

NOVA SCOTIA AQUACULTURE REVIEW BOARD
60 RESEARCH DRIVE, BIBLE HILL, NS B6L 2R2
Aquaculture.Board@novascotia.ca

RECEIVED

By Nova Scotia Aquaculture Review Board at 4:20 pm, Sep 19, 2023

INTERVENOR STATUS APPLICATION

Instructions - download this document prior to filling it in.

Please submit this form to the Aquaculture Review Board (Board) no later than **ten (10) days** after the publication date of the public hearing notice. You may attach additional pages if necessary.

Intervenor Status Applications will only be processed if they are received by the Board on or before 16h30 pm (local Nova Scotia time) on the deadline date.

A person applying for intervenor status for multiple applications must complete and submit individual Intervenor Status Applications forms for each application.

Pursuant to s.23 of the *Aquaculture Licence and Lease Regulations*, the Board will decide on this Intervenor Status Application within ten (10) days of receipt and will notify you of the decision no later than five (5) days after the decision is made.

All information provided to the Board on this form and any additional pages submitted (the "form information") will become a part of the record of the hearing. Should your application for intervenor status be accepted, the form information may be disclosed to the other parties to the hearing.

You are also advised that the form information may be subject to an access request under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* ("FOIPOP") and may, as a result, be released unless the information is exempt from disclosure under FOIPOP.

Please refer to the *Aquaculture Licence and Lease Regulations*, s.23 (attached) for more information on Intervenor Status Requests.

Application

Please read the entire application before responding. **(Print clearly or type).**

- Please identify the aquaculture lease application that you are requesting intervenor status for:

Lease Number:

1205

Hearing Date:

Feb. 5/24

- Name of Applicant:

Craig MacRae

- Civic Address:

██████████
Brooklyn, NS
B0J 1H0

- Mailing Address:
(if different than above)

- Phone Number(s):

██████████

- Email Address*:

██

- Preferred method of communication: ☒ email* ☐ Mail ☐ Other: _____

*Unless otherwise notified, email will be the preferred method of communication

NOVA SCOTIA AQUACULTURE REVIEW BOARD

60 RESEARCH DRIVE, BIBLE HILL, NS B6L 2R2

Aquaculture.Board@novascotia.ca

8. Specifically describe how the proposed aquaculture activities may substantially and directly affect you:

Substantial and direct affects to the author associated with aquaculture activities at Site 1205 are described below in terms of Quality of Life, Risk to Health and Economic Factors. It should be noted that this application is supported by 21 of the 23 property owners who have direct access to the beach. I was unable to contact the remaining two owners in time for this submission.

Quality of Life: My wife and I sold our home in Kingston Ontario to acquire a UNIT in Queens County Condominium Corporation 1 (QCCC1), and realize a shared dream to live by the ocean. Beach Meadows Beach (the beach) was appealing to us aesthetically, acoustically, and through the sense of smell from the vantage point of the UNIT. On the beach there were aesthetic and olfactory issues in Coomb Cove and in the Beach Meadows Creek Outlet Channel. I was told that representatives of the Department of the Environment and Climate Change had explained to concerned local residents that the odours were simply due to natural processes of the decay of buried organic mater. Otherwise, the beach was fairly clean of debris although periodically beachcast seaweed would accumulate impairing the aesthetic. I did not associate the periodic accumulation of macrobiotics on the beach with aquaculture activities for several reasons. One reason was that the recruitment and deposition of seaweed on the beach is also a natural process. As a novice, I revelled in the wildlife and ecological wonders I witnessed as well as the little treasures the beach yields. I walk the beach almost every day if not multiple times a day. It is a unique resource providing opportunities for relaxation or exercise, tranquility or excitement as the mood arises and the weather permits. My wife and I take full advantage of the fact that the beach provides a focal point for the gathering of family and friends creating a social node of great value and a strong sense of community among a group of diverse yet like-minded people.

The beach lends itself to a lifestyle that includes decompression, recharging, and healing; attributes that are extremely important to my wife and I at a very deep, personal level. As the saying goes, you are only as happy as your unhappiest child. In short, the Beach and the associated community was our version of a Blue Zone. Sharing this magic with our children and our grandchildren, particularly those struggling with the challenges that life can bring, is a priority. Every year our children and grandchildren vacation with us, the main attraction being the beach, and we witnessed the peace it brings them.

