



Meeting Minutes

Collin's Park Watershed Advisory Committee

Date: March 24, 2022

Location: Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Meeting Time:

6:30 pm

Adjourned:

8:30 pm

Member name and position		Agency/Representation
Attendees	Phil Francis (PF), Community Representative,	Fall River
	Barry Geddes (BG), (<i>Vice Chair</i>), Watershed Manager,	Halifax Water
	Bev Lawson (BL), Customer Representative (virtually),	Collin's Park WSP
	Peter Nightingale (PN), Planning and Development Officer,	Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM)
	Anna McCarron (AM), (<i>Vice Chair</i>), Source Water Planner,	Halifax Water
	Tom Mills (TM), Representative,	Shubenacadie Watershed Environmental Protection Society (SWEPS)
	Dick Pickrill (DP), (Chair) Community Representative,	Wellington
	Wayne Stobo (WS), Community Representative,	Waverley
	Colin Waddell (CW), Senior Manager Water Services (virtually),	Halifax Water
Guest:	Councillor Cathy Deagle Gammon (CDG), District 14/17 Shubenacadie Lakes	Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM)
Regrets:	Bernie Matlock (BM), P. Eng.,	Nova Scotia Environment and Climate Change (ECC)
	Mike Allen (DM), Watershed Planner,	NS Environment and Climate Change (ECC)
	Ken Burrows (KB), Industry Sector Representative,	Development Sector Representative
	Sanjeev Tagra (ST), Manager of Water Supply Plants,	Halifax Water

1. Attendance / Introductions

Meeting called to order by Chair, Dick Pickrill

Notes:	<p>Regrets conveyed (see above). Quorum noted. Minutes recorded electronically.</p> <p>DP commented on how detailed the Minutes were. While he appreciated the detail, perhaps they could be condensed in the future to lighten the transcription load.</p> <p>BG added that because there is so much development in this watershed the Committee's workload has increased, including discussions at meetings.</p>
--------	--

2. Review and Approval**a. Thursday, March 24, 2022 Meeting Agenda**

Discussion:	<p>Agenda approved as tabled.</p> <p>CDG will provide an update on a meeting regarding Conrad's quarry when we get to that Agenda item 6.b.i.</p> <p>TM and WS will provide an update on the meeting with the Minister regarding phosphorus loading at Agenda item 5.d.</p>
-------------	---

Decision:	Agenda Approved by consensus.
-----------	-------------------------------

b. September , 2021 Meeting Minutes

Discussion:	Minutes were reviewed.
-------------	------------------------

Decision:	Motion to approve the Minutes
-----------	-------------------------------

Motion to approve Minutes by BG	Seconded by: TM	All in favour. None opposed.
---------------------------------	-----------------	------------------------------

3. Education and Awareness**a. Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan Applications (HRM Speaker Opportunity)**

Discussion:	<p>AM explained that this agenda item is about a speaker opportunity from HRM to explain how erosion and sedimentation factors-in, in permit applications.</p> <p>PN added that the HRM expertise on this topic would fall under it's development and engineering group. There was a new grade alteration (GA) by-law adopted about a year ago, garnering changes to the GA permits and sedimentation and erosion control plans requirements for development. There may be a lot that is new to explain. PN offered to arrange for a guest speaker to come to one of our future meetings.</p> <p>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
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. BG/AM to find a time to have this special meeting.	PM/AM/BG	Pending
b. Education Strategy and Draft Materials		
Discussion:	<p>AM reminded the members that DP and AM were to work on the education package over the past year, but due to the Committee’s work being pulled so much toward development review and providing recommendations and letters of concern, time has not been given to this action item.</p> <p>DP suggested that compensation for the wetlands impacted by the new highway, which will be discussed further down on the agenda, may provide some action on the education and awareness file through our plan to create interpretive signage.</p>	
Decision:	See 3.c. below	
Action Items	Person responsible	Deadline
See 3.c. below	CW/BG/AM	ASAP
c. Newsletter re stormwater management (e.g., Sobey’s)		
Discussion:	<p>AM circulated copies of the newsletter to provide an example of what the Source Water Protection Group is doing with respect to education and awareness, albeit in the Lake Major and Middle Musquodoboit watershed areas.</p> <p>BG asked whether it was time to create a general source water protection watershed newsletter to circulate HRM-wide. AM advised that 2011 was the last time we had such a publication and agreed that it would be time.</p> <p>BG suggested that the newsletter focus on current watershed affairs. For example, we are opening up the Lake Major Watershed <i>Protected Water Area</i> Regulations for public review, which would be great subject matter for a general newsletter. Maybe a good news story, such as the Sobey’s development would be something to highlight, with respect to the Collin’s Park watershed area.</p> <p>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> <p>AM observed that this touches on our strategy.</p>	

