

MUNICIPALITY OF THE DISTRICT OF LUNENBURG
Meeting of the
SHERBROOKE LAKE COMMITTEE
Held in the Parkdale Maplewood Community Hall
Thursday October 8, 2015

ATTENDANCE:

Murray Coolican	Committee Member
Lennis Corkum	Committee Member
John Budden	Committee Member
Larry Hagell	Committee Member
Allan Veinot	Committee Member
Jack Wentzell	Committee Member
Douglas Moore	Committee Member
Garth Bangay	Committee Member
Mark Wentzell	Committee Member

STAFF:

Trudy Payne, Director of Recreation
Chasidy Veinotte-Dorey, Administrative Assistant
Kevin Malloy, CAO

REGRETS:

Rex Veinot Committee Member

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Larry Hagell called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Garth Bangay, seconded by Jack Wentzell that the agenda be approved as circulated. Carried.

3. COMMITTEE PROCESS- OVERVIEW BY CAO KEVIN MALLOY

CAO Kevin Malloy began by stating that he is a cottage owner on Mushamush; very close to the Municipal Beach. When it comes to land development, the road is not always smooth and can be bumpy with challenges. Look how far we have come with Church Lake and the success we have at that spot now. This is the first group in 30 years to come together and see this challenge come through. Mr Malloy does not underestimate that

this is a difficult task and lots of things will come up along the way. The recommendation that comes from this committee is key.

He stated that a terms of reference has been developed for this committee that outlines several factors and it has come to my attention that there is a lot of debate going on outside of the regular meetings. When committee members leave the table and then come back, they are all part of the same conversation. These are public meetings that take place and we want a good outcome and recommendation at the end. Remember when you go away from the table, you continue to support this group. There cannot be debate in the background as it can be disruptive to the end result. The credibility and success depends on those around the table. Personal agendas have to be put aside. Progress so far has been great and everyone is excited to see the final report. Mr. Malloy concluded that he will continue to be here to support in any way he can and commended Larry for stepping up and doing a great job as Chair.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Garth Bangay, seconded by Jack Wentzell, that the Minutes of the September 10, 2015 Sherbrooke Lake Access Advisory Committee be approved as amended. Carried.

5. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

No business arising from minutes.

6. MOTION TO COMMUNITY AND CULTURAL SERVICES STANDING COMMITTEE AND COUNCIL

Larry- A motion was made at our previous meeting. John and I took this to the Community & Cultural Services Standing. It was approved for us to move forward on public consultation. This is where I did speak about working in tandem. It was also approved by Council. I emphasised that public consultation was not to determine if it was going to take place but what kind of access is going to happen while sticking to the mandate.

Trudy- I called the province and could access up to \$10,000 to help offset the cost of the public consultation. I will continue to look at other avenues however we should look at it quickly as funding may not be available down the road.

Larry- There are other options as there are two districts around the lake. There has been no approach yet but there are certainly opportunities to do so.

7. VISIONING EXERCISE

Bring forward to next meeting.

8. REVIEW AND APPROVE WORKPLAN

Trudy- There were 5 outcomes we wanted to reach. #1 and #3 are switching places, all the rest would stay the same. I did not change the activities but there was debate around what order. What I am hoping to accomplish tonight is to take the "draft" off the work plan and use this as our living timeline.

Trudy went through the draft detail plan.

Trudy- This lays out the timeline and activities. Very ambitious work plan. Now is the time to have comments on whether we agree with the work plan and timeline.

Garth- Couple of suggestions on number 1 under outcomes- Identify "site" options. And #5 on outcomes "recommended" uses.

Larry- Can we have consensus to approve this?

Jack- Almost in agreement but not quite. Going to say that the problem that I have and maybe others have is with the hiring of the consultant. It's been said that we have been at this for 30 years and no organized effort has been done. I have worked on this project for 17 years straight. I have talked to people that had land on the lake and whether they would sell us access. They were not interested. No one wanted to sell. To have \$20,000 or whatever it may cost at this time, I have a hard time with this. We don't know what we can give the residents now. We can make fancy plans through a consultant but we have to find out what we can offer first. All we have is a 66 foot right away. We have nothing more to offer right now. We may as well be realistic that there are not many spots on the lake that people are going to give us access to. We have to find out what we have and then we talk to the people.

