

REGIONAL WATERSHEDS ADVISORY BOARD
MINUTES

March 12, 2014

PRESENT: Allan Billard, Chair
Richard Hattin, Vice-Chair
Pierre Clement
Timothy Hayman
Dr. Barry Thomas
Adam Fancy
Walter Regan
Tom Mills
Peter Lund
Mark McLean

REGRETS: Dr. Dusan Soudek

STAFF: Mr. Cameron Deacoff, Environmental Performance Officer
Ms. Shannon Miedema, Environmental Performance Officer
Ms. Maureen Ryan, Senior Planner
Ms. Jane Crosby, Legislative Support

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1. | CALL TO ORDER..... | 3 |
| 2. | APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - February 12, 2014..... | 3 |
| 3. | APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS..... | 3 |
| 4. | BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES - None | 3 |
| 5. | CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS | 3 |
| 5.1 | Porters Lake Watershed Servicing Study Report..... | 3 |
| 5.2 | Tantallon Watershed Servicing Study Report | 4 |
| 5.3 | Model Community Plan Environmental Section | 5 |
| 6. | CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS - None..... | 6 |
| 7. | REPORTS/DISCUSSION | 6 |
| 7.1 | Preston Area & Sandy Lake Watershed Studies – Interim Report..... | 6 |
| 7.2 | Musquodobit Harbour Watershed Studies | 9 |
| 8. | ADDED ITEMS | 9 |
| 8.1 | RWAB Mandate & Terms of Reference | 9 |
| 9. | DATE OF NEXT MEETING – April 9, 2014 | 9 |
| 10. | ADJOURNMENT | 9 |

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. in the Helen Creighton Room, Alderney Public Library, 60 Alderney Drive, Dartmouth.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES - February 12, 2014

The following changes to the minutes were noted: an error in Dr. Soudek's name and a grammatical error on page 6.

MOVED by Mr. Regan, seconded by Mr. Fancy that the minutes of February 12, 2014 be approved as amended. MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

3. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF BUSINESS AND APPROVAL OF ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

Addition:

8.1 RWAB Mandate & Terms of Reference

The Chair requested the addition of an email received from the Clerk's office regarding the Board's Mandate and Terms of Reference.

The agenda was accepted as amended.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES - None

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS

5.1 Porters Lake Watershed Servicing Study Report

The Chair asked Mr. Lund and Mr. Clement to provide the Board with an update on the recommendations and rationale that had been drafted in preparation for this month's meeting, and circulated by email to the Board. Mr. Lund reviewed the recommendations that have been made.

The Board discussed the wording and the reasoning. Mr. McLean asked for an explanation on the term "no net impact". Mr. Clement responded that this goes back to the mandate of the Regional Plan which states that there should be no change in the trophic status of the water bodies. Other minor clarifications were brought forth and the following motion was put:

MOVED by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Hattin, that:

- 1. The Regional Watersheds Advisory Board recommends to the Harbour East-Marine Drive Community Council, that the Porters Lake Watershed Servicing**

Study Report be accepted as background for future community planning, respecting all aspects of the CBCL report.

2. The Regional Watersheds Advisory Board further recommends that:

- a) HRM adhere to the best management practices specified in the report regarding wastewater and stormwater management, in order to ensure that there is minimal impact on receiving surface waters during and post development.**
- b) Discharges from all constructed wastewater treatment plants and stormwater management systems be routinely sampled and tested to ensure no net impact to receiving waters.**
- c) Porters Lake development district represents an excellent example of an area that should be considered as a Wastewater Management District(s) as per Policy CU-20 in the Regional Plan (2006).**
- d) HRM start to develop a plan for regular maintenance of on-site septic systems, to include a schedule for mandatory septic tank pump-outs.**
- e) HRM re-instate the Surface Water Monitoring Program, to include vertical profile sampling/testing of lakes, stream gauging and contaminant loading calculations.**
- f) Floodplain mapping in areas of high risk should be conducted in light of Climate Change.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

5.2 Tantallon Watershed Servicing Study Report

Similar to the Porters Lake Watershed Servicing Study, the Board discussed the recommendations and rationale that had been drafted in preparation for the meeting and circulated by email to the Board. The Board made some minor clarifications to the drafted recommendations.