	DP asked with whom do we leave this Action Item?	
Decision:	<p>BG replied that the Committee leave it with Halifax Water to discuss internally 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
Halifax Water’s watershed team to develop an education and awareness strategy that utilizes its communications team’s skills and expertise to create publications that help to raise awareness about the watershed and its volunteers.	CW/BG/AM	ASAP

4. Old Business:

a. Aerotech Park Connector to Hwy 2:

i. Wetland compensation next steps:

Discussion:	<p>The Province’s Public Works Department has approved McCallum Environmental Ltd.’s plans to conduct the wetland study as part of the compensation package for the wetlands impacted by the Connector. It is now up to NSECC to sign off on it. They haven’t since August.</p> <p>TM advised that they expect it to be ready very shortly. It looks like the wetland compensation package will include a wetland study.</p> <p>SWEPS’ preferred study area was for every watershed that touched on any of the lakes, from the crossing of the 102 highway at Lake Thomas all the way around Grand Lake and back down to the other side of Lake Thomas. That would include the Collin’s Park Intake Protection Zone (IPZ) as well as the near-zone for the Municipality of East Hants water supply area. McCallum may have extended it downstream slightly.</p> <p>If that shows that there is shovel in the ground work that would be near wetlands or to enhance existing wetlands, that would be covered by the remainder of the compensation package. Also, it is limited to 40% of the total compensation to the dollar, which would amount to \$200,000. Any of the wetlands touching any of the lakes around Grand Lake would be included in the study.</p> <p>AM asked whether the study is finished. TM replied that it is just about finished. TM also met with MLAs Brian Wong (Waverely -Fall River-Beaver Bank) and John MacDonald (Hants East) who said they would approach Environment Minister Tim Halman. It is his signature that is needed. TM expected that to happen in the near future.</p> <p>AM shared that she learned at the Scotian Materials (SM) Community Liaison Committee meeting that Ducks Unlimited has been granted the compensation funding for the wetlands being impacted by SM’s Goff’s Quarry activity. However, they don’t know where the compensation area will be applied. SM is also working with McCallum</p>
-------------	---

	<p>Environmental Ltd. on the wetland compensation project. AM suggested that TM may want to keep tabs on the work McCallum is doing with SM since they are in the backyard of the Aerotech Connector.</p> <p>[Wayne Stobo arrived to the meeting.]</p> <p>DP asked TM if he thought the wetland compensation area would be provided within the catchment of the Collin's Park watershed area.</p> <p>TM replied that it would and that that requirement was already signed off on by the Minister.</p>	
Decision:	<p>Next steps 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.
3. Hold off drafting a wetland compensation letter to PW pending meeting with McCallum, after which TM will inform AM to help guide next steps.	TM/AM	Pending TM's meeting with MacCallum Consulting
<i>ii. Community Liaison Committee (CLC)</i>		
Discussion:	<p>BG had no more to report.</p> <p>A letter was not sent per the Action Item below. BG felt it wasn't necessary to send a letter to Nova Scotia Public Works regarding sitting on the CLC as a representative of the CPWAC since he is already there representing Halifax Water as the Watershed Manager.</p>	
Decision:	<p>BG is sitting on the CLC already so it would be redundant to send a letter asking for him to sit there on behalf of the CPWAC.</p>	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. DP to send a letter to NSPW assigning BG to sit on the CLC on the Committee's behalf.	DP	Retract
2. BG to sit on the CLC on behalf of the CPWAC	BG	Next CLC meeting
b. Scotian Materials Goff's Quarry Community Liaison Committee (CLC)		
Discussion:	<p>AM reported to the CPWAC that she attended the Scotian Materials CLC meeting on behalf of the Shubenacadie Watershed Environmental Protection Society (SWEPS) on March 23, 2022. GHD Limited Consultants presented Scotian Materials Limited (SM)'s</p>	

