



Meeting Minutes

Collin's Park Watershed Advisory Committee

Date: October 13, 2022

Location: In-person at Gordon Snow Centre, Fall River and virtual via Microsoft Teams

Meeting Time:

6:30 pm

Adjourned:

8:30 pm

Member name and position		Agency/Representation
Attendees:	Mike Allen (MA), Watershed Planner (virtually)	NS Environment and Climate Change (ECC)
	Barry Geddes (BG), (<i>Vice Chair</i>), Watershed Manager (in person)	Halifax Water
	Bev Lawson (BL), Customer Representative (virtually)	Collin's Park WSP User
	Anna McCarron (AM), (<i>Vice Chair</i>), Source Water Planner (in-person)	Halifax Water
	Tom Mills (TM), Representative (in-person)	Shubenacadie Watershed Environmental Protection Society (SWEPS)
	Peter Nightingale (PN), Planning and Development Officer (in-person)	Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM)
	Dick Pickrill (DP), (<i>Chair</i>) Community Representative (in-person)	Wellington
	Colin Waddell (CW), Senior Manager Water Services (in-person)	Halifax Water
Guests:	Councillor Cathy Deagle Gammon (CDG), District 14/17 Shubenacadie Lakes (in-person)	Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM)
	Shilo Gempton (SG), Planner	Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM)
	Leah Perrin (LP), Planner	Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM)
Regrets:	Ken Burrows (KB), Industry Sector Representative	Development Sector Representative
	Jean-Charles Finnigan, Engineer	Environment and Climate Change (ECC)
	Phil Francis (PF), Community Representative	Lake Fletcher
	Sanjeev Tagra (ST), Manager Water Supply Plants	Halifax Water
	Wayne Stobo (WS), Community Representative	Waverley
Absent:	Francis White (FW), (<i>Tentative</i>) Community Representative	Fall River

1. Attendance / Introductions

Meeting called to order by Chair, Dick Pickril

Introduction of guests: Shilo Gempton and Leah Perrin, HRM Planners

Notes: Quorum noted. Minutes recorded electronically.

2. Presentation by HRM Planning on Regional Plan Review

Shilo Gempton and Leah Perrin, HRM Planners

Presentation:	<p>Regional Plan Review by Shilo Gempton (SG) and Leah Perrin (LP) (see Presentation slides (8) for more details):</p> <p>SG presented an overview of the Regional Plan review timeline and workplan and what is being considered for the watercourse and wetland buffers as follows:</p> <p>SG briefly explained the purpose of the Regional Plan (RP). The RP is a strategic document adopted in 2006 to provide a region-wide vision for land use and a comprehensive outline of how growth and development should take place between 2006 and 2031 in the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM).</p> <p>The RP is a high-level document that sits above the community or secondary plan level documents and land use by-laws, setting region-wide policy intent. For example, watercourse buffer policies sit in the RP and their regulations are rolled out through the community land use by-laws. The RP can also identify where are the needs for different types of programming, or opportunities to partner with community, or other levels of government, to achieve our goals.</p> <p>HRM planning is in its second review stage of the RP, which is broken down into five phases. The Public Hearing for Phase 3 of the RP was held earlier this week and was approved by Council, which marked the end of that phase. Phase 4 has begun. The aim is to bring a draft RP to Council and for public consideration in the spring, 2023. Phase 5, will look to study the municipality's future growth once Phase 4 is complete, likely in 2024.</p> <p>The preliminary work on the environmental policies of the RP has started through the Themes and Directions report, details of which will be worked on in the coming months. HRM planning can gather feedback now as the draft policy is developed for the spring. Groups can also review the policies again under the draft RP when that time comes. As HRM planning further investigates and updates the RP environmental policies, groups such as this one are seen to have an interest and desire to provide feedback on updating the environmental policies, the framework for which is expressed in Theme 8 (of 11 themes) – enhancing environmental protection, starting with wetland and watercourse buffers. This is what tonight's presentation is focussing on.</p> <p>Environmental management was one of the main focuses of the Regional Plan when it was first adopted in 2006. The plan focused on the idea that growth and development in HRM had been and would continue to be shaped by a network of open space. Since then, we have furthered this understanding with the Halifax Green Network Plan (HGPNP), which provides a high-level overview of the areas and features</p>
---------------	--

that contribute to the region's green network. Our work on the RP review will be instrumental in making sure that our region-wide policy is consistent with that plan. Protecting the Municipality's water resources is critical for our drinking water supply. The RP directs land use policy to regulate water flow, mitigate flooding, reduce water pollution, and protect ecological function. Through the RP Review, we will support ongoing work and look at ways to update our existing regulations. The updated work plan for Phase 4 is found in Attachment E of the Phase 3 report and available on the [Shape Your City Website](#), which outlines all the work from the Themes and Direction Report.

