

MUNICIPALITY OF THE DISTRICT OF LUNENBURG
Minutes of a Meeting
SHERBROOKE LAKE COMMITTEE
Held at the Parkdale/Maplewood Community Hall
Thursday January 14, 2016

ATTENDANCE: Larry Hagell Committee Member, Chair
Jack Wentzell Committee Member, Vice Chair
John Budden Committee Member
Murray Coolican Committee Member
Lennis Corkum Committee Member
Douglas Moore Committee Member
Allan Veinot Committee Member
Rex Veinot Committee Member
Mark Wentzell Committee Member

STAFF: Trudy Payne, Director of Recreation
Chasidy Veinotte-Dorey, Administrative Support
Alex Dumaresq, Deputy CAO

REGRETS: Garth Bangay Committee Member

MODL- Municipality of the District of Lunenburg
MODC- Municipality of the District of Chester

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Larry Hagell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Larry asked all committee members and staff to introduce themselves for any new members in the audience.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The following items were added to the Agenda:

- Letter from the Mayor of MODL to property owner
- Email correspondence to Trudy re meeting times
- Update from Trudy on grant from the province
- Item 10 to be moved up to item 9

Moved by Murray Coolican, seconded by Mark Wentzell that the agenda be approved as amended. Carried.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Jack Wentzell, seconded by Mark Wentzell, that the Minutes of the December 10, 2015 Sherbrooke Lake Access Advisory Committee be approved. Carried.

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There is no Business Arising From The Minutes at this time.

5. UPDATE ON MEETING HELD WITH KINGS COUNTY PLANNING RE: WATER MONITORING PROGRAM

Trudy- A large part of the agenda package this evening focuses on this discussion. Chair Larry Haggell and myself met with Mark Fredericks in December to discuss the Kings County Lake Monitoring Program. While members of the program had hoped to come and meet with the whole committee, timing did not allow them to do so. (Trudy read through pages 1 and 2 in the agenda package) Purpose of this meeting was to find out more information, such as best practises; this is considered to be a best practise. They would be prepared to share other information with us if we would like to have it.

John- Very impressed with the quality of work they are doing. What is MODL doing at the moment as far as water monitoring goes?

Deputy CAO Alex Dumaresq- We provide financial support to the Bluenose Coastal Action Foundation.

Murray- I am quite impressed with what they're doing. One of the reasons why I think this is important is that a number of cottage owners and others have expressed concerns about the impact over this and one thing that is evident is it's not just public access that creates an environmental impact but its cottage owners to. I hope that we can do work as a committee and if we recognize that there are concerns about water quality; given the boundaries of Sherbrooke Lake, that this really needs to be something done cooperatively with MODL and MODC. It's not enough to just do it on one side. The other thing is that there are a number of homeowner's around the lake that are making contributions to the water quality research but this should not replace it.

Larry- Unlike some other Municipalities, the Kings County model was based on capacity. They looked at what a lake can sustain and manage. It puts steps in place to enhance the building process so it's not an open ticket.

6. CORRESPONDENCE TO MODL COUNCIL

Petition to Sherbrooke Lake Access Advisory Committee from Greg Stokes

Larry- This part of the agenda package is an information item only. We wanted to bring it forth to let the committee know that this item did go through to Council and has been received.

John- When this letter goes to Council, how do we know as a committee that they did anything with it?

Trudy- Our job right now is to provide as much information as possible. We will be including this as an appendix in our final report. We are at an information stage right now as this is part of that information.

Email to Trudy Regarding Times and Dates of our meetings

Trudy- I received a couple emails from property owners and residents with some concerns with our meetings dates and that we might want to think about having our meetings in May rather than February and March. The suggestion was also made to have meetings on Saturdays to make it easier for the public to attend. I did speak with one of the persons today that has sent an email and they was very adamant that we should not be progressing with the survey now and that we should wait until May. I explained the process we are taken to make sure everyone is informed. The committee has made the decision to send a direct mail letter to every property owner around the lake and flyers in the mail to residents in both MODL and MODC so that everyone is aware. Public notices will also appear in the paper, on our website and in the community. I also have an ongoing email list of those who asked that I stay in touch with to forward along any issues that arise, and I will be emailing them as well. This will also include the road associations. We understand that not all owners live year-round, so we are taken every effort to make it as inclusive as possible.

Larry- If we feel our Thursday night meetings are not doable for most of the public, we can look at other days.

John- The concern maybe more so the time of year that all this is happening and that a lot of cottage owners are not here. I don't know if we could accommodate this with the work plan we have set out.

