



Meeting Minutes

Collin's Park Watershed Advisory Committee

Date: September 23, 2021

Location: Virtual Meeting via Microsoft Teams

Meeting Time:

10:00 am

Adjourned:

12:30 pm

Member name and position		Agency/Representation
Attendees:	Mike Allen (DM), Watershed Planner	NS Environment and Climate Change (ECC)
	Ken Burrows (KB), Industry Sector Representative	Development
	Phil Francis (PF), Community Representative,	Fall River
	Barry Geddes (BG), (<i>Vice Chair</i>), Watershed Manager	Halifax Water
	Bev Lawson (BL), Customer Representative	Collin's Park WSP
	Rosemary MacNeil (RM), 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), (<i>Chair</i>) Community Representative	Wellington
	Sanjeev Tagra (ST), Manager of Water Supply Plants	Halifax Water
Colin Waddell (CW), Senior Manager Water Services	Halifax Water	
Regrets:	Bernie Matlock (BM), P. Eng.	Nova Scotia Environment and Climate Change (ECC)
	Wayne Stobo (WS), Community Representative	Waverley
Guest:	Kevin Gray (KG), P. Eng., Manager Engineering Approvals	Halifax Water

1. Attendance / Introductions

Meeting called to order by Chair, Dick Pickrill

Notes:	Regrets conveyed (see above). TM to arrive later. Quorum noted. Minutes recorded electronically. DP commented on how busy the Committee has been between the last two meetings due to the number of development applications the Committee has been asked to review within this timeframe; and submitting a letter to the Minister of ECC regarding concerns about the potential increase in nutrients in the water supply system from the increase in development.
--------	---

2. Review and Approval**a. Thursday, September 23, 2021 Meeting Agenda**

Discussion:	DP, AM and TM requested the following additions to the agenda, respectively: 4.b.iii. Representative for Aerotech Connector Community Liaison Committee (CLC); 5.c.i. Membership vacancy for CPWAC Lake Fletcher representative; and 5.c.ii East Hants representation on the CPWAC.
-------------	--

Decision:	Added items to Agenda as described above.
-----------	---

b. March 25, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Discussion:	Minutes were reviewed by Action Item which guided the meeting.
-------------	--

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

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

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

Discussion:	AM advised that we can look into having a presentation on this topic once there are fewer agenda items and Covid restrictions are lifted.
-------------	---

Decision:	Keep on Agenda.
-----------	-----------------

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Seek a presenter to educate the Committee about how erosion and sedimentation control plans are applied to developments in HRM, as time permits.	AM/BG	Pending

b. Education Strategy and Draft Materials

Discussion:	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
-------------	--

	<p>development review and providing recommendations and letters of concern, time has not been given to this action item.</p> <p>BG updated the Committee about a couple of education tools that Halifax Water has circulated, including public service announcements (PSAs) through the Chronicle Herald about which recreational activities are permitted inside Lake Major and Pockwock protected water areas and a newsletter to Lake Major watershed area residents.</p> <p>AM suggested that for the sake of efficiencies, more PSAs could be communicated across all of Halifax Water’s watershed areas as part of this Committee’s education strategy, where applicable.</p> <p>BG added that while some of the messaging regarding the Lake Major and Pockwock watersheds may not apply to the Collin’s Park watershed because it is not a regulated watershed, some public messaging may apply across all watershed areas.</p> <p>DP observed through the Committee’s dialogue around riparian area enforcement, where we concluded that we still need more enforcement, the solution appears to be education of the residents as the best defence or protection mechanism. Also, this discussion reinforced the need for more erosion and sedimentation control.</p> <p>BG advised the Committee that next week is National Source Water Protection Week. Halifax Water’s communications department has issued a high level media release and source water protection tips through an official proclamation stating that September 26 – October 2 is Source Water Protection Week in HRM. The public relations around this includes links to Halifax Water’s Source Water Protection website.</p>	
Decision:	DP advised deferring this agenda item, but keeping it on the agenda.	
Action Items	Person responsible	Deadline
Keep on agenda	AM	Current

4. Old Business:	
a. Riparian Buffer Enforcement During the Permitting Process	
Discussion:	<p>DP observed that riparian buffer discussions lead into erosion and sedimentation control discussions. DP advised the Committee that there is little left to discuss about this topic. It comes down to education; unless KB has more to add to the discussion.</p> <p>KB maintained his position that HRM used to have a good plan and brochure to explain the buffer zone and a good protocol to deal with it; he would like to see HRM get back to enforcing the line on the plan; there are still a number of instances where the buffer is ignored, which is significantly impacting the water. We need to make sure that the riparian buffer is maintained and that HRM enforces that. Our role is to educate about what the buffer zone is about and that HRM’s job is to enforce it.</p> <p>AM drew the Committee’s attention to the Minutes of the previous meeting regarding Erin MacIntyre’s explanations on the subject, such that HRM has better techniques available to enforce the retention of watercourse setbacks and riparian buffers, which include Google maps and aerial photos that may be called upon to assess what was there and what should be there. HRM engages their urban forester when there is an infraction, to assess and apply what should be there, which may be different from what</p>