The HGNP identified the need to further protect riparian areas and establish a consistent watercourse buffer across the region. Greater protection for wetlands is also needed. Through the RP Review we intend to review our current land use by-law regulations/policies for these areas and make those updates.

Action items that relate specifically to environment work include:

- Continue development of watershed management and water quality programs
- Develop a regional approach to the protection of natural corridors
- Update policy to support ongoing work to improve stormwater management practices
- Review wetland and riparian buffer regulations
- Review coastal setback regulations

Council approved the HGNP in 2018. We are using the RP Review to implement many of the actions in that document as illustrated through item 8.10 of our work plan. The HGNP identified a need to better protect watercourses and wetlands, and Action 6 called for changing the watercourse buffer requirements.

The HGNP suggests considering:

- Increasing watercourse buffers for Protected Water Supply Zone from 30.5 metres to 100 metres
- Increasing standard watercourse buffer requirements from 20 m to 30 m for watercourses greater than 50 cm wide (needs further investigation)
- Maintaining standard watercourse buffer requirements at 20 m for watercourses less than 50 cm wide
- Removing the formula to increase buffer requirements based on slope
- Applying environmental protection zones to sensitive riparian areas and wetlands and
- Applying a buffer to wetlands

We may take a simpler approach and apply a consistent buffer, rather than depend on watercourse width. We are trying to determine the right approach. We are open to suggestions on these topics.

Questions / Discussion:On Buffers:

DP asked whether the 4th bullet meant that slopes would not be taken into account. SG responded that HRM planning and development staff are considering increasing the buffer, which would reduce the need for the slope calculation. In practice, when processing permits, development officers found that when it was necessary to apply the formula to calculate the buffer based on slope, the largest buffer amounted to 22 metres, so factoring in the slope didn't really have any added value. If we remove that formula and create a bigger buffer, that might add more watercourse protection value overall.

PN added that anecdotely, 99% of the time, the buffer is 20 m. The average slope has to be pretty significant to amount to greater than a 20 m buffer, which rarely occurs.

TM asked how HRM enforces the riparian buffer LUBs. Tom shared anecdotal reports of at least three instances of landowners creating private beaches on shorelines, involving the removal of trees and vegetation in the Collin's Park watershed area.

SG responded that it is a compliance issue. PN concurred and advised that it is his job to enforce the bylaws [with respect to permit applications]. HRM responds to infractions largely through a complaint-based process rather than going around looking for bylaw infractions. When HRM gets a complaint, a compliance officer investigates. If the buffer has been removed inappropriately, the landowner is required to create a reinstatement plan and hire a forester or landscaper to reinstate the damaged area. PN added that the watercourse buffer LUB, prevents the removal of vegetation in relation to development. However, if you have vacant land and you are not "developing" the land, the watercourse buffer bylaw does not apply. This is a limitation in the [Halifax Charter](#) through section 190. [Note: section 190 (3) states that the buffer bylaw does not apply to land used for forestry or agricultural purposes. However, the forestry act states you must have a 20 m buffer next to watercourses].

LP explained that when the HGPN was adopted, there were requests for Charter changes. Four years later, the Department of Municipal Affairs is asking us about making these changes. The hesitation has been about who is responsible for protecting the environment – a jurisdictional grey area. Currently, it's ECC's role through the Environment Act, not the municipality's. However, that view is shifting toward all agencies having a role in environmental protection, which could potentially give the municipality more jurisdiction, but making that shift would involve working with policy advisors in municipal affairs, the results of which may still end up status quo.

DP recapped to say if people want to cut down all the trees to have a better view of the lake, for example, HRM can only respond to infractions as they apply to development activities.

TM asked MA whether there are provincial regulations regarding infringement on the lake shore.

MA responded that there are buffer zones for industrial activity, e.g., forestry on Crown Lands and buffers to protect the PWA designation [which does not apply to

Collin's Park]. But there is no overarching buffer zone requirement for development in general, typically at the municipal level.

SG added that there is a staff report to be released in November requesting to investigate predevelopment charges and the private tree bylaw. Under the Charter, HRM has the authority to create a private tree bylaw, which is another tool we could use, but only within the serviceable boundary. Outside the serviceable boundary, we don't have the authority to create a private tree bylaw.

CDG asked whether the watercourse buffer bylaw applied only within the service boundary.

SG replied no, watercourse buffer bylaws apply to all areas within each LUBs, though there may be some differences between the bylaws within each LUB. Tree bylaws, on the other hand, cannot be created for areas outside the service boundary in any given LUB.

CDG thought the RP review was to bring the LUB into alignment; i.e., that the same rules will always apply.