We are not unique in our perception of the special nature of the beach. The value of our condominium and demand for rental shows that many people share this acuity. To my wife and I, as it is to them, the beach is not just a stretch of rock covered in sand but a place that reaches out and touches you in a profound way. More succinctly, the beach is the foundation on which the Blue Zone is built. Consequently, anything that would corrupt the integrity of the beach would compromise the functionality of the various elements necessary to maintain this Zone.

My concern is that aquaculture activities at Site 1205 are incompatible with the Blue Zone concept. Observations that I and others have collected over the years demonstrate that there is just cause to believe that existing aquaculture activities contribute significantly to degradation of the beach. By extension the proposed increase in aquaculture activities at Site 1205 will aggravate these impacts. It follows that these impacts will affect the functionality of the elements necessary to maintain the Blue Zone resulting in substantial and direct affects to my wife and I, our family, friends and community.

Risk to Health: In terms of risk-to-health, I am in the over 50 cohort which is considered to be of higher susceptibility to infection and with more severe complications. Furthermore, I have been diagnosed as immune compromised. My grandchildren and my wife, who has been treated twice for cancer, are also considered to be in high-risk groups. If they or I were to contact a zoonotic disease due to exposure to infected water or contaminated objects, e.g., beach glass, shells, etc., on the beach, as a consequence of aquaculture activities at Site 1205 the event could be life threatening. The risk has not been quantitated because it has not been monitored, however it is real and it is increasing.

The northward shift in the Gulf Stream has led to a significant increase in surface water temperatures along the South Shore. This trend which began in the 1960s is expected to continue unabated. The warming of surface waters has extended the northern range of parasites and pathogens. Every year new zoonotic pathogens are identified in the Maritimes with each pathogen increasing the probability of an out break within the caged fish population.

Unfortunately, with some zoonotic diseases the infected fish can be asymptomatic while shedding pathogens into the culture waters. Furthermore, treatment regimens for some zoonotic diseases have not been developed. According to the proponent's application even when sick fish are identified and extracted from the population they are not tested for zoonotic diseases. The inability of the Proponent to identify such outbreaks, isolate, extract or otherwise treat the infected fish means that they are not able to manage the outbreak or notify public health officials in a timely manner. This is a major issue of concern regarding approval of the Proponent's application. For this reason alone, the location of an acknowledged pathogen breeding facility near a public beach should never have been permitted in the first place. Expansion of aquaculture activities will only increase the health risk to beachgoers including myself.

Economic Factors: Data for the value of a UNIT was compiled for the period of 1999-2021 along with trends in provincial median house prices, residential property values in the Liverpool area, and various other causative Factors affecting real estate values at the macro-, meso- and micro-scales. These data were used to assess the impact of expansion of aquaculture activities on UNIT value projected over a 9-year period from Sept 1, 2022 to August 31, 2031. The increase in UNIT value was estimated using conservative and bullish market growth scenarios as projected by pundits in the industry with and without approval of the Proponent's application. The impact on UNIT value under each scenario was estimated as the difference between UNIT value with and without approval of the proposed aquaculture activities at Site 1205.

Losses to UNIT value over the 9-year period under the conservative growth scenario range from \$214K to \$324K. For QCCC1 the collectively losses ranged from \$1.9M to \$2.9M. These losses equate to employing between 5 and 9 fish processing plant labourers each year over the 9-year period. This is equivalent to the increase in jobs projected by the Proponent for the entire Liverpool area. Under the bullish scenario projected losses ranged from \$679K to \$990K. Collective losses were 7.9M to \$8.9M. The equivalent number of labourers employed was between 21 and 31 jobs per year. The estimated losses even under the most conservative assessment represent a substantial and direct affect on the author.

9. Describe your existing uses, if any, of the proposed lease site, and state whether the identified uses are recreational or commercial:

I do not currently use the proposed lease site for commerical applications except for the support of Indigenous use operated lobster fishies. However, I do use the beach for recreational activities and it can be demonstrated that this resoruce is feed sediment and water that passes through the proposed lease area. By extension the beach being downcurrent from the proposed lease site is part of the lease site.