John- The community? The local people here? Who do you consider people of the community? Cottage people? We are part of the community. There is more than those who live in the local community. Having said that, I am very committed to having public access under certain conditions. If you don't present a plan or something that you can swallow, people won't be happy. Lake People pay very high taxes. We want to make sure when we have a survey it has an unbiased view. Referring to the history, we asked Trudy to give us a rundown on the history, this only took about 10 min.

Jack- We are aware of this and do not want to make a bad light of that fact. It is possible to get along so long as we do not get excited. People at the lake look at things differently.

Garth- I would like this committee to start using the word "community" to include everyone. The only reason we are sitting around this table is that there is a pressure for access. We can do one of two things, fight it or get on board and suggest a process. Council went with it and created this committee. It would be an insult to cottage owners not to ask their opinion. They have never been represented. They have never had opportunity to be involved. We are here to avoid a war and spending \$20,000- let's get over it and if it brings people around the table and helps with consensus, so be it. I am all about getting this done and remain optimistic.

Jack- I never suggested that we don't get a consultant; it's the timing of the consultant to do it. We only have one thing to consult them about. 66 foot road to the lake.

Larry- Hoping the "in camera" this evening will help move this along

Murray- Agree we need to reach a consensus to move along. It's been said all cottage owners are against access. From my view, it is a good thing on the lake and what we need to, is organize it in the best way possible. I understand the limited land options but we should try to draw people in and ask questions. Is it important that there are facilities at the access point? What kind of boat launch are people interested in? Different size motors? Just canoes or kayaks? All this leads to different kinds of things. Does there have to be a gate? Hours? Can't be open all times of night? These are some of the different views we will get from the survey. Best way to do public access and to get access after all these years is to do it in a cooperative manner.

Lennis- One thing in being a community is being equal. We have to take into consideration all access should be equal. We need to talk about equal access the only problem is getting to that public resource. I realize that the lake owners pay a lot of taxes but that was their decision.

Garth- Talking about people having equal access to property. All cottages on the lake are not equal. Parts of the lake have access to motor boats. Others only have access for canoes and kayaks. The lake is not one thing. There is a whole variety of uses. Some cottages cannot launch a boat from there spot. They will like to have access.

Trudy- Have to make a decision around which direction we are taken.

Jack- This conversation needed to take place. Concerns needed to be heard from those in all parts of the community. We have now said what we needed to. Glad to have this clarified tonight.

Larry- Survey was never to determine if lake access was going to take place but what type of access. I think everyone has to have faith in the process and understand that when decisions are made around the survey that there is no intent to make this one sided. What we are trying to get is a non-biased option of the public. How the information is collected, no one has made a decision yet. We do not know what type this will be or how it will take place. You have this concern and it is very valid concern. When the process goes forward and we do hire somebody, these are concerns that we will bring forward. It is important that everyone gets there opinion across.

Trudy- We are drafting the request for the proposals. It is this committee that will make input on that. In the request that will be sent out they will have to work with this committee and council before moving forward.

Larry- Want to be sure that the issues here tonight are addressed by the consultant. Do we have the consensus on the work plan as presented here this evening?

Jack- Will this committee have say on this questionnaire

Trudy- What we would do if we agree for a draft request, the firms would bid on this. They will recommend different types of surveys. Whether it be phone, mail or consultation. Then we asses that, yes, this makes sense. We would hire them and sit down with them to hash out the details. They will come with a draft plan and there would be a lot of input back and forth with them. The important point to remember that when we hire a consultant, they then become a MODL employee.

Larry- Do we have consensus?

John- \$20,000 is just a drop in the bucket compared to the overall amount to get access. What is access to Sherbrooke going to look like for the future? Personal preferences have to be put aside.

Lennis- One final question, what can we do to utilize staff to reduce the cost.

Trudy- Personally I have never have done a survey.

Lennis- Jeff Merrill is on site at MODL who just went through the boundary review. Staff should be capable of doing the survey.