SG replied that there would be opportunity to vary the buffer bylaws based on science, incorporating flood risk as well, as directed by the HRM environment and climate group who are working on this.

CDG asked about the Floodplain Study – discussed in item 5.c. below.

TM added if you were to renovate it or tear down an old home, why can they can still build the same distance from the lake. Why do old rules preclude over new ones that are clearly better for the environment?

LP/PN responded that legislatively, HRM LUBs cannot be more stringent than the Charter. In residential cases, we don't want to burden people, say, if they want to rebuild a home that was burnt down. We don't want people to be without a home.

BG commented that problems arise where there are inconsistent regulations, as they create confusion between the agencies responsible for enforcing their respective regulations. For example, where there is a PWA Regulation stipulating a 100 m setback from the primary lake of one watershed catchment area, which Halifax Water and the province have the jurisdiction to enforce, there is a PWS (Protected Water Supply) zone bylaw stipulating a 30.5 m setback from the primary (same) lake or in the same catchment area, that HRM has the jurisdiction to enforce. This leaves HRM to enforce the smaller buffer area, while the province/Halifax Water enforces the remaining 69.5 m area.

BG added that the biggest challenge is in the enforcement, not in the regulation. For starters, it would be easier if the regulations lined up so everyone is clear what the bylaw/regulation is when it comes to enforcing the law in the PWAs.

CDG asked where was Halifax Water in the buffer zone regulation conversation to get us to this point?

LP advised that revisiting the buffer zone distances was an action from the HGNP, in which Halifax Water participated in the consultation part of that report. Through the RP discussions, we are now questioning whether increasing buffers is the right approach.

BG added that Halifax Water is putting together its position in its regard to water source protection to present to HRM planning through the review process through AM who is working with the Halifax Water representative consulting with/advising HRM about Halifax Water's position on the RP review.

AM had two questions:

1. Are there conversations in the RP review about creating buffer bylaws in non-protected water supply areas, e.g., the Collin's Park and Middle Musquodoboit watershed areas? Despite their non-designated status, which would otherwise provide them added protection through provincial legislation, they are nevertheless drinking water supply areas that deserve added protection.

SG replied that it might fall under the changes for watercourse buffers in general or an area for further discussion through Phase four. Now would be the time to engage in those discussions.

AM added that servicable areas in all of our water supply areas need to be considered too, since there are some servicable areas in our watershed and some non-servicable areas which muddies the waters again, so to speak, when trying to conform the bylaws that affect each drinking water supply watershed area.

SG responded that now is the time to get into that discussion as we work through Phase 4.

2. Regarding the tree clearance bylaw: under what mechanism are we able to create private tree bylaws in serviceable areas?

SG responded that the creation of this Halifax Charter regulation was triggered by a specific thing; HRM was then given the authority to create bylaws in serviced areas only. Not allowing private tree bylaws in unserved areas is with respect to the forestry industry.

On Wetlands:

TM expressed concern about wetlands. For last summer's restoration project we used a Lidar system that showed us wetland areas that we didn't know existed. How are we going to define the wetlands?

SG replied that we are having a discussion with the province about how to move forward with wetlands. The mapping is out of date. The province says it comes down to the issue that wetlands need to be surveyed in advance. Then there is the burden on the developers to survey everything. We are discussing how to figure that out. There is a lot of groundtruthing work required to determine where the wetlands are.

LP said the province is responsible for wetland alterations, which complicates the jurisdictional area. We are working to figure out how to balance responsibilities.

PN advised that the issue isn't whether the wetland is there; even if/when the developer knows it's there; it is about when the developer comes to HRM for the permit to develop and they already have a permit from ECC to infill the wetland. We are in conversation with ECC about finding a better approach.

DP advised that this underlies many of the issues coming to the Committee's table, pitting ECC against HRM. The Committee sees it and how it slips through. They are using the system the way it's designed but there needs to be another way to use it.

	<p>MA advised that he is not directly involved in the wetland review process. He explained that a regional office, e.g., Bedford, gets an application that goes through the inspector and the engineer in the office. The wetland goes through extra analyses according to it's size and/or if it falls within a specific category such as a Wetland of Special Significance, under which a salt marsh and a Protected Water Area belong. If wetlands are under a certain size there is another process to go through. For a wetland infilling there is an offsetting process that takes place; e.g., infilling a 10 square m wetland has to be compensated to restore the wetland, preferably in the same geographical area that was impacted and by 3 times the original size. Finally, a developer must hire a wetland delineator to assess for wetlands.</p> <p>BG suggested that if the Committee sees the draft, we can discuss it further then.</p> <p><u>On RP Review Process:</u></p> <p>CDG asked whether HRM has taken into consideration the other municipal units as part of Phase 4; e.g., East Hants.</p> <p>SG replied that HRM has invited some to consult with us, but have not heard back.</p> <p>LP added that there has been some discussion with the other municipal units about growth management, but not so much about the environment, which is equally important when it comes to development.</p> <p>AM commented that it is important to strive for looking past political boundaries with respect to managing watershed areas, particularly the Shubenacadie watershed.</p> <p>In closing, LP reminded everyone that HRM will be releasing a draft of the RP in the spring, which will come with a robust public engagement program after its release.</p>
--	--