	was there. That is the approach they are taking now. However, they are still relying on neighbours to report infractions to the applicable agencies as was done at the property along Highway #2 that DP and AM reported to NSECC and HRM.	
Decision:	DP advised there is nothing more to add except to redirect this as an education piece.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Remove this item from the agenda and add to the list of education program topics.	AM	Complete
b. Aerotech Park Connector to Hwy 2:		
<i>i. Environmental Assessment:</i>		
Discussion:	As discussed at the March 25, 2021 CPWAC meeting, the Minister of Environment approved this project on January 5, 2021, subject to a number of conditions . Many of the conditions were the same or similar to the recommendations that the Committee submitted in a letter to the Minister as part of the EA review process.	
Action item	Person Responsible	Deadline
Remove from Agenda	AM	Complete
<i>ii. Wetland compensation next steps:</i>		
Discussion:	<p>TM advised the Committee that as of this week, no decision had yet been made on wetland compensation for the Aerotech Park connector. A decision was expected this past August, just prior to the election. The hold-up on a decision to conduct a wetland study was due to the change in government and the Minister reviewing their files.</p> <p>KB asked whether \$0.5 million was available to fund wetland compensation.</p> <p>TM replied yes, there could be just under \$0.5 million: half of that could go to a wetland study, which the Shubenacadie Watershed Environmental Protection Society (SWEPS) asked for and the other half would be shovels in the ground type of work.</p> <p>KB suggested that a wetland education centre be constructed close to a wetland area that is fairly accessible to the public, with some pamphlets, some boardwalks, and a kiosk. This would be a very important thing for students and others in this area to go to – food for thought – to which the Committee agreed.</p> <p>RM said she worked at a wetland centre at a school in Middle Sackville. KB thought it could serve as a potential model for a centre here. RM will provide the school's name, which she did – Hamilton R. Hamilton Elementary School, Middle Sackville.</p> <p>BG added that a wetland interpretive centre could be a nice addition to a local trail development project.</p> <p>TM informed the Committee that SWEPS Trails is working on a trail that begins in Waverley and goes toward Dartmouth. Along the trail at Marshall Brook is an extensive wetland. Dexter Construction must provide money to go toward information and to help with the construction of the trail infrastructure, to compensate for the loss of wetland area they were responsible for in the Rocky Lake Area, which is near this trail. SWEPS will have a lot of signage in place for that area, but is out of the way for this</p>	

area. Instead, where the new interchange will be at Sunnylea Road, and if we have to do a lot of engineered wetland construction in this area, this could be a good place for signage since it would be close to the impact zone of the wetland loss.

KB agreed that this would be a perfect location. KB added that when a wetland is destroyed, they try to build another one in the same watershed that is twice the size of the destroyed wetland area.

AM added that there is [Ducks Unlimited Wetland Education Centre at the Shubenacadie Wildlife Park in Shubenacadie](#). Perhaps a wetland Centre for this watershed area could get additional funding from Ducks Unlimited to create one here.

TM liked the idea of a wetland area where you can stand with your phone to get information about the area your phone is pointing at. SWEPS is hoping to get that kind of system in place for the wetland that they plan to develop.

AM added that the wetland at the Fairbanks Centre, also in our watershed area, is another place to do some education and where there is a Ducks Unlimited partnership.

BG asked whether there is an opportunity for wetland compensation to coincide with SWEPS Trails' plans.

TM replied that SWEPS trails is also planning to have a trail through the old K road / old post road at the end of Holland Road. They have been in discussions with the Nova Scotia Department of Public Works (NSPW) (formerly NS Transportation and Infrastructure Renewal – NSTIR). A pedway across the Connector Road is also proposed. Further, the Airport Authority is putting in a trail from the airport that is parallel to the Aerotech Connector road and joins onto the proposed SWEPS trail. So, there is a lot of trail activity proposed around the wetlands.

DP thought that these are all good suggestions and asked how to keep this front and centre as the project moves on.

BG suggested that if SWEPS Trails already has wetland compensation projects in the works and if they know that the Committee endorses the compensation project goals that are within the Collin's Park watershed, then going through SWEPS is probably the most productive way for the Committee to move forward.

TM is looking for support to keep that money close to the Connector Road wetland disturbance area because SWEPS believes keeping the money closer to the impact zone would be best. But because the Shubenacadie River watershed area is so large, PW has been looking at putting the wetland compensation money from this site into the Stewiacke portion of the watershed, toward a big project in that area. It is hoped the wetland study will show there are suitable areas to engineer wetlands closer to the disturbed areas.

BG suggested that the Committee show its support for SWEPS' initiatives to keep the wetland compensation money inside the watershed and put the support where it is needed.

AM asked about an associated agenda action item regarding TM's meeting with [MacCallum Environmental Ltd.](#), the results of which determined whether the Committee would write to NSECC supporting SWEPS' wetland compensation goals.