	<p>5-year 2021 Monitoring and Comprehensive Report for the Goffs Quarry, situated at 171 Resource Road, Halifax, Nova Scotia, dated February 15, 2022, which included the water quality sampling data.</p> <p>AM described the report as very lengthy but that a link to it would be provided to the CLC members, and to TM for his perusal, as the chair of SWEPS.</p> <p>BG indicated that he had not attended this meeting, but was provided with the link to the report and the consultant’s presentation, which was displayed to the Committee members for discussion purposes.</p> <p>AM explained how large volumes of water runoff are pumped from a settling pond through a custom made filter bag, from which the water is dispersed into the environment and tested. This method helped to reduce the total suspended solids and metal readings and mitigated potential erosion and sedimentation issues associated with heavy stormwater flows. The life cycle of the bag depends on the contents and volume of the water going through it.</p> <p>BG asked where the bag was placed in relation to the quarry, while WS asked about its capacity. These questions were not answered directly, however, the location and capacity of the bag may be determined upon further examination of the report.</p> <p>There were two instances where the water quality testing results exceeded the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment Water Quality Guidelines for the Protection of Aquatic Life (CCME WQGPAL) for the following metals: aluminum, cadmium, copper and lead in one sample set and aluminum, arsenic and iron in another. However, these exceedences were consistent with the existing water quality for the area before the quarry commenced its operations and therefore not a result of the quarry operations.</p> <p>AM invited TM to review the report for more details.</p> <p>TM added that SWEPS has been testing for metals every year since the quarry started, except last fall, in the water going into Soldier Lake that runs in close proximity to the SM Goff’S Quarry area. Their sample results are consistent with the level of exceedences reported by the SM Goff’s Quarry consultants.</p> <p>TM added that the background water quality is very high because of the construction of the 102 in the 1970s and the exposed rock that was left behind when all of the rock quarries used in that construction were just walked away from. The cadmium readings back in 2012 were 4-5 times higher than you would expect, as a result.</p> <p>AM continued to highlight other report findings: GHD reported no net loss of water quantity to stream #5, which is immediately adjacent to the working portion of the quarry site.</p> <p>The pinked out area displayed will not be quarried and will be used for storage because of its proximity to the gas pipeline. A representative of the gas pipeline sits on the CLC and are informed when blasting is planned.</p> <p>GHD were satisfied with the results of their findings.</p>	
<p>Decision:</p>	<p>BG will attend the next meeting to further assess the role Halifax Water and/or what the CPWAC might play on the CLC.</p>	
<p>Action Items</p>	<p>Person Responsible</p>	<p>Deadline</p>

Sit on the Goff's Quarry Community Liaison Committee (CLC) and report back.	BG/AM	Pending further assessment.
c. HRM Shubenacadie River Watershed Floodplain Mapping Study		
Discussion:	<p>CDG reported that Council has not heard any news on this Agenda Item. Certainly there has been no presentation to Council yet.</p> <p>CDG will check and send an update by email. Who should she find out from?</p> <p>PN added that he had not heard anything but would help CDG.</p>	
Decision:	CDG and PN will check on who is responsible for this mapping study.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Investigate the status of the Floodplain Study.	PN/CDG	Next meeting
d. Carwash Stormwater Design Specifications:		
Background:	This item generated item <i>i</i> below, at our March 25, 2021 meeting. Follow-up on this action item is described below.	
<i>i. Added to Halifax Water's Stormwater Design Specifications?</i>		
Discussion:	<p>BG reported that he received a response to the email sent to Halifax Water's Regulatory Services Director about whether catch basins with oil and grit separators (or the equivalent) and pervious surfaces are or could be part of stormwater design specifications. BG learned that there are still some federal regulations that are being examined. That doesn't mean the Committee shouldn't make recommendations when a stormwater application comes in.</p> <p>AM advised that there is a formula in Halifax Water's Design Specifications. BG added that developers' stormwater design consultants are responsible for creating the stormwater design and to practice due diligence in the process.</p>	
Decision:	Leave on agenda. This topic ties into the erosion and sedimentation plans that we are concerned with as all of our development applications depend on this.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Ask whether this design feature (i.e., catch basins with oil and grit separators and pervious surfaces) is already a specification in Halifax Water's Stormwater Design Specifications and if not, could it be added to them.	BG	Complete and pending more federal regs around stormwater specs
e. Nova Scotia Lands Montague Mines Reclamation Project		
Discussion:	BG reminded the Committee that this is about the mine tailings around Barry's Run and Mitchell's Brook above the Port Wallace development. This past summer, NS Lands' contractor completed their second round of sampling.	

	On page 9 of the Source Water Protection Annual Report under Montague Mines it states that there have been no concerns to warrant reaching out to Halifax Water. The NS Lands contractor has done the final sampling and will send along the final report when it is ready, after which BG will report to the Committee.		
Decision:	Information only. Keep on agenda.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Information only. No action required.			
f. Grand Lake Water Levels			
Discussion:	BG asked to defer this to the discussion under New Business, Item 5.a. – Broadening Scope of CPWAC.		
Decision:	See under Item 5.a. – Broadening the Scope of CPWAC		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
See under Item 5.a. below.		All	See Item 5.a.
g. Water Quality – SWEPS Report (from cyanobacteria item)			
Discussion:	<p>TM advised the Committee of SWEPS' water quality research findings as follows: SWEPS has learned that as pH goes up, there is a higher probability of blue green algae. We will be conducting more water testing in that regard this summer.</p> <p>CDG added that HRM initiated a (LakeWatchers) project which proposes to test 76 lakes. Emma Wattie is the lead on this project. This is its first year.</p> <p>BG asked which lakes are being tested to avoid redundancy (see link above).</p> <p>TM shared that SWEPS has a database of lake water quality data from the Shubenacadie River watershed area that has been collected from various sources, including the 10-year lake water quality studies, conducted over at least 30 years by the Centre for Water Resources Studies, (established in 1981), which is being put into a GPS program. It's a massive project that SWEPS should have a prototype of by the summer. TM will let us know when the prototype is ready to present.</p>		
Decision:	<p>CDG will send the CPWAC the list of lakes to be studied through AM.</p> <p>TM will let the Committee know when SWEPS' database prototype is ready to be presented to those interested.</p>		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Determine which lakes will be studied to avoid redundancies in water quality testing and data collection.		BG/CDG	Complete (see link above)
Inform the Committee when SWEPS' database prototype is ready to be presented to those interested.		TM	When it's available.