Mr. Hattin expressed that he felt the report was not complete. He noted specific areas of the watershed that were not covered in the study, in particular the Brine Lake area. He indicated that development could occur in an area of the watershed that hasn't been studied. Mr. Lund indicated that these particular watershed studies were commissioned to look only at the growth centres with HRM as defined within the 2006 Regional Plan. Ms. Maureen Ryan confirmed that the RFP was based on the growth centres defined in the 2006 Regional Plan. Mr. Mills indicated that the Porters Lake Watershed Study also lacked completeness. The Board briefly discussed the geography covered in the studies and the following motion was put:

MOVED by Mr. Lund, seconded by Mr. Clement, that:

- 1. The Regional Watersheds Advisory Board recommends to the North West Community Council, that the Tantallon Watershed Servicing Study Report be accepted as background for future community planning, respecting all aspects of the CBCL report.**
- 2. The Regional Watersheds Advisory Board further recommends that:**
 - a) HRM adhere to the best management practices specified in the report regarding wastewater and stormwater management, in order to ensure that there is minimal impact on receiving surface waters during and post development.**
 - b) Discharges from all constructed wastewater treatment plants and stormwater management systems be routinely sampled and tested to ensure no net impact to receiving waters.**
 - c) Tantallon development district represents an excellent example of an area that should be considered as a Wastewater Management District(s) as per Policy CU-20 in the Regional Plan (2006).**
 - d) HRM start to develop a plan for regular maintenance of on-site septic systems, to include a schedule for mandatory septic tank pump-outs.**
 - e) HRM re-instate the Surface Water Monitoring Program, to include vertical profile sampling/testing of lakes, stream gauging and contaminant loading calculations.**
 - f) Floodplain mapping in areas of high risk should be conducted in light of Climate Change.**
 - g) Homes near and on Hubley Mill Lake Road, Flat Lake Road, Stillwater Lake Road and Lane, Cambridge Court and Ensley Road be revisited for testing for the same items for which they were originally tested.**

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

5.3 Model Community Plan Environmental Section

A document titled "Boilerplate Environmental Sections for Community Plans" by Genivar was before the Board.

Mr. Lund asked for clarification on the role of the Board with regards to the document. The Chair indicated that the Board is being asked by HRM staff to comment on the

document. Mr. Lund noted that he has a number of comments on the document that he wishes to discuss. Mr. Clement asked if there is a set process on how the Board should approach the document. He felt that there should be time added to the meeting and that staff would lead them through a review process. He added that he was under the impression that this process would take more than one meeting.

Ms. Miedema indicated that Mr. Richard MacLellan, Manager, Energy and Environment, delegated this item to her. She provided the Board with some guidance and agreed that this item would be discussed at a number of meetings over several months. Mr. Clement noted that the Board would require some leadership on this item. Ms. Miedema asked the Board what level of input they want to provide and suggested various approaches. Mr. Mills asked for clarification on the purpose of the document. Ms. Miedema clarified that the document is the starting point to come up with a boilerplate for the environmental section of all community plans. Mr. Regan commented that he believes the document is great. He suggested that perhaps the Board review one section of the document per month.

Mr. Deacoff provided the Board with the origin of the document. He indicated that there are approximately 20 community plans across the municipality. He noted that some of the plans include an environmental section and some do not. The primary focus of the document is to ensure environmental issues are covered in community plans and that they are consistent. The community plans would be added to or updated to accommodate the changes to the environmental sections. He indicated that the original timeline for the completion of the document was June 2014 and noted that perhaps this date may be premature. The Board entered into discussion and staff responded to questions.

The Chair suggested that this item be put on the agenda for next month's meeting and requested that Mr. MacLellan perhaps attend to discuss the scheduling for working through the document. Mr. Lund and Mr. Fancy agreed with Mr. Regan's suggestion to review specific sections of the document over a number of months. Ms. Miedema indicated that she will establish a plan for reviewing the document. Mr. Clement expressed that he would like to have a better understanding of the document. He indicated that the task is not clearly explained. The Chair asked that staff provide the Board with a rationale and context for the document, as well as a review process prior to next month's meeting.

6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS - None

7. REPORTS/DISCUSSION

7.1 Preston Area & Sandy Lake Watershed Studies – Interim Report

An information report dated February 6, 2014 was before the Board.

Mr. Deacoff provided the Board with a brief introduction to the studies being presented. He indicated that the studies are currently underway and they are being presented to the Board so that they may comment on the studies before they are completed. Mr. Russell Dmytriw, Senior Project Manager, AECOM, introduced himself to the Board and noted that for timing purposes he would present both studies concurrently. He added that they approached the Sandy Lake and Preston Area watershed studies using the same process and he would focus on the interim results of the report for this presentation.

Mr. Dmytriw indicated that the purpose of the watershed studies were to take a holistic look at the watershed to help manage the impacts that might be associated with future development and land use changes. He indicated that the study would evaluate mitigation options for protection of the watershed. He noted the origin of the watershed studies and presented the location of the watersheds and some of the bodies of water that make up the watershed. He presented the wilderness areas, game sanctuaries and areas that are protected from development. He also noted the locations within the study areas that would eventually be serviced and developed, as well as AECOM's sampling locations.