TM explained that he met with MacCallum a while ago to discuss the wetland compensation package. A wetland compensation package has been submitted to

	NSECC; if approved then NSPW will be able to release monies and get going on this. TM added that he also met the new NSECC Minister, Tim Halman at a community function. He is also the MLA for the area that includes the Shubenacadie Canal.	
Decision:	Next steps pending a decision by the department of NSECC. Leave on the Agenda. 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.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Keep on the Agenda.	TM	Pending decision 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>iii. Community Liaison Committee</i>		
Discussion:	<p>DP received a letter from NSPW asking that someone from this Committee sit on the Community Liaison Committee (CLC) for the Aerotech Park Connector project and asked if anyone felt strongly about sitting on this CLC.</p> <p>AM asked whether TM had been invited. TM replied that he had not and wondered whether a geographic area had been defined that community members must reside in.</p> <p>BG advised that NSPW had invited Halifax Water to be represented on the CLC as well. BG will be attending on Halifax Water's behalf. BG is willing to represent both the CPWAC and Halifax Water on the CLC if the Committee supports this.</p> <p>DP could send a letter stating that BG could sit on behalf of the Committee. However, if NSPW would prefer a separate representative from the CPWAC, DP would be happy to represent the CPWAC on the CLC.</p>	
Decision:	DP will send a letter to PW assigning BG to represent the Committee on the CLC.	
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	Immediately
2. BG to sit on the CLC on behalf of the CPWAC	BG	Next CLC meeting
<i>c. Scotian Materials Quarry Community Liaison Committee (CLC)</i>		
Discussion:	BG updated the Committee on his attendance at the Scotian Materials (SM) Goffs Quarry (SMGQ) CLC meeting, which he was invited to observe to determine whether there might be a role for Halifax Water or the CPWAC to play on this CLC. BG has not	

determined whether either group/agency needs to be represented on the CLC. The consideration is whether we would be able to provide comment as issues arise.

BG explained that the meeting he attended was mostly about the day to day operations of the quarry. So, unless there are expansions or a major operation, there really isn't a big role for Halifax Water or the CPWAC to play on the CLC at this point.

BG added that he asked at the CLC meeting whether there was potential for further expansion of the Quarry. The Manager of SMGQ affirmed that they would apply again for 2 more phases when the need arises.

BG advised that when the SMGQ applies for these 2 added phases, another Environmental Assessment will be required for the Minister to review; which will thereby provide another opportunity for the CPWAC to comment.

AM informed the Committee that she also sits on the CLC, representing SWEPS.

BG added that AM does not represent Halifax Water on the CLC. However, AM's position on the CLC could be beneficial for the CPWAC if she is permitted to provide reports. BG asked for confirmation as to whether she could provide updates to the CPWAC through her SWEPS representation on the CLC. AM affirmed that she could.

AM added that so far, Scotian Materials only received Ministerial approval for phases 1 and 2 of the 4 phases proposed to NSECC in their Environmental Assessment (EA) Report for the Goffs Quarry; and when they do apply for Phases 3 and 4, the EA for those phases will hinge on the reports provided for phases 1 and 2. AM also added that BG may find the next meeting more informative and may help to answer whether there is justification for Halifax Water and/or the CPWAC to sit on the CLC, since that meeting will include the Goffs Quarry activity report for the last 2 years.

AM further added that the quarry activity over the past year involved blasting only once, but that more quarry activity is anticipated once the highway development proceeds.

BG added that Scotian Materials was asked whether they plan to do some remediation for the already quarried areas. Scotian affirmed that remediation would take place as required.

Overall, BG felt that he does not see a big role for either Halifax Water or the CPWAC on the SMGQ CLC. However, he will attend at least one more meeting to assess this.

DP was grateful for the report and reminded the Committee that reclamation and remediation, particularly before phases 3 and 4 were embarked upon, as well as the importance of continuing to monitor water quality and watch for changes in it, were particular foci of this Committee in its EA comments; and that for the next quarry expansion, the Committee should be prepared to comment on these items again.

DP recommended that BG and AM continue to observe Scotian Materials Quarry activity on behalf of the Committee and provide updates as needed.

MA added that typically, any quarry with industrial approval, must reclaim the area; and that they must post a bond before quarrying begins should they become incapable of doing the reclamation, thereby leaving others to reclaim the area for them.