3. Review and Approval

a. Thursday, October 13, 2022 Meeting Agenda

Discussion:	Agenda adjusted to items h.ii: <i>East Hants Representative on CPWAC</i> , which was merged with Item i.: <i>Broadening Scope of CPWAC?</i> to become Item i.i..
Decision:	Agenda Approved by consensus.

b. March 24, 2022 Meeting Minutes

Discussion:	Minutes were approved, assuming everyone has read them.
Decision:	Motion to approve the Minutes
Motion to approve Minutes by CW. Seconded by: TM All in favour. None opposed.	

4. Education and Awareness

a. Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan Applications (HRM Speaker Opportunity)

Discussion:	AM explained that this agenda item is about inviting a speaker from HRM to explain how erosion and sedimentation factors-in, in permit applications.
-------------	--

	<p>PN offered to invite a person from HRM to present at either our next meeting or at a special meeting.</p> <p>BG suggested we wait until the end of this meeting to determine how much we have taken off this agenda before we add anything more.</p> <p>DP concurred with this approach.</p> <p>At March 24 Meeting: BG suggested that a special meeting on this topic be held – under the education and awareness mandate – to give the time required to address this topic. To have a presentation during a regular meeting would not afford enough time to give it the attention it deserves. BG also suggested that we invite other WAB/Cs to the presentation, e.g., the Bennery Lake Watershed Management Committee, which also faces increased development impacts.</p>		
Decision:	Let PN know when we want a special meeting on this topic and he will scout out who might be interested in presenting from the HRM development and engineering group.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
<p>PN to seek a presenter from the HRM development and engineering group to educate the Committee about how erosion and sedimentation is regulated with respect to developments in HRM.</p> <p>BG/AM to find a time to have this special meeting.</p>		PM/AM/BG	Pending
b. Education Strategy and Draft Materials			
Discussion:	<p>AM advised the Committee that Halifax Water is working on its education program. This has involved exploring the communications department’s ability to assist us. BG added that our resources are stretched.</p> <p>TM expressed unhappiness with the answer. We were promised signage 3 years ago for the Collin’s Park area. That should take precedence as low hanging fruit.</p> <p>BG said to leave it with us. Perhaps explore utilizing students to implement this task.</p>		
Decision:	Focus on getting signage up first.		
Action Items		Person responsible	Deadline
Put signs up ASAP		BG/AM	ASAP
c. Newsletter re stormwater management (e.g., Sobey’s)			
Discussion:	<p>AM advised that it is Collin’s Park’s turn for a newsletter. We want to provide a good news story, such as the Sobey’s development as something to highlight, with respect to the Collin’s Park watershed area.</p> <p>Engaging a student to help with this, as BG/DP suggested, as well, would be prudent.</p> <p>From March 24, 2022 Minutes: CW suggested that we leverage the communications team and put out a PSA, for example, directing people to relevant websites where they can get more information on the watersheds.</p>		

	<p>CW advised that the watershed staff (BG/CW/AM) could strategize on how to leverage Halifax Water’s resources to reach the widest audience, to highlight and promote the efforts that go into managing a watershed and to show recognition for our volunteers who give of their time, expertise and efforts on a regular basis.</p>	
Decision:	<p>From March 24 2022 Minutes: BG advised the Committee to leave it to Halifax Water to discuss internally how to broaden the horizon on the information that should be shared with the public.</p> <p>DP added that this presents a solution to our attempts to see our way through the education and awareness challenges on this Committee.</p> <p>TM added that he has all the files on the Sobey’s development including all the requirements and the specs to highlight what Sobey’s did in a newsletter.</p>	
Action Items	Person responsible	Deadline
The watershed team is to meet to develop an education and awareness strategy that utilizes the communications team’s skills and expertise to create publications that help to raise awareness about the watershed and its volunteers.	CW/BG/AM	ASAP