h. Membership

i. Fill Lake Fletcher Vacancy

Discussion:	<p>AM explained that since Phil Francis (PF) filled the Fall River Community seat vacancy, Keith Manchester (KM) vacated his Fletcher’s Lake Community Representative seat on the Committee, leaving the latter seat open. However, KM technically lived in the Fall River community on Fletcher Drive, on the outskirts of Fall River, bordering the community of Fletcher’s Lake. AM suggested that since PF essentially lives next door to where KM used to live and since the Fletcher’s Lake Community representative seat is open, perhaps we should rethink the community representation on the Committee for Fall River and Lake Fletcher.</p> <p>AM suggested filling the Fall River community representation seat with someone who perhaps lives in Fall River Village, or on Lockview Road, and/or who receives municipal water/wastewater to provide the CPWAC with a broader scope of representation.</p> <p>Prior to the meeting, AM approached PF, who agreed to sit as a representative of Fletcher’s Lake, filling KM’s vacant seat. AM also approached CDG about a potential Fall River Community representative.</p> <p>CDG explained that she asked a few people and no one was willing. CDG atalked with PF about a person they thought may be interested.</p> <p>AM asked if everyone is comfortable with this approach to seat members for the communities of Fall River and Fletcher’s Lake. BG said he was comfortable with this approach because we have community representatives who know the communities and the representation needed for the Committee, and that this approach would help to broaden the community scope on the Committee. No one on the Committee disagreed with this strategy.</p> <p>DP closed the discussion stating that if we secure a representative with this approach, great, but if not, we will search in other ways. In the meantime, DP advised that a decision on a new member be made outside of a formal Committee meeting, considering the few meetings we have per year. The Committee was satisfied with this strategy for picking a new member.</p>		
Decision:	<p>CDG and PF will approach the 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. PF will sit as a representative of Fletcher’s Lake.</p>		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
<p>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.</p>		CDG/PF and all	ASAP between meetings

5. New Business

a. Broadening Scope of CPWAC

Discussion:	<p>Since the Collin’s Park Water Supply Watershed Area is within the Bomont Water Supply Watershed Area, BG asked the Committee to consider broadening its scope to include the Bomont watershed area, which includes East Hants’ water supply areas, the Nine</p>		
-------------	--	--	--

Mile River watershed area and Shubenacadie Grand Lake. Broadening the scope of this Committee would provide the means to meet NSECC's requirement to have a Bomont water supply area advisory committee.

Halifax Water is also mindful that it does not want to burden the Committee.

AM added that this broadened scope could mean more development applications coming from the Municipality of East Hants for the Committee's review. BG explained that East Hants is currently not required to provide us with these applications because the Collin's Park Watershed Areas is downstream of the Municipality of East Hants.

DP asked what the risks are to the Bomont Watershed Area.

BG replied that Elmsdale Landscaping activities pose a significant risk due to the sediment-laden runoff produced during rain events. There is also an increase in development activity as well.

BG added that we haven't considered who might join the Committee from East Hants. The ToR would need to be updated to reflect the new membership, and a minimum of at least two more people would be required.

CDG asked whether that would mean more meetings per year? WS added that he wondered if there would be compensation for sitting Committee members. TM said the Municipality of East Hants Source Water Protection Advisory Committee is compensated \$50 per year.

DP advised that the same rules would apply for the newly structured committee as they do for other watershed advisory committees; moreover, the experience for the current members is beneficial [many expressed agreement]. Despite the added tasks of late for this Committee, because of the support from Halifax Water, sitting on the Committee is not that onerous; however, increasing the meeting numbers to 3 per year may be required to properly address all the agenda items in addition to finding better mechanisms to get agenda items off the table.

BG concurred and suggested that HRM and Halifax Water internally vet which development applications need to be circulated and reviewed by the Committee.