AM added that Scotian Materials advised at the CLC meeting that they would fill in the areas as they were going along; and that the land use once they were finished with it

	would probably fit in with the Aerotech (AE) Zone for that area, i.e., industrial, considering that is the type of development currently around them.		
Decision:	BG will attend the next meeting to further assess the role Halifax Water and/or the CPWAC might play on the CLC.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Sit on the Goff's Quarry Community Liaison Committee (CLC) on behalf of the CPWA Committee and report back.		BG/AM	Pending further assessment.
d. HRM Shubenacadie River Watershed Floodplain Mapping Study			
Discussion:	TM advised contacting Councillor Cathy Deagle Gammon to ask her to inquire and follow up with the Committee on where the Study rests. Before Covid 19 restrictions began, we were advised by staff that the Study results wouldn't be released until it had been presented to Council. Staff has been unable to provide further information.		
Decision:	AM to ask the Councillor where the Floodplain Study sits and advise the Committee.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Ask Councillor Deagle Gammon where the Floodplain Study sits and advise the Committee.		AM	By next meeting
e. Carwash Stormwater Design Specifications:			
Background:	This item generated items <i>i</i> and <i>ii</i> , below, at our March 25, 2021 meeting. Follow up on these action items are described below.		
<i>i. Added to Halifax Water's Stormwater Design Specifications?</i>			
Discussion:	BG reported that he sent an email 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 Halifax Water's Design Specifications for stormwater services and is awaiting response. BG knows that changes are planned.		
Decision:	BG will forward the answer to everyone when he receives a response.		
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	Pending
<i>ii. Letter of Appreciation to Sobeys</i>			
Discussion:	DP perceived that this item has been pushed down the priority list and suggested this item be removed from the Agenda. AM suggested that instead of writing a letter, put Sobeys' developers on a list of education resources who may be approached to be an ambassador or to showcase		

	examples of how surface and groundwater may be protected through innovative stormwater infrastructure practices.	
Decision:	The Committee agreed that this would be a good idea.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Remove the following from Agenda: Send a letter to Sobeys thanking them for taking these stormwater protection and groundwater recharge initiatives and ask if they would like to join us in promoting this as a stormwater best management practice example for the community at large.	AM	Complete
2. Include Sobeys on a list of education resources to showcase stormwater best management practices.	AM/DP	Complete
f. Nova Scotia Lands Montague Mines Reclamation Project		
Discussion:	BG had nothing new to report. The NS Lands contractor are still carrying on their sampling. NS Lands have not decided anything yet.	
Decision	Information only.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Information only. No action required.		
g. Grand Lake Water Levels		
Discussion:	AM reminded the Committee that KB expressed concern at the March 25, 2021 meeting about the low levels of water in Grand Lake, which was surmised may have been caused by East Hants drawing water for its municipal supply to offset the water they are drawing out of the Shubenacadie River. East Hants calculated that the total number of litres may have made a difference of 5-7 cm in the lake.	
Decision:	No decision.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Determine at next meeting whether to keep on agenda	AM	Next meeting

5. New Business

a. Water Quality – Cyanobacteria Testing by Halifax Water in CP Watershed

Discussion:	<p>BG reported that Halifax Water has a cyanobacteria sampling program. Cyanobacteria is present in all of Halifax Water's drinking water supplies and all of its treatment plants are able to treat it.</p> <p>ST added that water quality sampling for cyanobacteria is very active, especially in the warmer months in the Collin's Park (and all) watershed area(s) because of Halifax Water's heightened awareness about the presence of cyanobacteria.</p>
-------------	--

	<p>TM added that SWEPS frequently tests and will have funding to test over April and May next year. However, the testing is not specifically for cyanobacteria; testing is conducted for colour, phosphorus, ammonia and nitrogen. SWEPS is tracking other factors needed to feed the growth of cyanobacteria as well, including hours of sunshine, relative humidity, temperature and the weather at the airport. Besides testing in the major lakes in the watershed, SWEPS initiated testing in "A" and Perry lakes this year and will continue this next year.</p> <p>BG advised that Halifax Water shares its testing results with SWEPS. Halifax Water would appreciate accessing SWEPS' testing results as it is compiled.</p> <p>DP was impressed that SWEPS has the resources to do this work. TM said that SWEPS applies for grants every year for summer students to conduct field work; 90% of which usually goes toward brook restoration projects. This year we used some of the resources to do water quality testing because of the blue green algae concerns last summer.</p> <p>AM asked whether SWEPS' data could be presented to the Committee once it is compiled. TM replied; they can't commit to a specific date, but could have something by next spring.</p>		
Decision:	SWEPS will provide a water quality data report to Halifax Water when available.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline	
Provide water quality sampling data report to CPWAC.	SWEPS/TM	As available	
b. HRM Development Application Case 23052 (Loon Lake)			
Discussion:	<p>AM advised the Committee that in conversation with Halifax Water's engineering staff, she learned that this development has quite a robust overflow containment system, which most other private wastewater systems do not have. AM also learned that when most other systems overflow, the effluent is directed into the stormwater system, which eventually makes its way into a watercourse. AM expressed that this was a concern.</p> <p>AM asked the Committee whether this was something it would like to express concern about in a letter to the regulatory agencies; i.e., NSECC.</p> <p>DP replied that this Loon Lake application just came to the Committee a couple of days ago and that it could be left on the agenda for the Committee to provide comment on via the email process.</p> <p>TM asked whether Loon Lake is part of the Dartmouth water supply and now part of Halifax Water's water supply.</p> <p>BG replied no; Loon Lake is now part of the Collin's Park watershed area, because the flume between Loon and Topsail lakes is no longer viable. TM added that Loon Lake flows through Barry's Run, to which the Committee concurred.</p>		
Decision:	<p>Leave this item on the agenda for the Committee to provide comment on via the email process.</p> <p>Comments are due October 4th.</p>		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline	
Review this application and provide comments via email.	All	As directed by the agency.	