5. Old Business:	
a. Aerotech Park Connector to Hwy 2:	
i. Wetland compensation next steps:	
Discussion:	<p>TM advised that the Aerotech Highway construction has begun. The wetland compensation agreement has been approved at every level except for the ministerial level. However, it is fully expected to proceed. TM added that he recently learned that a large section of the existing wetland has been removed. TM added that we are hopeful the wetland study will start in the next 6-9 months.</p> <p>DP asked whether the compensation would be allocated to the watershed area.</p> <p>TM replied that the wetland study is part of the compensation package, which will, as has been confirmed in writing, be focused within the watershed area. However, only 40% of the value of the compensation can be used for the study. We hope the study will identify areas within the watershed area that may host engineered wetland(s) to compensate for what will be lost. Once they get ministerial approval they can begin the study.</p> <p>TM added that the associated trail will be the connector to the airport. CDG asked whether the motorized vs non-motorized trail debate had been settled. TM replied that it was determined that the trail will be shared with motorized vehicles.</p>
Decision:	<p>Next steps are pending a decision by the department of NSECC. Leave on the Agenda.</p> <p>The Committee will continue to show its support for SWEPS’ work to keep the wetland compensation funds inside the watershed area closest to the disturbed wetland area.</p>

Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Keep on the Agenda.		TM	Pending sign off by the Minister
2. The Committee will continue to show support for keeping wetland compensation funds inside the watershed area, as opportunities arise.		All	As needed.
ii. Community Liaison Committee (CLC)			
Discussion:	BG had nothing to report as he did not attend the last meeting. Neither did TM.		
Decision:	Information only.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
BG sitting on the CLC on behalf of the CPWAC		BG	Ongoing
b. Scotian Materials Goff's Quarry Community Liaison Committee (CLC)			
Discussion:	<p>AM reported that she did not attend the last meeting. Neither did BG but he received the Minutes.</p> <p>CDG attended and reported that a Department of Natural Resources and Renewables staff person presented about the wildlife in the area and the proximity of the Game Sanctuary to the quarry.</p> <p>BG reported that according to the Minutes, also of interest were the wetlands, for which the compensation was committed to Ducks Unlimited – a different scenario from what we are experiencing with the Aerotech Connector project.</p>		
Decision:	Information only.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Sit on the Goff's Quarry Community Liaison Committee (CLC) and report back.		BG/AM	Ongoing
c. HRM Shubenacadie River Watershed Floodplain Mapping Study			
Discussion:	<p>PN reported that he checked with the HRM engineering group about the status of the Floodplain mapping study. The target is still fall 2022 to present to Council. It is currently an internal document.</p> <p>TM stated the study's importance to this committee because of the impact flooding could present in/to the watershed.</p> <p>DP expressed that there shouldn't be any hesitance to release the document to the Committee, which is under the tutelage of Halifax Water.</p> <p>PN asked whether Halifax Water had had access to the study.</p>		

	<p>CDG indicated that she had learned at a Board meeting that Halifax Water had not had access to it. However, she provided a document to AM in May 2022 regarding a National Disaster Mitigation Plan – Flood Risk Implementation Plan that might provide some insight as to what we might expect from the study, found here: https://cdn.halifax.ca/sites/default/files/documents/city-hall/regional-council/220503rc1517.pdf</p> <p>PN says he hasn't seen the study and will ask again about its availability.</p> <p>DP asked PN to take the Committee's concerns back to his camp and to bring back what the concerns are back to the committee.</p>	
Decision:	PN will ask the engineering group what the hold up is and whether the Committee is able to review the Study before it is released to the public, considering the impacts flooding can have in the watershed area.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Investigate the status of the Floodplain Study.	PN/CDG	Next meeting
d. Carwash Stormwater Design Specifications – implementation and effectiveness:		
Discussion:	<p>This item was originally about whether the seemingly advanced design specs for the car wash were included, or could be included in the Halifax Water Stormwater Design Specifications. Whether or not the design specifications are in the Design Guide is not of real consequence to the watershed, so DP recommended that we take this off the agenda.</p> <p>However, TM has concerns about the effectiveness of the design specifications for this carwash due to reports that water is flowing from the carwash onto the road (Hwy #2) and remarked that we should know whether the effluent from the car wash area is being effectively treated and where it is being directed.</p>	
Decision:	<p>Due to the concerns about the runoff from the carwash property, we want to know the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. were the design specs properly installed / designed considering the apparent run-off; and 2. is the stormwater infrastructure working/maintained properly <p>PN will see what he can find out more if someone sends him the property address.</p>	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Remove the previous Agenda item regarding whether the car wash design specs are or could be included in Halifax Water's Design Specifications & Supplementary Standard Specifications for Water, Wastewater & Stormwater Systems .	AM	Next meeting