DP reminded the Committee that the table created to keep track of applications already commented on is an excellent reference, to help jog memories about the various applications without going into the archives. This will help too, especially if our scope is broadened to include East Hants' development applications.

WS argued that in addition to adding 3 meetings per year, curbing the number of applications prematurely sent to the Committee without adequate information to properly address the application would help save the Committee members' time. There should be a written description of what the property is and what the critical water quality points are so we can address them. *[Though the Committee consists of volunteer community members who are knowledgeable and concerned about protecting the quality of the water supply, they should only be expected to comment on impacts to water quality from a community perspective. HRM/Halifax Water must provide adequate information about potential impacts to water quality prior to requesting the Committee's expertise. (AM's interpretation)]*

BG added that a lot of the water quality concerns are the same within each application.

DP added that we also spend a lot of time trying to figure out what the septic system risks might be with various applications and wrote letters to regulatory agencies to that

effect, only to find that our concerns were unfounded and that the system is state of the art. Having more information about how these systems are designed would also help to save time.

CDG advised that if the details had not been hidden by the developer (and NSECC (WS)), fostering the notion that there is something to hide, that would have saved time too.

BG asked the Committee whether they were amenable to incorporating the Bomont Water Supply Watershed Area into the Committee's responsibilities.

CDG asked what is Halifax Water's capacity to handle the workload?

BG responded that there may be some synergies in place. In the short term, we are working to get some internal assistance with our education and awareness program.

DP suggested that BG and AM determine the gatekeeping rules about what may come to the Committee and then we determine whether the CPWAC can handle the added workload.

CDG asked whether the Terms of Reference needed to be ammended. BG replied yes.

DP asked PF and BL and CW to weigh in. PF and BL suggested turning to the experts at the table. BL added that she is shocked how some things are allowed to go through.

CDG asked whether the Councillor consistently came to the meetings. BG replied no. The Committee members expressed gratitude to have CGD attend. CDG said that these meetings are a great learning experience and that she intends to continue attending.

AM advised that both the Middle Musquodoboit (MM) (to which CDG also attends) and Collin's Park (CP) watershed areas are kind of the wild west in terms of restrictions on land use activity with respect to watershed protection. Compared to Bennery and Pockwock lakes and Lake Major, which have regulations attached to the land use activities within those areas, the watershed protection mechanisms in MM and CP essentially are only confined by HRM's land use bylaws and by Council.

Regarding NSECC, there is not as much emphasis or responsibility for watershed protection by them, per se, unless the watershed is designated under the *Environment Act* (section 106), or some activity falls under provincial regulation, such as there is for OSSDS or off-highway vehicles.

WS asked if East Hants is interested in having someone sit on this Committee. Cooperation is key. BG will determine this.

CDG asked if there was an issue with the Terms of Reference between municipal units and whether there would be any conflicts with that arrangement. For example, would there be an issue with the Committee reviewing East Hants and HRM plans that are not yet made public since sometimes the Committee does view HRM plans that are not yet in the public purview.

Halifax Water will discuss with CDG how to make a combined advisory committee work. Ideally we should be at the table together because the watersheds are intertwined, at least at the upstream end.

AM sees this as an opportunity to create a model of how municipal units can work together and to demonstrate how the watershed may be governed based on watershed boundaries rather than political ones.

DP observes that there are no objections to take it to the next stage.

Decision:	HRM and Halifax Water internally vet which HRM development applications should be circulated and reviewed by the Committee. Halifax Water will discuss with CDG possibilities to develop a terms of reference for a common watershed advisory committee for both Bomont and Collin's Park, internally.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Internally vet which development applications need to be circulated and reviewed by the Committee.	HRM and Halifax Water	Ongoing
Halifax Water will discuss with CDG possibilities to develop a terms of reference for a common watershed advisory committee for both Bomont and Collin's Park, internally.	Halifax Water/CDG	Before next meeting.
<i>i. Grand Lake Water Levels</i>		
Discussion:	There was no discussion on this agenda item in relation to KB's concern about the water levels in Grand Lake at the March 21, 2021 meeting. Perhaps this may be addressed if it is decided to add to the Bomont water supply to this Committee's mandate.	
Decision:	Leave on the agenda.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Discuss further if Committee adds Bomont to its mandate.	AM	Next meeting
<i>ii. East Hants representative on CPWAC</i>		
Discussion:	The ToR would need to be updated to reflect any new membership. See further discussion under Item 5.a. above.	
Decision:	In consideration of expanding the mandate to include the Bomont watershed area, the Committee needs to determine what is contained in a new terms of reference, including whether East Hants members are permitted to review non-publicized HRM documents which the Committee is currently permitted to review.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Consider inviting a member of East Hants to a CPWAC meeting.	All	Pending review (see Item 5.a.)
<i>b. Fish Lake Subdivision application in Bomont watershed</i>		
Discussion:	BG/AM advised the Committee that the comments had been received by the members on this development application and were sent to HRM. There will be another opportunity to provide comment at the next stage of the development application process for this Oakfield Park Road development. The lots have been put up for sale and some lots have been sold. PN advised that it is not uncommon for lots to be sold before they exist. It meets the lot requirements.	