c. Membership:**i. East Hants representative on CPWAC**

Discussion:	<p>TM asked whether the CPWAC membership could be expanded to include an East Hants representative since the Collin's Park watershed area is part of the East Hants watershed area.</p> <p>BG advised that the CPWAC boundary does not fall in the East Hants watershed boundary, but ours falls in theirs; in other words, their actions do not impact our watershed, but our watershed activities do impact theirs. We could invite them as a guest to give them a better understanding how this Committee helps to protect their water supply.</p>		
Decision:	Consider inviting a member of East Hants to a CPWAC meeting.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline	
Consider inviting a member of East Hants to a CPWAC meeting.	BG	At EH Advisory Meeting	

ii. New member to fill Lake Fletcher vacancy

Discussion:	<p>AM reminded the Committee there is a vacant seat that KM vacated when he moved. DP suggested, considering we don't have many people left at this meeting we should send a separate email to recruit a member to fill the vacancy left by KM.</p>		
Decision:	AM to circulate an email to the members asking for membership nominations/suggestions to fill the vacant Lake Fletcher seat.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline	
Circulate an email to the members asking for nominations/suggestions to fill the vacant Lake Fletcher seat.	AM	ASAP	

6. HRM Planning and Development Update**a. HRM Regional Plan Review**

Discussion:	BG deferred to KG: Halifax Water is engaged with HRM staff around this topic, but there is nothing to report as the review process is ongoing.		
Decision:	Defer until we have more information.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline	
No action currently.	BG	Per information.	

b. HRM Planning Applications in CP Risk Areas

Discussion:	<p>RM stated that Thea Langille had just sent her a list of Case files, which can be sent to the Committee to review as they have time.</p> <p>DP observed that the Committee has already commented on most of these applications. The concerning issue to the Committee is that most of these are relatively high-density</p>		
-------------	--	--	--

developments that are close to lakes, many of which have been spurred on by Fall River's recent connection to the municipal water supply distribution system. Once developed, these large developments in Fall River will be serviced with municipal water and will need to use new wastewater system technology that has been untested in this area. Aside from whether we comment on these cases individually, how do we not let the wastewater management of any of them fall through the cracks?

RM reminded the Committee that she is only bringing the information forward and that concerns about wastewater treatment is for NSECC to answer.

DP continued, saying that there are many proposals the Committee has had serious concerns about, especially regarding phosphorus loading. This is a bigger policy issue about how responsible agencies will be able to approve them and incorporate the changes in technology. It is not that we are against development, but we must approve the processes within the technology.

AM commented that most of the applications RM has provided in this list today, the Committee has thankfully been receiving through Halifax Water's engineering department, which the Committee has had an opportunity to comment on, as DP mentioned. By matching what Halifax Water gives us with what HRM gives us we can see that our communication system, to be aware of development applications that concern this Committee, is working.

AM added, in support of DP's concerns about the management of the private wastewater systems attached to these large developments, an additional concern she has learned about is that many of these systems do not have an overflow protection system; it appears, when these systems happen to overflow, it goes into the stormwater system, which she felt was not a good back-up system.

KG wanted to clarify that Halifax Water does not comment on private wastewater systems and how they are engineered. Approvals for those systems are done by NSECC. However, Halifax Water does make comments on systems that connect to its own wastewater systems.

AM asked whether KG was suggesting that the CPWAC should not comment on these private wastewater systems? BG clarified that no, the CPWAC is its own entity.

KG clarified his comments stating that Halifax Water must compartmentalize its comments. For example, for the property on Fall River Road (Carr property) that has been approved (by NSECC) to discharge its wastewater effluent to Lake Thomas, Halifax Water's wastewater division would not make comments, since it is a private wastewater system. However, when Halifax Water's drinking water supply source is also the receiving waters for wastewater effluent, then Halifax Water does make comment – a different kind of comment – from its watershed management division.

BG added that when a development proposal goes to Halifax Water, it is initially filtered through the engineering department and then distributed to the applicable divisions (waste/water/storm) who need to provide comment; and from there comments are directed to the applicable advisory committees/board, if necessary, to provide comments through that avenue; to which KG concurred.

TM commented on the point of wastewater systems, regarding the number of units treated by a wastewater system. The water and wastewater regulations state that when you hit the number of 500 you must have an approved wastewater system; but is it 500 individuals or 500 of units TM wondered?

KG responded that he is not sure about that piece of regulation, because it does not fall under Halifax Water's approval, it falls under NSECC's approval.