2. Send PN the address of the carwash site.	AM	Before next meeting.
3. PN will investigate	PN	Next meeting
e. Nova Scotia Lands Montague Mines Reclamation Project		
Discussion:	BG has learned from NS Lands that the report is still being prepared. Nothing to report.	
Decision:	Information only. Keep on agenda.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Information only. No action required.	BG	Ongoing
f. Grand Lake Water Levels		
Discussion:	This is currently outside the scope of the Collin's Park Watershed Advisory Committee. It concerns the Bomont watershed area.	
Decision:	Remove from agenda	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Remove from Agenda	AM	Next meeting
g. Water Quality – SWEPS Report (from cyanobacteria item)		
Discussion:	<p>TM reported that SWEPS had a very active summer conducting water quality testing and research on cyanobacteria. All the water quality data is going into SWEPS' GIS system. Data collating is still being worked on and will be circulated once it is complete.</p> <p>TM added that SWEPS has learned that phosphorus levels have been decreasing over time, which is attributed to upgrades to the Aerotech Wastewater treatment system and improvements to public septic systems.</p> <p>Another parameter of interest is temperature. Research conducted by Dalhousie's Dr. Robert Jamieson, indicates saline stormwater runoff affects the temperature of the lakes because salt water is heavier than fresh water which impacts the turnover of the lakes (lake inversion) resulting in warmer water. The salt is coming from places like Sobey's and other large parking areas as well as the highway.</p> <p>It is also apparent that one of the biggest salinity inputs into the watershed is coming into Soldier Lake through the Granite Lake area. Salinated water is in the 10,000 mg/L range or more. Seawater is over 32,000 mg/L.</p> <p>SWEPS' research activity also shows that cyanobacteria information is still developing.</p> <p>MA asked if there were any other parameters. At the time, TM made the data available to BG. TM will dig it out and send the information along to the Committee.</p>	

	<p>DP asked whether, based on this information, we should take more samples of TDS and Salinity.</p> <p>BG said that Halifax Water has tested the salinity of East Lake in the Lake Major watershed area, which has the same bedrock formation. We could compare the results.</p> <p>TM added that pH is also increasing, which promotes photosynthesis.</p>	
Decision:	TM will send the data to the Committee so it can be compared to other water quality data regarding salinity.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Inform Committee when SWEPS' database prototype is ready to be presented to those interested.	TM	When it's available.
TM will send the Committee the water quality data for BG and others to compare with other water quality data regarding salinity.	TM/BG/All	ASAP
h. Membership		
i. Fill Lake Fletcher Vacancy		
Discussion:	<p>AM advised the Committee that she had been in touch with Francis White (FW) early on when he offered to sit on the Committee, but she had not been in touch since, other than to send emails about the meetings.</p> <p>CDG advised that she is often in touch with him and will ask whether he is still available to sit on the Committee.</p>	
Decision:	CDG will ask FW whether he is still interested in being on the Committee.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Approach a potential candidate to sit on the Committee as a representative of Fall River. The new member will be determined outside of a formal Committee meeting.	CDG/PF	Complete
CDG will approach FW to determine his interest in the Committee.	CDG	By next meeting
i. Broadening Scope of CPWAC		
i. East Hants representative on CPWAC		
Discussion:	<p>Because there are two advisory committees that overlap in the Bomont and Collin's Park watershed area, i.e., Collins Park and East Hants, both of which BG and TM sit on, BG and TM are exploring ways to create efficiencies between the two groups. The mandates of these groups are essentially the same, as are many of these committee's action items. Between the two, up to six meetings/year are held to discuss similar items.</p>	

BG has reached out to East Hants about joining forces. How this might work still needs to be discussed with East Hants and NSECC.

Watershed advisory committees are creatures of the province under [A Drinking Water Strategy for Nova Scotia](#), which states that each drinking water supply area must have an advisory committee associated with it as one of the safeguards to protect drinking water through the Multiple Barrier Approach.

BG asked MA whether other municipalities share committees to cover over more than one drinking water supply area. There are at least three drinking water supplies sharing the same watershed area and many of the same issues.

MA replied that in many cases, the same agency members cross over between watershed areas and within committees. Sharing committees for different water supply areas is conceivable. MA advised considering the following: on one hand, there are efficiencies to be gained; on the other, there is fear of watering down one committee's mandate over another; where some efficiencies are gained, meetings could become really arduous; and it can make for long meetings because a portion of the subject matter may not apply to one or the other watershed area, which could cause some members to lose focus. MA suggested a hybrid model.

CDG asked whether any change of ToR would need to be vaulted to HRM for approval.

BG replied that the ToR ultimately fall under provincial jurisdiction.

TM suggested we come up with an umbrella group, but not just confined to the water supply committees, like the Nova Scotia Water Advisory Group (NSWAG).

CDG asked whether there was anything to gain to have a Shubenacadie watershed advisory committee or something of that nature.