	TM advised that the brook running through the property (where there were blue green algae issues in 2021 in the news) has constraints that do not allow fish passage due to the culvert placement and lack of a fish ladder.		
Decision:	If we have any concerns about the brook we could let NSECC know.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Add to development case parking lot and to spreadsheet of applications that we have responded to.		AM/BG	ASAP
c. 299 Waverley Road Subdivision			
Discussion:	<p>An existing home where they want to divide it into two lots.</p> <p>There is really nothing to discuss about this application since it is fully serviced and it is a preliminary subdivision application. There were no watercourse buffers to be concerned about from the Committee's perspective and the property lies on the edge of the watershed boundary.</p> <p>In future, the Committee does not need to review this kind of application.</p>		
Decision:	Remove from agenda.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Remove from Agenda			
d. Phosphorus Loading Baseline			
Discussion:	<p><i>The first subtopic was regarding funding for SWEPS to conduct water quality testing:</i></p> <p>TM asked that this be added to the agenda to discuss phosphorus loading mechanisms as a significant contributor to blue green algae blooms in the watershed system.</p> <p>TM described why the Cheema Aquatic Club septic system improvement is a good example of how phosphorus loading may be mitigated. Installing a new septic system and removing the old one, which was a significant contributor to blue green algae found in that area, improves the phosphorus loading situation more than the addition of higher density developments with enhanced treatment systems contributes to the problem.</p> <p>TM added that SWEPS is using citizen science to test phosphorus in the watershed again this summer and needs funds to test the water at the labs.</p> <p>CDG advised TM that Capital funds are available for such projects and that she would send TM the forms to apply.</p> <p><i>The second subtopic was about phosphorus loading from enhanced sewage treatment systems:</i></p> <p>DP asked, along the lines of phosphorus loading, how was the meeting between TM, WS and NSECC regarding CPWAC's and SWEPS' concerns about the effectiveness of the new enhanced sewage treatment systems in removing phosphorus, especially with respect to the system annodes.</p> <p>TM explained that after WS (representing the CPWAC) and TM (representing SWEPS) met with NSECC's Minister's staff, they did not have any more concerns about the enhanced systems functionality. For instance, there are alarms on these systems to</p>		

	<p>indicate when/if they are malfunctioning. Moreover, these are classified systems, which means they have 3rd party contractor certified operators.</p> <p>TM added that there are a lot of classified systems in our watershed area, unbeknownst to SWEPS and the CPWAC. TM advised writing to the NSECC engineer (Bernie Matlock’s replacement, JC Finnigan) requesting to know where these systems are.</p> <p>AM asked if you needed to FOIPOP this information. TM replied that a classified system has to be registered, which makes it public information.</p> <p>TM explained that only the applications for systems are FOIPOPped so as not to tip off the competition during the application process. Once the systems are classified they are registered, which makes the information public and leaves no reason for the system to be a secret.</p> <p>DP collated the information we received from TM as follows:</p> <p>There are three types of sewage treatment systems that this Committee is concerned about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Standard systems 2. Enhanced systems 3. Classified systems <p>TM recommends that NSECC require that all non-classified systems be classified, which means third party operators ensure the system are removing phosphorus from the effluent. TM advised that SWEPS has written the Minister requesting a change in the regulations such that if you have an enhanced treatment system, then it must be classified. Further, if you don’t have a disposal field you don’t have to be classified.</p> <p>BG/CW asked TM to put something in writing for the Committee to use as a guide for the Committee to write to NSECC supporting this regulation change request.</p> <p>DP sees two sides, as follows: how sewage treatment has been handled in the past in terms of the classified systems and the gap in the regulations with respect to the new systems. TM agreed. WS added that further associated with that, NSECC has indicated they have things in place in terms of governance, monitoring and 3rd party contracting that we didn’t know about. We could ask Dawn MacNeill (DM) of NSECC to flesh that out for the Committee to understand what NSECC has in place with regard to phosphorus loading, and to provide some background to formulate or frame what we are asking of them in the letter. Best for TM to initiate this process and ask DM to flesh it out.</p> <p>Further, AM/WS suggested that if the CPWAC could get this information out to the public, it might appease many of the people who really have no need to be concerned. Provide a package of what is classified and what isn’t as a first step, then tackle that objectionism. We need this because we are the ones who are dealing with water quality.</p> <p>TM added that at the end of his and WS NSECC meeting, they indicated they wanted to keep the conversation going in another meeting, with the same group (i.e., CPWAC, East Hants and SWEPS).</p>
<p>Decision:</p>	<p>Subtopic 1: CDG will send TM a form for SWEPS to apply for.</p> <p>Subtopic 2:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) TM to initiate the process and ask DM to flesh out better the details of governance, monitoring and 3rd party contracting so we have a common base of understanding; and