TM believed that when a development hits a [population] of 500 [defined under section 12 of the [Water and Wastewater Facilities and Public Drinking Water Supplies Regulations](#)], they must have an approved wastewater system under a classification system [per section 11 of those [Regulations](#)]. For example, the Carr property has been approved under this class system, and since it is classified, they need a certified operator.

KG agreed and reiterated that it would have been approved under NSECC. Using Wingate farms as an example, the single-family unit dwellings in that development, collectively, have a shared wastewater treatment facility and would require a wastewater operator.

CW reiterated that Halifax Water has absolutely no input into those private facilities. It is entirely NSECC who license and classify and regulate those private systems.

TM stressed that the [Regulations](#) predate the new technology. Therefore, there is a loophole in the wastewater regulations as a result, which is where he sees the problem arising, which SWEPS will be addressing in another letter to NSECC. So, while there will be a classified wastewater system for the Carr property, that doesn't mean that the other large systems we are seeing in the Fall River area will be classified too; and if there is no requirement for them to be classified under NSECC's [Facility Classification Standards](#) and the [Regulations](#), they don't need a certified operator.

DP commented that TM had hit the nail on the head. At our last meeting, the Committee had had no further questions about the Carr property once the questions were answered about the way the wastewater system was designed and engineered and so forth, except for where the effluent was going in the lake; the Committee did and still have concerns about the intermediate-sized new systems that don't appear to have any quality control or sense for review beyond the single unit OSSD system review process that we have now.

CW wanted to reiterate the point that KG was making to avoid confusion over Halifax Water's and the Collin's Park Watershed Advisory Committee's roles and responsibilities over all; and this discussion would fall out of that. And even though there are certified operators and the water in the watershed may impact one of our water sources, the only thing we do is source water protection and sampling around the relevant water treatment plant so we can monitor the quality of the product we provide to our customers.

AM clarified that the mandate of the CPWAC is to be an advisory Committee not just to Halifax Water but to NSECC and HRM as well as all the Committee stakeholders.

DP came back to TM's point to say the big issue is that things are falling through the cracks with the new technologies and more dense development being proposed. We hear that approvals of wastewater systems are very much in the hands of NSECC and that they are not the responsibility of Halifax Water. However, ultimately, if water quality continues to deteriorate because of these systems, it may be in Halifax Water's best interest to get involved in the margins, perhaps, if it is not in their mandate. Unless there are changes in the regulations, the Committee's concerns are that we are going to continue to see deterioration in water quality and excessive phosphorus loading unless some of these regulations are changed.

KG responded by saying that historically, HRM was ordered to take over operation of a number of these privately-owned smaller systems. It could be inevitable that it happens again.

BG assured the Committee that Halifax Water does get involved. Though Halifax Water doesn't implement the regulations that protect the water supply, Halifax does relay the information and concerns that are generated by this and other advisory committees / board to the responsible agencies (i.e., HRM and NSECC) in the margins, toward implementing changes that further protect the water supply. Also know that the concerns that Halifax Water are expressing through the advice given by the committees and boards are not falling on deaf ears. We are optimistic that changes will be made. It just takes time to move through the correct channels.

DP expressed that it is reassuring to hear that we are not operating in a vacuum, considering the great deal of work that this Committee has undertaken over these past months.

MA added that it is important to view this work holistically. The concern is the amount of development. And that development necessitates supplying water and wastewater services. The real concern is the amount of development in the area of concern, which is in HRM's realm of responsibility, while wastewater is the responsibility of NSECC. When these applications go to an individual planner or wastewater engineer, these individuals may be missing the big picture as they examine each application. So, an overall correspondence to these two regulatory agencies would go a long way toward tackling the real challenges.

DP thanked MA for his comments and added that to some degree the Committee has taken that approach with Councillor Deagle Gammon (who could not attend tonight).

Regarding the list of applications that was provided at this meeting by RM, DP observed in reading through all the applications, that there isn't really anything more we can do about their status at this stage. On most of these applications, the Committee has already provided submissions via email as they have come in.

AM offered to help the Committee keep track of all of the development applications, the comments it has made on them and their status regarding further action by creating a table that she would circulate to the members for their records.

AM also suggested that because we don't have time to review all the applications in our meeting, that we continue to respond to the applications via email as they are presented to us. The Committee concurred with this approach.

BG wanted to stress that the Committee's input has helped to change the way agency staff think. The forward thinking from this group has highlighted common themes that can be addressed in a cohesive way on some of the concerns such as OSSDS, riparian areas and nutrient loads.

DP found that encouraging. However, DP felt that we cannot do any more on these applications. DP asked AM to please collate these applications and clean them up to get them off the agenda and put them in a "parking lot".