AM suggested that such a group could have the recognition that the Shubenacadie Lakes Advisory Board (no longer in existence) still has through Policy 48 in the [District 14/17 Municipal Planning Strategy](#); i.e.,

P-48 It shall be the intention of Council to continue to support and cooperate with the Shubenacadie Lakes Advisory Board by referring subdivisions and developments within three hundred (300) metres of the streams and lakes of the Shubenacadie-Stewiacke system.

DP suggested considering a hybrid model, as MA suggested, divided along lines whereby separate committees would look after their own day to day issues separate from a broader group, which would take care of the commonalities between the water supplies, to avoid sitting through 6 meetings a year.

TM suggested 3 meetings per year, between the two watersheds, one of which could be a truncated meeting that deals only with common ground.

AM suggested, when it comes to development applications and any concerns about each municipality seeing one another's applications, that they be dealt with separately, via email.

PN responded to AM's suggestion that anything confidential wouldn't be released to the public anyway, so East Hants would not be privy to those, regardless.

	<p>BG will speak to East Hants to have some kind of combined meetings to create efficiencies between the three drinking water supplies.</p> <p>MA added that separately, each committee is responsible for a water supply, which has a corresponding source water protection plan that that committee is responsible for administering, which technically only one committee is interested in upholding.</p>	
Decision:	Leave the exploration of combining the committees with BG.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Explore what kind of watershed group or meeting opportunities can be created to fulfill the advisory committee requirements for the East Hants, Collin's Park and Bomont water supplies to create efficiencies between the groups' responsibilities / ToR.	BG	By next meeting.
Consider inviting a member of East Hants to a CPWAC meeting.	All	Pending discussions with East Hants
j. Fish Lake Subdivision application in Bomont watershed		
Discussion:	This falls within the Bomont water supply and outside this Committee's responsibility.	
Decision:	Remove from this agenda.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Remove from agenda.	AM/BG	By next meeting.
k. Phosphorus Loading Baseline		
Discussion:	<p>TM deferred these action items.</p> <p>CDG recalls Jonathan McDonald of NSECC recommending reviewing the regulations and recommended a document of Atlantic Standards to TM.</p>	
Decision:	Leave on agenda.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. a) TM provide the specifics through NSECC on what to ask NSECC in a letter regarding opening the regulations regarding enhanced sewage treatment systems classifications vis-à-vis certified operators.	TM	Deferred
b) The Committee to send a letter requesting a list of classified systems and also asking that the regulations be changed based on Action Item #1a above.	All	Deferred

6. New Business		
a. Merits of new on-site sewage disposal systems designs.		
Discussion:	The Committee could not recall what this item was referring to.	
Decision:	Remove from agenda.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Remove from Agenda.	AM/BG	Next Meeting
b. Fuel Spill 3161 Hwy 2 Fall River		
Discussion:	<p>BG described the diesel fuel spill that occurred at 3161 Hwy 2 in Fall River on September 28. A generator belonging to East Link fell over on the shoulder of the road spilling 250 litres close to the bank of a French drain that flows into the southern portion of Lake Thomas. When BG arrived on scene, the site was being attended to. By 4 pm the sucker/vac truck was on site. Halifax Water began collecting water samples right away and again the next morning. All samples came back as non-detect for hydrocarbons. The company hired by East Link to do the clean-up also collected soil samples and provided the results to Halifax Water.</p> <p>NSECC was aware of the spill but did not contact Halifax Water. The inspector BG contacted advised him that they knew it was in the water supply but didn't believe it would reach the water, so they didn't contact Halifax Water. BG advised them that Halifax Water would contact NSECC under such circumstances regardless and would expect the same communication effort from NSECC.</p>	
Decision:	Information item only. No action necessary	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Information item. No action necessary.	N/A	N/A
c. Meeting format (virtual or in-person or hybrid)		
Discussion:	<p>DP advised that we should canvass the members to ask their preference. Those in attendance at this meeting provided a variety of preferences. Essentially, virtual attendees preferred that option and/or the hybrid option; in-person attendees preferred that option and/or the hybrid option. Hybrid meetings were seen to be the most complicated. Virtual meetings were seen to be most productive with less time wasted. Some felt that meetings were agenda-dependent. For meetings that require a lot of discussion, in-person is better.</p> <p>AM advised that having the proper tools (speaker and video cam) helps to make for a more productive meeting.</p> <p>CDG would like to continue coming to the meetings in-person, as a guest.</p> <p>DP added that having CDG at these meetings has been positive and has positively influenced the outcomes of many meeting agenda items.</p>	
Decision:	Canvass the members as to their meeting format preferences.	

