



Project:	Sturgeon Lake ASP Review	Project No.:	15216
Client:	MD of Greenview No. 16	Meeting Date:	December 4, 2018
Location:	DeBolt Public Service Building	Meeting Time:	6:00 PM
Purpose:	Citizens’ Panel Meeting	Meeting No.:	2
In Attendance:	CP Members: K. Johnson (KJ), E. Langenecker (EL), H. McKinnon (HM), B. Edgerton (BE), D. Gorman (DG), L. Burnside (LB) MD: S. Rosson (SR), L. Dixon (LD), P. Leurebourg (PL) ISL: D. McRae (DM), T. Olsen (TO)	Written By:	TO
Distribution:	Attendees, D. Schoor (ISL), L. Newman, A. Clarkson		

The subjects discussed and decisions reached are summarized in the following record. Please notify the author of any errors or omissions. If no comments are received within 7 days this record is considered correct.

Item No.	Description	Action By
1.0	<p>CP Meeting #1 Record of Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The notes from the previous meeting were reviewed. Change to minutes regarding septic tanks in “Boyd’s” should instead refer to “The Narrows”. 	Info/ISL
2.0	<p>Community Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dave McRae led a debrief discussion on the October 29 Open House <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 30 general public attendees No unanimity on most issues; many are close to 50-50 splits. Input at open house consistent with survey results. There were concerns respecting enhanced services in the Narrows based on cost – those opposed don’t want higher taxes. Also noted that on most issues people are either firmly in favor of development or firmly opposed General sense is that people aren’t opposed to development if it is done correctly Possible water quality testing was being investigated. Greenview Council consideration and approval would be required. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alberta Parks does tests weekly for E.coli and coliforms, but only in relation to swimming water quality, not potability. Research may be able to provide more information. Used to be a water level test, which is believed to be discontinued McRae provided Sturgeon Lake water quality sampling from 1976-2000 as a possible baseline for new testing Question if the public seems to be confused as to the level of cross-jurisdictional involvement in that area. McRae believed they are more aware of the jurisdictional divisions (MD vs. Province vs. First Nation) Online Survey Summary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results of the survey were reviewed. Interest was shown to see a comparison of the results from the previous SLASP survey to the current ones. McRae to provide. Note: Typo under Q7: “No” respondents should read 7 not 72 	<p>Info</p> <p>Info</p> <p>ISL</p>



Item No.	Description	Action By
3.0	<p>Issue Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Density <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion of areas that remain available for development. Large majority of remaining density is north of the West Bay. - Is there really a need to specify numbers, if the intention is to protect the lake? - Why not just insist on the measurement and mitigation of pollution and go application-by-application? - Arbitrary numbers assigned to density do nothing but cause frustration. - Development standards vs. density restrictions. Not so much about “how many” but “how” and “what”? - Can look at other lakeside locations to draw on for examples, e.g. Gull Lake, Pigeon Lake, Pine Lake, Sylvan Lake. - Question what the demand for development would be if density restrictions were lifted <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thoughts that there would not be a flood initially - Question regarding purpose of density numbers. Is it purely about controlling population density, governing people or is it about protecting the lake? Because even then there has to be enforcement that sewage, etc. is being done right regardless of density. - Can density limits be relaxed/eliminated and replaced by a development standards approach? - Suggestion that continuing with density restrictions is due to anxiety over development floodgates opening and stress on the lake’s ecosystems/capacity. • Environmental Protection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggestion was made to change Environmental Reserve, replace with easements so deadfall can be removed? ER is not well maintained, accumulation of dead trees could pose a fire risk. Province has essentially “leave-to- rot” rules. - ER/MR along the shore is being lost to erosion and/or higher water - Concern expressed on shape of the weir on First Nations land. - Suggestion to target the septic systems around the lake rather than density numbers. - Rosson clarified, the Sturgeon Heights Lagoon had been closed for its expansion during the construction phase. - Usually only two ways to intervene in improving outdated sewer systems: conditions of subdivision/development approval, and by complaints to AB Health Services. - Suggestion that septic systems that did not even meet the standards of their day should be compelled to upgrade. Incentive to upgrade? - Council is considering a future location of an RV/Sewage dump station to enable more responsible sewage disposal. - May need to establish that no change in density controls take place until a permanent sewer system is in place. 	<p>Info</p> <p>ISL</p> <p>Info</p> <p>Info</p>
4.0	<p>Mapping Exercise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploration of Potential Land Use Options 	<p>Info</p>



Item No.	Description	Action By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the line separating Primary Area from balance actually matter? Should it remain? - Investigate higher standards for RV parks/campgrounds. - Retain residential density but separate from RV/camping? 	
5.0	<p>Round Table/Additional Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None 	Info
6.0	<p>Next Meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of January – tentative. Look at possible teleconference/Skype for those unable to attend. • Next meeting to review draft policy directions based on discussion. 	Info