AM stated that she would create a spreadsheet that accounts for all of the cases, organizes the comments already provided by the Committee and the responses from the developers, the timelines for further comment if required and circulate it to the

	<p>Committee. From there, the Committee may determine how to move forward. These applications are time-sensitive and timely responses are key.</p> <p>BG liked the parking lot analogy to remind us which cases need attention and to allow us to see where common themes emerge.</p> <p>The Committee agreed. We can go through each as a list.</p> <p>TM expressed concern that when we get an application, sometimes it is too late to comment on the wastewater system because they have already been approved by NSECC. Can we get them earlier so we can make comments on the septic systems?</p> <p>BG responded that he is supposed to be receiving these private septic system applications from NSECC. He had been getting them but is no longer. BG asked MA to investigate this on NSECC's end.</p> <p>MA asked BG to check out what is happening on Halifax Water's end. MA does not have access to that information but will check on the distribution on his end. It sounds as though there was a break in the process for some reason either on someone's end.</p> <p>DP feels that this is an important point.</p>	
Decision:	<p>Continue to inform regulatory agencies regarding development impacts to the water supply.</p> <p>Continue to review applications and submit comments as advised by the agency providing the applications for the Committee's review, via email.</p> <p>AM to create a spreadsheet to help the Committee keep track of all the development applications, the comments it has made on them and their status.</p> <p>BG and MA will look into where the private wastewater system notification process has been broken between NSECC and Halifax Water.</p>	
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.	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	ASAP
4. Determine where the wastewater system notification process broke between NSECC and Halifax Water.	BG/MA	ASAP
<i>i.</i> Case 23060 – Soldier Lake Conservation Design Development		
Discussion:	<p>AM advised the Committee that this item was deferred at our last meeting. AM called Jacqueline Belisle (JB) after receiving her number from RM per the Action Items.</p> <p>AM learned from JB how cases should be reviewed. JB advised AM that this conservation development is on hold and it is uncertain whether it would proceed.</p>	

	<p>AM added that she was alerted to this case because it was posted on the website. JB advised AM that it shouldn't have been posted there.</p> <p>AM asked whether it should be taken off the agenda until or unless it comes up again. Hearing no comment, we will apply the "silence is consent" rule.</p>	
Decision:	Remove from agenda until it comes up again.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Remove from Agenda	AM	Complete
<p><i>ii.</i> Case 22670 (Conrad's Quarry) Rezoning Application:</p>		
<p>1. Status of the CPWAC submission to Tyson Simms, HRM Planner assigned to this case:</p>		
Discussion:	<p>Between the developer, the stakeholders and HRM, the Committee wants to know its status.</p> <p>RM said that HRM planners Myles Agar and Jaqueline Belisle have this file. KG added that he works with them on this file.</p> <p>KG advised that there is an NSECC application involved with Port Wallace and that Tyson Simms' report to Council is in its final stages. The development is under the name Port Wallace Holdings Ltd., a subsidiary of Shaw and Cresco. Ltd. The best person to answer any questions about this development is Kevin Neatt at Clayton Developments Limited. BG or AM will contact Kevin Neatt.</p> <p>RM received an answer on this Agenda item during the meeting from Kate Greene, at HRM, as follows:</p> <p><i>The unserviced portion of this project was separated out from Port Wallace – and will be coming forward for a decision to Regional Council in the next few months – there are some changes proposed to the zoning. The Conrad Lands were not part of the Environmental Assessment HRM conducted –we only conducted the Assessment on the lands we owned, which were suspect to have mine tailings resulting from the Montague Mine. Other landowners would be responsible for their own assessments relative to the Montague Mine and any pollution resulting from that use.</i></p> <p>KG clarified the zoning areas as such: he would describe the rezoned portion as the serviced portion, so the rezoning portion applies to the Port Wallace Master Plan area, which is what they are going for the rezoning on. They want the lower portion to be single unit dwellings and the upper portion, where the existing quarry and the Oceans office and where RVs and school bus vehicles are historically stored, to be light industrial zoning. They are rezoning the lower portion for single unit dwellings.</p>	
Decision:	<p>Information item mostly.</p> <p>Contact Kevin Neatt of Clayton Developments Limited for details about the status of the Port Wallace development project.</p>	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Contact Kevin Neatt of Clayton Developments Limited for details about the status of the Port Wallace development.	BG/AM	In time for next meeting.
<p>2. EA Conducted on Quarry? and Water Quality Monitoring</p>		

