



**REGIONAL WATERSHEDS ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 12, 2014**

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

REGRETS: Mr. Richard Hattin, Vice-Chair
Dr. Dusan Soudek

STAFF: Mr. Cameron Deacoff, Environmental Performance Officer
Mr. Peter Duncan, Manager, Infrastructure
Mr. Paul Morgan, Senior Planner
Ms. Katie Neale, Planning Intern
Ms. Jane Crosby, Legislative Support

The following does not represent a verbatim record of the proceedings of this meeting.

*The agenda, supporting documents, and information items circulated to the Board are available online:
<http://www.halifax.ca/boardscom/rwab/141211rwab-agenda.php>*

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 p.m., and the Board adjourned at 7:12 p.m.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. in the Helen Creighton Room, 2nd floor, Alderney Public Library, 60 Alderney Drive, Dartmouth.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 8, 2014

MOVED by Mr. Regan, seconded by Mr. Lund, that the Regional Watersheds Advisory Board minutes of October 8, 2014, be approved as presented.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

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

Mr. Mills indicated that he has reviewed the Sandy Lake Conversation Association's response to RWAB's recommendation regarding the Sandy Lake study. He commented that their response to the study was very thorough and highlighted some critical detail. He added that they were more specific in their response. Mr. Mills suggested that the Sandy Lake Conservation Association's response be circulated amongst Board members as an information item.

MOVED by Mr. Regan, seconded by Mr. Lund that the agenda be approved as amended.

MOTION PUT AND PASSED.

4. BUSINESS ARISING OUT OF THE MINUTES

Mr. Lund inquired about the Board's method for reviewing that work they've completed on the Model Community Plan Environmental Section. He suggested that perhaps they do it in sections. The Board entered into discussion and following advice from staff it was decided that they would review the work once it is completed.

5. CONSIDERATION OF DEFERRED BUSINESS – NONE

6. CORRESPONDENCE, PETITIONS & DELEGATIONS - NONE

7. REPORTS/DISCUSSION

7.1 Model Community Plan Environmental Section – Salt marshes, Lake & Stream Protection, Coastal Lands/Shoreline/Waterfront

Salt Marshes: Policies E-77, P-30 and E-78

Policy E-77

The Board briefly discussed the comments filed under “Regional Plan (2014) Comment”. Mr. Deacoff indicated that this comment is simply to provide context to the policy statement. He added that the Board is to provide commentary on the policy statement.

Mr. Lund inquired about whether this also relates to wetlands. Mr. Deacoff indicated that this relates to salt marshes. The Board then entered into discussion on the definition of salt marshes. The Chair inquired about what jurisdiction salt marshes would fall under. Mr. McLean commented on water levels as they relate to salt marshes.

Mr. Morgan provided the Board with a statement from the Regional Plan noting that the operation of wetlands falls under provincial jurisdiction. He added that this would include coastal wetlands (salt marshes) as well. He noted the prohibition on development except for roads.

The Board agreed that they support the policy statement; however they do not support some of the wording in the comment section. Mr. Regan noted that he is not pleased with the term “suitable development”.

Walter comments on having suitable development removed. The Board briefly discussed the policy statement and whether the city would approach the Department of Environment or the Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Regan and Mr. Clement suggested that perhaps the statement be changed to say “provincial government”. The Board agreed.

Policy P-30

Mr. Clement commented that the term “seriously consider” be removed. The Board agreed.

Mr. Regan commented on the Regional Plan Comment. He expressed that HRM is losing the opportunity to acquire public open space because Parks and Recreation doesn’t want to maintain long linear strips of land.

Mr. Lund asked if the 20m buffer also applies to salt marshes and wetlands. Mr. Morgan confirmed that they do.

Policy E-78

The Board agreed that the policy statement be changed to:

“It shall be the intention of Council to encourage the necessary scientific studies to identify any coastal wetlands requiring specific protection, and to amend this strategy to establish and apply conservation zoning in such areas.”

Lake and Stream Protection: Policies E-87 to E-96

Policy E-87

The Chair initiated discussion on E-87 commented on the water quality monitoring program that is mentioned in the policy statement. Mr. Deacoff provided the Board with some background information. He explained that there is currently no water quality monitoring program as defined in the Regional Plan. He added that protocols are currently being developed to be applied to the whole region and they are currently in draft form. It is not yet available, but Mr. Deacoff explained that it should be available soon.