Lennis- We are a committee operating under the umbrella of MODL. As a committee we have set out a timeframe and a work plan. We have picked a suitable night that seems to be acceptable for our committee. If we get into a situation where we are changing dates due to a few emails we are getting into a bad situation. I think we should stand by our time commitment, work plan and meetings dates.

Murray- One of the important things will be the surveys and the public meetings around the surveys. I think we need to make sure that everybody around the lake both permanent and seasonal residents are reached through the survey.

Trudy- People are encouraged to send me their emails and to pass the survey along. Anyone here tonight that would like to be included in the email list, please sign the paper on your way out this evening. We will include you in the whole process as much as we can.

Larry- Residents will receive a one-page flyer with information directing them to how they can access the survey among other things. We as a committee have tried to go above and beyond with all the residents and property owners to make sure everyone is aware of where we are at with the survey.

Letter re Mayor

Alex Dumerasq, Deputy CAO of MODL made the following statement with regards to this item:

The committee and council has received a couple of pieces of correspondence about the mandate of the committee and scope of the survey. It boils down to a single issue; why is the committee looking at what type of access instead of first asking the questions should there be public access to Sherbrooke Lake. Council has made this decision already. It is the prerogative of council and set in their priorities. They established this committee to help determine what type of access this will be. Their decision was based on what they have heard from residents and is also based on some of the strategies and policy work that the Municipality has been doing for a number of years. We have our Open Space Strategic Plan which dates back to 2002 and was updated in 2009. The development of that plan included some information on the types of access in particular coastal and water sites. In 2009, when the plan was revised, Sherbrooke Lake was determined to be a top priority. Council has recently moved it into the overall priorities list. This is what essentially birthed this committee. Council has listened but hasn't changed course in terms of when they have received questions or concerns about having already decided they would like to see access developed. They have gone through their process and I just wanted to make sure that this message was clear to this committee and this is the explanation.

Grant from the Province

Trudy- We have been approved for up to a \$12,000 grant from the province to help with the public consultation process. \$2000 of this has been earmarked to help gather information of history and knowledge around the lake. I have also reported to Chester who has approved \$5000. This is great news for MODL as it helps to decrease our cost.

7. UPDATE FROM HISTORY/KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAKE SUB-COMMITTEE

Trudy- Trudy read the update to the committee as attached in the agenda package. We did talk about this being a big piece of work and while it is not directly related to public access, it still is important document to have. We could continually add to this document.

John- Very important that we create as much awareness of lake as possible and by doing this exercise it has turned out to be a very interesting project.

Murray- Table of contents question; where would one find issues around the settlements of communities around the lake before there were cottages on the lake? The settlement of the lake - is that just cottages or the communities of Maplewood.

John- Communities as a whole. The communities' names have changed overtime.

Jack- School section divided it up and the school sections was the reasons why they did so.

Murray- It might be interesting if the person we find has some skills with computers, websites and social media. My head is going towards a book publication. It would make more sense to do today to make something that is accessible through the internet. People could add onto this and access it.

John- That was the idea. To have an ongoing piece of material and can be added to as time goes on.

Jack- So many times history gets lost in the shuffle. History does get lost no matter what. It would be nice to know some of these things.

Trudy- Confirmed there was consensus by the committee to proceed with the suggestions put forth by the sub-committee.

8. PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS UPDATE

Trudy- I had a brief conversation with the firm doing the survey today. We are hoping to launch the survey the week of January 25th and this will go for 5 weeks, till the end of February. We're in the middle of firming up the locations to hold the public meetings. We have 2 confirmed locations and are hoping to finalize tomorrow or Monday then we can start sending the direct mail out. We can then proceed to send an email out Monday to all emails I have to let them know information will be coming out and to stay tuned for the website.

Larry- The goal is to try and get information out to everyone. People who are in the communities, live at lake and those who are gone back to their primary resident. We are doing our best to get this information out to everybody while being independent as well.

Trudy- Councillor for the New Ross area, Tina Connors from MODC is here tonight and has also been getting information out. MODC had something in their newsletter. We are trying to work with Chester and use their venues to promote as well.

Larry- Lots of work that went into the questions on the survey and we can all agree it's been well debated. This will be going to council tomorrow.

Murray- What locations are the public open houses at?

Trudy- We are looking at 3 locations. Parkdale Maplewood Community Hall has been confirmed. The New Ross School has been confirmed. We are also looking at having one in Halifax. If you can't make public meetings you can email as well.