	b) Committee to send a letter requesting a list of the classified systems and that NSECC open the regulations regarding classifications of enhanced sewage treatment systems.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Between TM and CDG, work together to find funding	TM/CDG	ASAP
2. 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	ASAP
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 #2a above.	All	Pending TM
e. Annual Source Water Protection Plan 2021 Report – Collin's Park Excerpt		
Discussion:	BG introduced the SWPP Report which summarizes to NSECC what Halifax Water has done regarding moving forward with the Source Water Protection Plan. DP asked the Committee to read the SWPP report and to get back to BG by the following Monday with any concerns or changes that might be required in this Report.	
Decision:	Read the SWPP report and get back to BG with any concerns or changes.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Read the SWPP report and get back to BG about any concerns or changes required in the report.	All	By March 28, 2022

6. HRM Planning and Development Update

a. HRM Regional Plan Review

Discussion:	PN advised that he would prefer that the HRM experts in this field (i.e., Kate Greene and Leah Perrin) be the ones to explain to the Committee where we are in the process in addition to the erosion and sedimentation control presentation we have been asking for. The focus right now is to go to Council with some quick fixes to open up sites for development considering the rising demand for housing in HRM. December 2022 is the target date to present the draft Regional Plan to Regional Council. September meeting would be best to get an update on where we are in the process. If we could schedule a special meeting sooner that would be best. CDG added that there is a survey on the HRM website where anyone could put in their comments if desired.
Decision:	PN will invite the experts to the next meeting, or sooner, if desired, to inform the Committee on the Regional Planning process.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
PN will invite the HRM experts on the subject to present at our next CPWAC meeting.	PN	Next meeting or sooner if possible.
b. HRM Planning Applications in CP Risk Areas		
Discussion:	<p>AM advised that Halifax Water engineering department through POSSE has been reliably sending development applications to the source water protection department, even those in non-serviced areas.</p> <p>AM asked whether we still require PN to advise the Committee of development applications (as Rosemary MacNeil did in the past), or whether we should continue to receive notifications about these applications from both agencies to ensure none of the applications fall through the cracks.</p> <p>BG advised that the applications must come through Halifax Water to provide a funnel so we aren't getting application from different places.</p> <p>PN advised that if he sent every application it would hundreds.</p> <p>DP advised that we don't want to get into the nuts and bolts of the applications at meetings since we have been effectively reviewing most of them (except those needing further discussion) between meetings through email.</p> <p>Everyone agreed with PN that there is no need to see as-of-right applications since HRM is obliged to approve the application regardless of any recommendations from the Committee. However, DP advised that the Fish Lake application (discussed in Item 5.b.) is a great example of an exception to the rule because of the brook running through it, and therefore may be an appropriate one for the Committee to comment on. For example, perhaps there should be a watercourse setback/buffer.</p> <p>PN replied that there is no restorative requirement in any permit application if there was no buffer there to begin with. It is up to DFO and NSECC to make comment on this brook, aside from any development permit issued by HRM, to whom the Committee could provide comment to, aside from HRM.</p> <p>DP advised that it would be up to BG to determine whether the application should come to the Committee.</p> <p>Regarding Action Item #4 (below) from our last meeting, BG advised the Committee that Halifax Water stopped receiving notifications of on-site sewage disposal system applications from NSCEC due to confidentiality issues.</p> <p><i>PF left the meeting.</i></p>	
Decision:	The Committee decided to maintain receipt of applications through Halifax Water only and that BG would determine which applications the Committee needs to see.	
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:	<p>CDG advised that after the new Light Industrial Zoning (LIZ) was approved to accommodate Conrad's Quarry, CDG and Councillor Toni Mancinni committed to having a meeting with the NSECC Minister and his staff and members of the community, which happened March 16. The meeting was attended by NSECC Minister Hon. Tim Halman, Deputy NSECC Minister Lora MacLaughlin, NSECC and HRM staff, as well as Kenda MacKenzie (Halifax Water), Kim and Brent Conrad from the Quarry, three members of the community and Councillors CDG and Mancini. CDG will ask that the Minutes of that meeting be shared with this Committee.</p> <p>Everyone at that meeting agreed that the most important thing to agree on is the protection of Lake Charles, what is the solution and where is the runoff coming from that is causing the silt and sedimentation into Lake Charles.</p> <p>The Minister's team talked about the short and longterm goals that they will commit to to protect Lake Charles.</p> <p>Conrad Bros. talked about another infrastructure improvement that they will make, in response to Stantec's review based on the last infrastructure enhancement they did, in addition to improvements on the existing holding pond.</p> <p>Emma Wattie (HRM) talked about the 77 lakes HRM will be conducting testing on in the spring and summer and the different testing locations including Spider Lake and the quarry and another site where a pipe comes out on the other side of the highway.</p> <p>The Minister's team talked about the short-term plan to set up inspections proactively in response to complaints, which will be initiated immediately. Andrew Murphy (NSECC) said that there is no one cause. They will look at legislation and regulations to enhance the regulations already in place. This group will come back every month or two to follow through with what these plans are.</p> <p>Kenda McKenzie (Halifax Water) talked about stormwater management. There is a combined government agency group level meeting including Climate Change agencies and HRM with respect to blue green algae on April 13. The goal is to create a consistent communication package to share with the community about what NSECC will be examining and solutions they will be working on with regard to Lake Charles.</p> <p>The LIZ approval only has to do with the the commercial aspect of project. This zoning is being applied to ensure that the quarry activities are furthest away from the Waverley Road. There has been no talk about the residential portion yet.</p>
-------------	--