Mr. Clement asked is this policy would be adapted for a general HRM view. Mr. Deacoff responded that it would. Mr. Regan expressed concern regarding the water quality functional plan that was initiated by HRM but not acted upon. He added that there should be more testing done. Mr. Deacoff explained that the current Regional Plan does not consider such a document.

Mr. Clement and Mr. Mills noted that the language in the policy statement is wrong and it should be re-worked. Mr. Clement commented that the policy statement doesn't mention change in trophic status during development. He expressed that it should be included. He added that the Municipality should be responsible for water quality monitoring during development and bill the developer for that work.

Mr. Morgan explained that some of the policies from Bedford West came from Morris and Russell Lake. He indicated that in the Regional Plan it will state that trophic status will be maintained where possible. He also added that these policies were written before the 2006 Regional Plan. He noted that there has been some refinement.

The Chair asked the Board what they are looking to change in the policy statement. Several Board members commented on a report from Stantec. Mr. Deacoff provided clarification on the reports from Stantec, noting that two reports have been provided. Mr. Mills commented that one of the reports set out parameters for testing and should be used by the Municipality. Mr. Lund and Mr. Regan commented that the recommendations from the 2006 Stantec report should be implemented as a functional plan.

The Board would also like to see the CCME guidelines changed to Water Quality Monitoring.

Policy E-88

The Board concluded that this could be removed as it is specific to location.

Policy E-89

The Board concluded that they agree with this policy but it needs to be made more regional to represent all of HRM.

Policy E-90

Mr. Regan commented on watershed plans. He indicated that planning should encompass and consider the entire watershed. The Board recommends that HRM implement watershed planning. Mr. Clement suggested that this recommendation be mentioned in Policy E-87. The Board agreed.

Policy E-91

It was noted that this particular policy discusses slopes. In a previous RWAB meeting, slopes were discussed and it was recommended that a tiered approach be taken with regards to development on slopes. These recommendations should be referenced in this policy. Buffers were also discussed; however Mr. Regan commented that a 30 metre buffer should be used in public ownership.

Mr. Morgan commented that this policy had been written for Morris and Russell Lake. He explained the history of the policy and why there is so much detail on buffers. Mr. McLean noted that section A in the policy statement should also indicate that control measures are implemented and maintained. Mr. Lund commented that he supported the detail on the vegetation in the buffer zone. The Board agreed that they supported the policy with their comments and suggestions incorporated.

Policy E-92

The Board concluded that they agree with this policy but it needs to be made more regional to represent all of HRM.

Policy E-93

It was noted that this particular policy was written for Imperial Oil. Mr. Regan suggested that gauging the water flow be included in this policy. The Board agreed with Mr. Regan's suggestion.

Policy E-94

The Board agreed that this policy should be kept but noted that it is very specific to location.

Mr. Fancy left the meeting at 6:40pm.

Policy E-95

The Board agreed that they supported this statement, however it was suggested that the term "recreational" be removed

Policy E-96

The Board agreed that they support this policy and commented that it should be the first policy in the section.

Coastal Lands/Shoreline/Waterfront: Policies E-97 to E-103

Policy E-97

The Board agreed that they support this policy.

Policy E-98

The Board voiced support for this policy.

Policy E-99

The Board agreed that this policy is redundant.

Policy E-100

The Board agreed that the Regional Plan Comment from Policy E-99 could be carried to Policy E-100. The Board voiced support for this policy.

Policy E-101

The Board agreed that this policy is no longer applicable.

Policy E-102

Mr. Deacoff provided the Board with some context to this policy statement and indicated that it is site specific. Several members felt it could be removed, however other members felt it should be left because it would still be important for that particular site (Map-4). Mr. Clement asked if that particular location is a conservation area. Mr. Deacoff responded that he believes it is. Mr. Clement then suggested that rather than the policy being specific to this particular site, they could have it apply to conservation areas. The Board agreed.

Policy E-103

Mr. Morgan provided the Board with some context around this policy. Mr. Regan indicated that there should be a buffer. Mr. Morgan explained why buffers are not present on operating harbours. The Board voiced support for this policy.

8. ADDED ITEMS - None

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – December 10, 2014

10. ADJOURNMENT

The Meeting adjourned at 7:12pm.

Jane Crosby
Legislative Support

INFORMATION ITEMS
None