Larry- Once date has been set for this, we will distribute posters within the communities and online.

Trudy- General information will be going out to everyone we can get this to and we will try to be consistent with the information we put out there.

John- I would also be available to donate time to help with this.

9. PUBLIC INPUT (15 MINUTES)

Larry- Tonight's public input will not be a repeat of the input at New Ross. I did my best at that meeting to let as many people as possible speak and it got out of hand. I will do my best tonight to allow everyone the opportunity to speak but I ask when someone is speaking to kindly refrain from making comments during that conversation. I would just like to reiterate that we are not here tonight to debate across the floor. Everyone who wants to have the opportunity tonight to speak will get the chance and I hope you feel comfortable to do so. And I thank you for your cooperation in doing so.

Ron Seney

The first brief presentation I have, at the request of Garth Bangay, he was looking for information and statistics on things. Carroll Randall, past president of the Salmon Association had Garth get in touch with us for these statistics. I would like to file a report of the last project we had with regards to Sherbrooke Lake and since Garth is not here, if I could leave it with yourself Trudy.

Secondly, I am an affiliate director with Nova Scotia Federation of Anglers and Hunters. I was at the December meeting and was appalled at the disrespect for this committee and its process. And also I am concerned about the lack of knowledge that was being said about the laws of this province. I bring a letter tonight addressed to the chair which I will read here tonight from the President of the Association:

It was recently brought to our attention, again, an attempt of sorts to limit public access to Sherbrooke Lake, found within the Municipality of the District of Lunenburg, by landowners from the immediate area, most notably those who own seasonal homes surrounding the lake. As a reminder, residents of the province, whether landowners surrounding the lake or not, have the right to go on foot along the banks of any river, stream or lake and upon and across any uncultivated lands and Crown lands to lawfully fish with rod and line in these rivers, streams or lakes; residents also have the right to use a boat or canoe on or across any river, stream or lake. With that in mind, the Nova Scotia Federation of Anglers & Hunters wholly supports the combined initiative of the Municipality of the District of Lunenburg & the Municipality of the District of Chester's committee to provide suitable public access onto Sherbrooke Lake for public, recreational use. Sherbrooke Lake is not a "private lake", as some would like to believe, yet the ownership of "watercourses" in the Province of Nova Scotia rests in the Provincial Crown.

By definition, "watercourse" means the bed and shore of every river, stream, lake, creek, pond, spring, lagoon or other natural body of water, and the water therein, within the jurisdiction of the Province, whether it contains water or not.

The Nova Scotia Federation of Anglers and Hunters was founded in 1930 by concerned sportsmen who wanted to establish a unified, single, strong provincial voice to speak for hunters and anglers to government on matters of wildlife conservation. This role was recognized by the Government of Nova Scotia when they passed Chapter 148 of the Acts of 1930, the act creating the Federation.

The Federation has been that voice since 1930 and, currently supported by our 34 affiliated clubs across the province with an estimated 5,100 members and supporters, it continues to work to ensure the message of hunters and anglers is heard at all levels of government. We have been able, with the help of our partners in government, to make significant positive changes in the province for sports people and the resource and, through legislation protected our heritage activities.

We must all work together to ensure future generations enjoy the right to Fish, Hunt, Trap or otherwise enjoy the wildlife resources of Nova Scotia

Frank Gibson- Boat Cove

My family owns a cottage property about 500 meters from the beach that's being looked at for access by what's known as the extension of Veinotte Road. There

are 13 cottages that go around Boat Cove. I am the chair of the association. I understand that MODL is committed to public access. The issue is the nature of the access and the place. I am sure that there is not many in our group that would oppose fisherman having access to our shore. I have heard various things regarding the nature of the access being considered. Where there would be a path to; options go from there to a full road right to the beach, boat ramp, campground and trails through the woods for walking. Those trails if they were put in would bring people within 5 or 6 meters of cottage owners. One of our concerns is security. If there is a campground, the road to the lake has to be open 24 hours. How would we be assured of the safety of our properties? Several years ago 6 or 7 of our cottages were vandalized. This is one of the concerns. Our little Boat Cove has a marsh at the end. Two families of ducks live there. It is a wet land and loons go in and out of there. Beavers harvest birch within our cove. Another concern, not just quality of water, but the whole environment. We look out to the deep cove where the trout are. We have 2 species of evasive fish, chained pickerel and small mouth bass; motor boats will bring in other species of fish. This is another issue. Point I'm trying to get to is that when you survey the owners around the lake, what the questions will be and what will be the information provided to them. Ask folks whether they are in favor of access or not but also the forms of access and the science behind it. This way the people responding can make an informed decision. If I am going to vote on access I want to know what I am voting for. Shocked to hear that the survey is going out so quickly. Don't know how it's possible that people can really look and see what their voting for.