NOVA SCOTIA AQUACULTURE REVIEW BOARD

60 RESEARCH DRIVE, BIBLE HILL, NS B6L 2R2

Aquaculture.Board@novascotia.ca

10. Describe your existing uses, if any, of the area surrounding the proposed lease site, and state whether the identified uses are recreational or commercial:

I live adjacent to the Beach Meadows Beach approximately 1.1km north of the northern most pen in the existing array at Site 1205. I use the surrounding area for recreational purposes and business purposes. In terms of recreation I explore the surrounding area on virtually a daily if not multiple times per day basis with my wife and our dog. This involves:

1. Exploring the intertidal pools in Coomb's Cove;
2. Walking the length of the beach;
3. Crossing the Outlet Channel to the north beach up to Wolf's Point;
4. Touring the brackish water lagoon upstream of the Outlet Channel.

During our excursions I enjoy:

- a) Wading and swimming in the ocean;
- b) Surfing the waves on a boggy board;
- c) Collecting beach glass, peices of weathered trees, shells, and the exoskeletons of crabs, starfish and Sand Dollars washed up along the beach.
- d) Watching the shorebirds, seals and other wildlife along the shore or in the lagoon.

Conversely, we sit down by the water and sunbath, read, build sand castles with our grandchildren and socialize with friends and other beachgoers.

In terms of business uses we rent out our UNIT and promote recreational activities and general uses of the beach. The little treasures we collect on the beach are used as accessories in our stained glass busines or in resin tables created by our son.

11. Please provide any other information which you consider relevant to your application for intervenor status including any affiliations, if any:

I would like to be given the opportunity to address aspects of the application submitted by the proponent that deals with their economic assessment and their computer modelling work in particular and some other aspects of their application in general. I hope that the ARB will, should the concerns raised be considered significant in their opinion, require the proponent to address these concerns and resubmit their proposal.

12. Declaration

By signing and submitting this form, I acknowledge that I have read, understand and accept the above statements regarding the collection, use, and disclosure of the personal information provided on this form. I also hereby certify that the information provided on this form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Craig MacRae

Signature of Applicant

19-Sep-2023

Date

HOW TO SEND YOUR APPLICATION TO THE BOARD:

Upon completing the application form, you have two choices on how to submit your application to the Board.

- To send this document electronically after filling in the form, either click on the "Send Via Email" button OR [click on this link](#) to save it and open an email for you to attach it to.
- To print the document on your printer and send via Canada Post or courier, select the "PRINT" button .

Send Via Email

PRINT

Additional Information on Intervenor Requests

Excerpt from the Aquaculture Licence and Lease Regulations

Request for intervenor status

23 (1) *A person may request intervenor status from the Review Board.*

(2) *A request under subsection (1) must be in writing in a form determined by the Review Board and must be submitted to the Review Board no later than 10 days after the date that notice of the adjudicative hearing is published under Section 19.*

(3) *No later than 10 days after the date it receives a request for intervenor status, the Review Board must decide whether to grant or refuse the request.*

(4) *The Review Board must grant intervenor status to any person requesting it who, in the opinion of the Review Board, is substantially and directly affected by the hearing.*

(5) *A decision made by the Review Board with respect to intervenor status is final.*

(6) *No later than 5 days after deciding on a request for intervenor status, the Review Board must provide notice of its decision to the person requesting intervenor status and, if the request is granted, to each of the parties to the proceeding.*

In making decisions on intervenor request, the Board will reference the regulated factors below to determine whether the intervenor applicant is directly and substantially affected by the hearing pursuant to section 23(4) above.

Excerpt from the Aquaculture Licence and Lease Regulations

Factors to be considered in decisions related to marine aquaculture sites

3 *In making decisions related to marine aquaculture sites, the Review Board or Administrator must take all of the following factors into consideration:*

(a) the optimum use of marine resources;

(b) the contribution of the proposed operation to community and Provincial economic development;

(c) fishery activities in the public waters surrounding the proposed aquacultural operation;

(d) the oceanographic and biophysical characteristics of the public waters surrounding the proposed aquacultural operation;

(e) the other users of the public waters surrounding the proposed aquacultural operation;

(f) the public right of navigation;

(g) the sustainability of wild salmon;

(h) the number and productivity of other aquaculture sites in the public waters surrounding the proposed aquacultural operation;