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Canvass the members as to their meeting format preferences.	AM	Next meeting

7. HRM Planning and Development Update

a. HRM Regional Plan Review

Discussion:	Based on what we learned through the presentation earlier tonight, the Committee has the opportunity to provide comment. DP felt we needed more advice on timing that. AM reminded the Committee that there is existing policy in the MPS which sets a precedence for the advisory committee to provide advice on HRM development applications.
Decision:	AM will keep tabs on the process and let the Committee know when there are opportunities to comment as a Committee and/or through the public review process.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
AM will keep tabs on the process and let the Committee know when there are opportunities to comment as a Committee and/or through the public review process.	AM	Pending

b. HRM Planning Applications in CP Risk Areas

Discussion:	BG provided a spread sheet of the applications that Halifax Water has received and their status.
Decision:	Continue to keep the Committee informed and ask for advice as needed.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Continue to highlight areas of concern to the applicable regulatory agency regarding development application impacts.	All	As opportunities arise.
2. Continue to review applications and submit comments as advised by the agency providing the applications for the Committee's review, via email or in some exceptions at meetings.	All	As they are presented.
3. Create a table of all the development applications, the comments it has made on them and their status for the Committee's reference.	AM	Ongoing
4. Determine where the wastewater system notification process broke between NSECC and Halifax Water.	BG/MA	Complete

i. Case 22670 (Conrad's Quarry) Rezoning Application

Discussion:	CDG advised the Committee that the Minutes of the Rezoning Application meetings are internal so the Minutes are not available to the public.		
Decision:	These are internal discussions – a work in progress – so the Committee may not have access to the Minutes of the discussions at this time.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Ask whether the Minutes of the meeting with NSECC, HRM, Conrad's Quarry and the community members may be acquired and circulated to the CPWAC members.		CDG	Complete
<i>iii. FOIPOP questions (WQ monitoring and Stormwater Flow) resulting from IA</i>			
Discussion:	Do we want to keep this on the agenda. If it is going to be rezoned, we want to keep tabs on it.		
Decision:	The IA provides the details on the water quality testing that was required by the quarry. We can delve into these parameters in the future if the Committee wishes to. Keep on the agenda for WS to comment.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Review the IA and determine whether we need to have further discussions on it.		All	By next meeting
<i>ii. Other "Parking Lot" Case updates as required</i>			
Discussion:	As indicated above, BG provided a spreadsheet of the development application cases that have been coming to the watershed team at Halifax Water and their status.		
Decision:	Information only		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Update spreadsheet for each meeting		BG	Next meeting
c. Port Wallace Development			
<i>i. Comments on second draft of policy</i>			
Discussion:	CDG advised that the Public engagement process is now open on the development. It then goes to the Minister for review. Public Engagement starts now until the 26 th . BG advised that the municipal housing authority was given the authority to clear the trees and to blast. All the environmental concerns are still on the table. There is a rush to get houses built - approximately 200 units.		
Decision:	Keep on Agenda		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Ask for a presentation from Clayton Development and keep on agenda as information is provided.		BG	Recinded

<i>ii. Status of the CPWAC submission to Tyson Simms, HRM Planner assigned to this case:</i>		
Discussion:	<p>Kevin Neatt was not contacted. BG asked whether contacting Kevin Neatt about the development is now moot considering how the Port Wallace will be developed, now. PN advised that the provincial government took the approval power away from Council. HRM still has the planning application so it is still going through the regular process, but it won't go through Council and no public hearing. In the last year or so public engagement is open, but many are asking if there is any point. Some of the approvals are going through the regular process, while others, like Port Wallace have been overturned. Port Wallace is going to be a test as to how this process will play out since this one didn't already have drafted documents.</p> <p>They are still following the environmental setbacks while the building applications are going ahead. In fact the buffer zone has been exceeded. However, they approved site clearing before erosion and sedimentation plans were in place. Our engineers are still out there and they still have to do that by the book. And the infrastructure plans still have to go through Halifax. They can't force Halifax Water to accept something different unless the province wants to take over the roads and infrastructure for stormwater etc. Public ownership is going to Crown.</p>	
Decision:	Remove from agenda	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Contact Kevin Neatt of Clayton Developments Limited for details about the status of the Port Wallace development.	BG	Recinded
<i>iii. Measure Water Volume</i>		
Discussion:	This is being addressed through CDG team addressed through the stormwater group at Halifax Water. CDG reminded the Committee that WS was very concerned about stormwater runoff volume that would be in the design specs.	
Decision:	Keep on agenda.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Keep on agenda	WS	Next meeting

8. Election of Officers – Spring 2024

9. Next Meeting: March 2, 2023 Scheduled at 6:30 pm – 8:30 – Virtual and In-person at Gordon Snow Centre if possible.

10. Adjourned at 9:00pm.

*Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Anna McCarron,
Secretary, Collin's Park Watershed Advisory Committee*