Ron Francis- Highland Road

My question is similar as the gentleman who spoke before me as he has summed up a lot of my concerns. Will the survey include cost of land purchases, mile of road to put in, parking areas, boat launches or are we talking about a trail and path. In order to vote will this be spelt out in the survey? Another option that could be in the survey is user pays an option. I pay \$450 a year to help maintain our road. Does it seem fair to make cottage owners go up? Yes, I agree it's a public lake but the road itself cost a ton of money. Maybe those who want this should pay for it. Is this on the questionnaire?

Trudy- At this point in time, there is not a question around the cost. One of the things in the request for proposal is that they are to come up with 4 concept plans and approximate prices. This way council has some information. Cost is not on the survey as the responsibility of the consultant is to come up with 4 concept plans with estimated cost for council to consider moving forward.

Ron- When I fill out my survey I will not have any idea of cost. Any contractor that builds roads can give you a cost. Let's do this right and put the cost there. What is the rush? Let's do it right. Next question I have, if you get a high percentage of negative responses from people who do not want it, are you going to throw in the towel or say council gave us a mandate? Any council meeting I

went to, they were told we had meetings around here for years and everyone wanted public access. When I personally went over minutes of meetings this was missed information. Council has put us in this situation. This is our chance to do it right but not saying I'm against it but let's go forward with all the information we can be given.

Hugh Harper- Sherbrooke Forest

I'm confused on logistics of emails. I am going to go ahead and tell my association that you are looking at a January 25th launch with more information to come but are they going to get the information from the list I provided you?

Trudy- I am hoping either tomorrow or Monday to send out an email with more information and this will include dates and when things happen. Direct mail that goes to everyone will have firm information on it.

Hugh- Emails are a huge thing because people may not get mail. How do you know you have emails of everyone?

Larry- Based on geography of lake and our contacts, we feel confident we have everyone.

Joselyn Wentzell- Boat Cove Road

Back to December's meeting, when Dr Barry Clarke stood up and did his presentation, he had mentioned the south end of lake not having an outlet and that the south end is going to have some problems as time goes on as more people are on the lake. This is where you're going to get algae problems and that all the stuff that goes to the south end of the lake may sit there; there is no turnover on that end. I would like to put forward that any access that is looked at be looked at away from the south end of lake. Unless MODL is going to take on any cleanup efforts that make take place.

Second thing I would like to mention is about the survey. Larry has said lots of things have been done to reach out to everyone and Don Downe letter is saying MODL and MODC informing everyone. Why isn't this letter going out with the survey? This survey that everyone is getting; is the consensus that everyone in the whole wide world going to be able to fill this out? Does everyone have equal say as to what it is no matter where they live or what they do?

Trudy- The direct letter will be going to those that live around lake and the reason for this is that this may not be there full time residence so no matter where they live, they will get the information. If mail is not redirected, we are making extra effort to email folks. For full time residents that live in MODL and MODC, they will not have it addressed to them personally, but will inform them of where they can go fill out surveys. This is a web based survey, so yes if you live in New Brunswick, you could still

fill it out, but there will be questions around where the primary residence or secondary residence is located. This will separate those from who are who. Then they can say this is what the residents of MODC and MODL want and can separate the two. The reason for the web based survey came about from talking about several different factors; mail and phone, those who are not physically here but still would like to be involved and so forth. If some people do not have access to the internet, there will be other options. Such as fax, mail, or by phone.

10. NEXT MEETING DATE

Thursday, February 18th, 2016 at 6:30 pm – New Ross Fire Hall

11. IN CAMERA ITEM AS PER THE MGA 22 (2) (c) – LAND NEGOTIATIONS

Moved by Murray Coolican, seconded by John Budden that the Committee go In Camera In Committee. Carried.

The purpose of the In Camera meeting was to deal with Land Negotiations, in accordance with section 22 (2) (a) of the Municipal Government Act.

Moved by Mark Wentzell, seconded by Lennis Corkum that the Committee return to open session. Carried.

12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss at 9:10 p.m., it was moved by Jack Wentzell, seconded by Allan Veinot that the meeting be adjourned. Carried.