Discussion:	<p>MA responded to the request to provide an update on whether an EA was conducted for the Conrad Quarry and in relation to the other questions posed by WS and TM at the March 25, 2021 meeting (Item 5.a.).</p> <p>MA advised that if there was an EA done on this quarry, then it was a long time ago. MA further advised that while he was not able to dig up any information about whether an EA was done, there was an Industrial Approval (IA), dated 1993, which is active until 2030. MA has a copy of the IA from the public facing link so it may be shared with the Committee to see what the terms and conditions of the Quarry are, under the current IA. AM asked MA to share it to circulate to the members, subsequent to the meeting, which should help close the loop on this.</p> <p>MA added that if the Quarry is not under an EA now, if there were to be an expansion, then an EA would be triggered, unless there was an older one; and if there was, MA was not able to dig that up. Further, if the Committee wants any old information on that file (which pertains to some of the other questions posed by TM and WS under this action item), it would have to go through the FOIPOP process through the Bedford office. Nevertheless, the Committee can review the Industrial Approval document and if there are further questions about the track record or enforcement records or monitoring, we could gain more information through Access to Information avenues.</p> <p>MA was then asked to respond to the following series of WS' questions (<i>in italics</i>) as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Has consideration been given, since this is a regulation of quarries, to maintain a quarry to that size that would be restricted to about 20 percent of that size?</i> <p>This question was not clear to the Committee members. Deferred until WS is available to clarify the question.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>Is there any intention to require any reclamation of the C-I zone area of those lands?</i> <p>MA advised that in the terms and conditions of an active quarry operation, there is typically a requirement to actively reclaim areas that have been worked over as you move along.</p> <p>C-I Zone is a commercial zone. However, if the operators decide to use the worked-over area for storage, then it is an active use; if it is still in the quarry footprint, MA interprets that that area wouldn't have to be reclaimed. If it has already been quarried and it has already not been used for anything else, then that is the questionable area. So, for equipment, or aggregate storage, or weigh scales, then they would still be assumed to be used for operations.</p> <p>TM remarked that the operations have moved back quite far and he doesn't remember any reclamation there. TM thought that they stored RVs and school busses there for the winter last year.</p> <p>MA remarked that the IA lays out the operations expectations.</p> <p>The Committee's subsequent actions on this Agenda Item then is to review and come up with any further questions and pose them to the Bedford office. The questions would be formed from the reference point of the IA.</p> <p>When we review the scope and ground rules outlined in the IA, we will be able to further address the answers to this and other questions we may have.</p>
-------------	--

	<p>3. <i>The stormwater flow from this whole site comes down through a major stream to Lake Charles. The soil they were grubbing was dumped into the current R-I portion of the site, just east of the number 7 Highway. I don't recall any public consultation about putting hundreds of thousands of tons of fill where the recreational vehicles are now, thereby covering over that stream running into Lake Charles. To my knowledge there has never been any water quality monitoring of that water from that site, which could contain arsenic and other metals. What is being done to ensure monitoring of the water quality and potential contaminants coming from the expanded commercial use of that site going into L. Charles?</i></p> <p>MA replied that the answers to this question would also be derived from the IA MA circulates and that any further questions should go to the office handling the IA.</p> <p>KG advised that the Committee may want to review the 2019 Port Wallace Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessment to see whether the Conrad Lands were included in that. MA advised that this Environmental Site Assessment is not a Provincial EA.</p> <p>BG requested that although MA has fulfilled the Action Item associated with the question about a Provincial EA on Conrad's Quarry, questions remain, the answers to which may be answered upon review of the IA provided by MA. Additionally, there are questions about HRM's consultant's Environmental Site Assessment associated with the newly proposed land use development activity. So, this item should be kept on the agenda to address the further queries.</p>	
Decision:	<p>MA will share the Approval with the Committee with AM for circulation to members. Remove the EA Action item, as far as MA's responsibility is concerned, from the agenda. However, keep the discussion on the agenda to address further questions:</p> <p>a) that TM and WS asked at March 25, 2021 meeting;</p> <p>b) pending review of the Industrial Approval; and</p> <p>c) pending review of the 2019 Port Wallace Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessment with respect to Case 22670 and Conrad's Quarry.</p>	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
1. Check whether an EA was done on the Conrad Bros. Quarry and whether monitoring is required; and if so, whether the Committee can access the stormwater monitoring water quality test results.	MA	Complete Remove from Agenda.
2. MA and AM to circulate the Conrad's Quarry Approval to the CPWAC members for their review.	MA/AM	After this meeting.
3. Members to review the Conrad's Quarry Industrial Approval.	All	For next meeting
4. Review the 2019 Port Wallace Phase I/II Environmental Site Assessment .	All	For next meeting
5. Package the previous questions asked by WS (see March 24, 2021 Meeting Minutes Item 5.a. above	AM	Complete

second Action item) and send to MA to distribute to the appropriate contacts at NSE for answers.			
<i>i.</i> Parking Lot – defined under Agenda Item 6.b. above - (See Spreadsheet for Details on these cases)			
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			
<i>c.</i> Port Wallace Development			
<i>i.</i> Comments on second draft of policy			
Discussion:	<i>RM received an answer on this Agenda item during the meeting from Kate Greene, at HRM, as follows:</i> We have been working with the Province on the issue of arsenic contamination in and amongst some of the lands, and how provincial management of this matter might relate to potential development of the Port Wallace area. We will be bringing an update to Regional Council in the next month or two on this matter.		
Decision:	Keep on Agenda		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Review as new information is presented		PN	As required
<i>ii.</i> Measure Water Volume			
Discussion:	Deferred		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Deferred			

7. Election of Officers – Spring 2022**8. Next Meeting: March 24, 2022 – Virtual and In-person at Gordon Snow Centre if possible.****9. Adjourned at 12:30 pm.***Minutes Respectfully Submitted by Anna McCarron, Secretary, Collin's Park Watershed Advisory Committee*