police coverage, road closures, etc. After the explanation, Mr. Ashdown continued to question, Mr. Marr further indicating that all of the breakdowns were provided in reports to Council.

13. J. Vandebeek: opposed having received a bill and requested reimbursement. He suggested the costs to spray be included as a tax in the operating budget.

14. G. Fuller: Noting she owns what is considered a rural property, the onus is on her personally. She advised that she paid over \$1200 last year, and ground sprayed herself. She indicated a preference for Alternative #5.

15. C. Barrett: Also a rural resident with 24 acres of forested area, Ms. Barrett advised that her cost for spraying last year was approximately \$3,000. With the majority of the population in Fonthill, if only the urban area is sprayed and levied to all of the municipality she suggested this is not the same as previously compared to snow plowing. If a levy increase is between 8% and 10%, she would prefer to self-fund spraying her rural property when necessary.

16. J. Pilzecker: In response to her question on how the estimates given in the Alternatives were arrived at, Mr. Marr indicated that he reached out to various municipalities to determine costs on a large spray zone and although the alternatives present estimates, he was confident with how the numbers were applied based on the 2019 experience.

**Moved By** Bob Hildebrandt

**THAT the Rules of Procedure as contained in the Town of Pelham Procedural By-law, be suspended;**

**AND THAT the specified meeting curfew time of 9:00 p.m. be and is hereby waived;**

**AND THAT the remainder of the business listed on the agenda for this meeting continue to be considered until all matter have been concluded.**

**Carried**

17. D. Seley-Sikos - Noted that infestation near the A.K.Wigg elementary school and the Fonthill cemetery was severe. She spent a great deal of time killing the caterpillars and eggs, so wondered if egg sacs are the only way to determine infestation levels for 2020. Mr. Robertson advised that they will also use Ministry of Natural Resources defoliation mapping to inform infestation levels and locations.

18. R. Tychynski: Questioned why there is a difference in criteria and whether the Town uses a competitive process to complete the work. Mr. Marr advised that the survey process will be conducted through a Request for Proposals and it is likely that the spray program will use the firm who completes the survey. Although there are other consultants with the necessary expertise than the one used for 2019, this type of service and expertise is limited. The Town is hoping for a competitive process, although for 2019 the firm was sole sourced based on past programs.
19. C. Ram: Suggested that any education initiatives include children because the caterpillar droppings are present in the parks and people don't know what they are playing in.
20. D. Boksa: Sought further explanation into pricing formulas and alternatives, noting that she protects the Carolinian forest abutting her property and pays the costs. She suggested that the Town and the Province should be responsible. Mr. Marr noted that the alternatives are meant as a means to open the dialogue for additional feedback and suggestions.
21. G. Ashdown: Questioned the RFP process for the survey work. Mr. Marr advised that 2019 levels will be used and various options will be considered for implementing the program. This RFP will also inform the process for years to come and assist with program development.
22. K. Gorman: Provided positive feedback to municipal staff noting they have been helpful in assisting with the billing she received.

**Moved By** Mike Ciolfi

**THAT Committee recommend:**

**THAT Council receive the public written submissions provided to the Clerk for information; and**

**THAT Council receive the verbal submissions made by the public.**

**Carried**

**7. Committee Input**

In response to questions by Committee, staff advised as follows:

- The 2019 spray program costs amounted to approximately \$90,000, with the administration and survey work being about 10,000. Part of the assignment was to establish a grid system to better map out infestations, to be used as a baseline to compare to future infestation surveys. Additional work was conducted this time to better track infestations.
- The tree maintenance budget line is \$80,000 for tree removal, with a separate line item for planting;

- The pilot who did the work for the town was present, and explained when a single or twin engine aircraft is used advising that charges begin when the aircraft leaves the base. He explained that a per acre unit cost is not how determinations are made, but because small, scattered sprays are more costly than larger 100-acre parcels, there will be a cost difference. Further, he noted that there are a number of approvals that are required before the aircraft can begin the process, and time to make the necessary arrangements is mandatory to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

## **8. Adjournment**

**Moved By** Mike Ciolfi

**THAT this Special Meeting of Committee be adjourned until the next regular meeting scheduled for November 4, 2019 following Council.**

**Carried**

---

Mayor: Marvin Junkin

---

Town Clerk: Nancy J. Bozzato