Trudy- In my opinion, it's best to hire an outside company. To cut on cost- we can be looking for the venues, if it is a mail survey, we could have staff mail out. We do the advertising. There are ways we can cut down the cost. When they do the public meetings, we do the recordings and the minutes. We could also try to partner with other people who could help decrease cost to MODL.

Garth- Council has approved this; it's done. I can rely on Trudy to do the best job in making sure any ways we can save money are found. Staff are here for a reason, let's let them do it.

Larry- Do we have consensus to move forward with the work plan as presented which includes doing the public consultation process at the same time as looking at site options?

All committee members were in agreement.

9. REVIEW AND APPROVE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Trudy reviewed the Scope of Work in the proposal.

Larry- Does anyone have concerns?

Murray- I'd be interested in the opinion about public meetings. It needs to be done carefully. There are often those who are louder than others. The other thing is picking up on the earlier concern. It might be important to discuss the community in terms of the cottage owners who may have some different concerns than those who are not cottage owners. This to make sure when we get the results of surveys and looking at the results, we should be able to say at the end of the day that the people who are not cottage owners have this interest and those not cottage owners have that interest. It is not about majority it's about getting sense of what concerns are and what we are seeing. There could be concerns with washroom access for non-cottage owners vs cottage owners.

Jack- Very valid point and have to be careful we don't spread fear.

Larry- Having an option where people can write opinions down is important, as not all people like to get up and speak.

Murray- Clickers. They may give people more confidence when making decisions.

Lennis- We just went through a survey that did not include names and addresses. Very important to have names and addresses to avoid duplications and it will allow us to see who is filling it out.

Trudy- We can put this in the scope of work, to request the consultant to clarify how they would avoid duplication.

Lennis- The survey could be done online and made so they could not duplicate.

Trudy- We will ensure whatever method is used does not have duplication. If someone does not get the phone call or survey they can come to a public meeting to get their voice heard. This can be discussed after. Focus groups could be very effective as well. I will go back and re send scope of work. If you like this, then the next step should be to put a call out for bids. If we put a max level, then those who cannot do this for less than \$40,000, won't bother to bid. However on the other side, we risk people putting high bids.

Murray- This is out on public record and public knowledge.

Trudy- If they all come in over \$20,000, then we need to come back and say what we need to change in our scope of work.

Garth point 2 on page 6 what does this mean

Trudy- This is a very public process and we want to make sure council is aware and has opportunity for input. We do not want this to be a drawn out process.

Garth- Public meetings in January will not be well attended. We need to keep that in our thinking. We may have to think of ways around that.

10. REPORTING TO COUNCIL

Trudy- Ad will hopefully be put out by October 19th. I would ask that you email with anymore concerns ASAP. November was the time we said we would go provide an update to council. I will see about scheduling the Chair and myself to speak. We will send out a draft so you will know what is being talked about.

11. PUBLIC INPUT (15 MINUTES)

Hugh Harper - Sherbrooke Forest, felt that this meeting was much more productive and positive then previous meetings that have been held. Wanted to bring up a couple

points; do you intend on reaching people on the Chester side? (yes, that's the plan). With regards to public meetings, it may be a good idea to hold separate meetings for those who are on the lake and those who are not. There are concerns from both sides that should be voiced and then we can shape this public access to fit everyone. In addition to this, there are those who invested a lot of money around the lake.

Robert Cox - Kill Dog Cove Rd- I have spent 28 years on lake, 13 at Mush and 15 here at Kill Dog Cove. I was at Mush when the site was built and I noticed that there was a significant increase in boats. There are lot of good things that came out of that park as well. Nice beach, kids swimming, road going in and out, gates, staff cleaning up and washrooms; it is a good operation there. And when we are thinking Sherbrooke Lake, we should be emulating that.

12. 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 Jack Wentzell, seconded by Garth Bangay that the Committee return to open session. Carried.

13. ADJOURNMENT AND NEXT MEETING DATE

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, November 12th at 7pm at the Parkdale Maplewood Community Hall.

There being no further business to discuss at 9:45 p.m., it was moved by Garth Bangay, seconded by Allan Veinot that the meeting be adjourned. Carried.