Mr. Dmytriw provided an overview of the watershed studies objectives as per the 2006 HRM Regional Plan Policy E-17. He indicated that the studies will establish the carrying capacity of both watersheds. He clarified that the carrying capacity is a measure of the watershed's resilience to development. He added that it's an assessment of the watershed to meet water quality objectives over the longer term. The objectives of Policy E-17 include:

- Identify surface and groundwater quality issues.
- Recommend water quality objectives (WQOs).
- Recommend areas suitable and not suitable for development.
- Make recommendations to protect and manage quality and quantity (both surface and groundwater).
- Recommend management strategies to achieve WQOs.
- Recommend monitoring plan to determine if water quality objective are being met.

Mr. Fancy excused himself from the meeting at this time.

Public Outreach activities were presented for both the Preston and Sandy Lake areas. Mr. Dmytriw continued his presentation and described the methodology used for data compilation and analysis. He noted that they reviewed data that is currently available and have added their own data from field sampling. He outlined the water quality indicator parameters, noting that they are the parameters that would most likely be impacted from future land use changes. These measures include:

- Total Phosphorus
- Nitrate
- Total Suspended Solids
- Chloride
- *E.coli* bacteria

Mr. Dmytriw presented various graphs and charts outlining trends in the watersheds, as well as current water quality within the watershed. Mr. Hattin asked if one of the sampling locations within Sandy Lake was in front of the beach. Mr. Dmytriw indicated that establishing if the water was suitable for bathing was not within their scope. Mr. Deacoff confirmed that sampling at the beach would be covered under the program that measures water quality at the HRM beaches and not within this particular study. Mr. Dmytriw described the standards used for the purposes of the studies. He indicated that the CCME Fresh Water and Aquatic Life Standards are being used. He noted that the numerical objectives for the lakes are set up to do better than the regional standard.

He then presented the Preston groundwater evaluation and noted that bacteria and well yield are issues for dug wells in the area. He added that arsenic is an issue for drilled wells in the area. This is attributed to the Goldenville rock group. Mr. Dmytriw then presented the next steps for the studies and indicated that AECOM would return to the Board with the Draft Final Report for further comment. He concluded his presentation and the Board entered into discussion.

Mr. Regan asked Mr. Dmytriw if AECOM has studied floodplains in the watersheds. Mr. Dmytriw responded that they hadn't looked at the floodplains within the studies. Mr. Regan then asked if the studies would include a stormwater management model, similar the Shubenacadie watershed study. Mr. Dmytriw indicated that the Sandy Lake and Preston watershed studies would not include the stormwater management plan because Sandy Lake would be more responsive to the Lakeshore capacity model. Preston would not see the same type of development, nor would it see the same level of development, therefore the stormwater management model would not be applicable.

Mr. Lund asked if there were any areas within Preston that were designated rural growth centres. Mr. Deacoff indicated that all of the areas are rural commuter local within the 2006 HRM Regional Plan. Mr. Mills expressed concern that the Mineville area is not included in the Preston watershed study. Mr. Deacoff noted that the capacity of the study does not include Mineville.

Mr. Regan expressed concern that the watersheds are not being addressed individually. Mr. Deacoff asked for clarification on Mr. Regan's comment. He asked if Mr. Regan is suggesting that all secondary watersheds be addressed on an individual level. Mr. Deacoff advised that this would greatly expand the size of the study area.

Mr. Lund advised that any development within the areas be cognisant of blasting. This is due to not only arsenic levels, but also to aluminum levels. Blasting would cause

residual impacts through a blast halo effect. Mr. Lund also indicated that the water treatment plant in the Sandy Lake area has been of concern to him. He indicated the sampling should be done further downstream.

The Chair concluded the discussion and thanked Mr. Dmytriw. He indicated that the Board is looking forward to seeing the Draft Final Report. The Chair suggested that members review the documents by AECOM posted to the HRM website.

7.2 Musquodobit Harbour Watershed Studies

A report dated February 24, 2014 was before the Board.

The Chair noted that the Consultant involved with these studies would not be available until the April 9th Board meeting. He indicated that by tabling the item one month early, members of the Board would have time to review the information provided.

**MOVED by Mr. Regan, seconded by Mr. Lund that Item 7.2 – Musquodobit Watershed Studies be deferred until the April 9th, 2014 RWAB meeting.
MOTION PUT AND PASSED.**

8. ADDED ITEMS

8.1 RWAB Mandate & Terms of Reference

The Chair indicated that the Environment and Sustainability Standing Committee (ESSC) has responded to the Board's motion that the ESSC review RWAB's mandate and Terms of Reference. The Chair noted that the ESSC would not be making changes to RWAB's mandate and Terms of Reference at this time. The Chair expressed disappointment, however he indicated that maintaining good working relationship with staff and members of the ESSC would allow RWAB to provide earlier input on studies.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – April 9, 2014

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

Jane Crosby
Legislative Support