	<p>Conrad Brothers have had meetings with community members with the goal to resolve any environmental concerns. This aspect of the development is in tandem with the Port Wallace development, which is the size of Truro.</p> <p>Originally, HRM had Conrad's looped into the Port Wallace development. A Motion in Council removed it from the residential component. The residential portion is grouped into the Port Wallace amendments.</p>		
Decision:	CDG will ask if she is able to acquire and circulate the Minutes of the meeting with NSECC, HRM, Conrad's Quarry and the community members.		
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	By next meeting
1. Status of the CPWAC submission to Tyson Simms, HRM Planner assigned to this case:			
Discussion:	<p>CDG gave us a great update on the status of the application.</p> <p>At last meeting we discussed asking Kevin Neatt to of Clayton Development to present to the Committee about the status of the development.</p>		
Decision:	BG to contact Kevin Neatt of Clayton Developments Limited for details about the status of the Port Wallace development.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Contact Kevin Neatt of Clayton Developments Limited for details about the status of the Port Wallace development.		BG	In time for next meeting.
2. FOIPOP questions (WQ monitoring and Stormwater Flow) resulting from IA			
Discussion:	<p>AM explained that by reading the Industrial Approval (IA) that was circulated prior to this meeting, the answers to our questions about what should have been measured from the quarry, are answered there.</p> <p>It is something we could delve into and discuss at a future meeting after review of the IA.</p>		
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.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Review the IA and determine whether we need to have further discussions on it.		All	By next meeting
3. Review the Port Wallace Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessment			
Discussion:	CDG said that there will be a good communication plan going forward. This aspect of the development proposal has been separated from the Conrad's Quarry rezoning application.		
Decision:	Remove from agenda/add to item 6.c.		

Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Keep on agenda/add to item 6.c. for future discussions as information is released.		All	As information arises.
<i>ii. Case 23052 (Loon lake)</i>			
Discussion:	There is nothing new to add to this case file besides what was discussed via emails outside the meeting.		
Decision:	Add this case to the spreadsheet (parking lot).		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Remove from agenda but add onto the spreadsheet (parking lot)		AM	By next meeting
<i>iii. Parking Lot Case updates as required</i>			
1. Carr Property			
2. Case 233325 – Highway 2 (next to Turtle Back restaurant)			
3. 4203 Highway 2			
4. “Special Meeting” large developments with enhanced wastewater treatment systems			
c. Port Wallace Development			
<i>i. Comments on second draft of policy</i>			
Discussion:	<p>BG advised that the plan is there. Do we want Kevin Neatt of Clayton Development to come in to present the plan?</p> <p>AM advised that they are going to put a 50 m buffer around Barry's Run, which includes the wetland area.</p> <p>BG delayed calling Kevin Neatt pending further discussion with the Committee. See item 6.i.1 above.</p> <p>PN advised that at the bear minimum there would be a public hearing.</p>		
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	Pending progress on the development.
<i>ii. Measure Water Volume</i>			
Discussion:	This is being addressed through CDG team addressed through the stormwater group at Halifax Water.		
Decision:	Keep on agenda.		

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Keep on agenda	AM	Next meeting

7. Election of Officers – Spring 2022

WS moved to keep the executive as is. All approved. The members remain as is.

8. Next Meeting: October 13, 2022 at 6:30 pm – 8:30 – Virtual and In-person at Gordon Snow Centre if possible.

9. Adjourned at 9:45pm.

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