



# Advisory Board Meeting/ *Réunion du comité consultatif* Agenda / *Ordre du jour*

November 5, 2009

Grand-Pré national historic site of Canada /  
*Lieu historique national du Canada de Grand-Pré*

1 pm – 3 pm / 13 h à 15 h

Chair/ *Président de session*: Peter Herbin

1. Welcome / *Mots de bienvenue*
2. Approve agenda / *Approbation de l'ordre du jour*
3. Approve minutes from previous meetings / *Approbation des notes de la réunion précédente*
4. Presentation of Designation Impact Study / *Présentation de l'étude sur l'impact d'une désignation*
5. For discussion and approval / *Pour discussion et approbation*:
  - a. Recommendation on governance / *recommandation sur la gouvernance*
  - b. Recommendation on RFP outcome / *recommandation sur le résultat de l'appel d'offre*
6. For information / *Pour information* :
  - a. Financial and administrative report / *rapport financier et administratif*
  - b. Project manager's and progress reports / *rapports d'étape et du directeur de projet*
  - c. Report on archaeological activities (tabled in November and discussion in January) / *Rapport sur les activités archéologiques (dépôt en Novembre et discussion en Janvier 2010)*
  - d. Contributions from Acadian associations / *contributions des associations acadiennes*
  - e. New Board Member / *Nouveau membre du comité consultatif*
7. Other business / *Autres affaires*
8. Open floor (time limited by chair)/ *Plénière (temps limité par le président de session)*
9. Next meeting / *Prochaine réunion*
10. Adjournment / *Levée de séance*



Advisory Board Meeting/ *Réunion du comité consultatif*  
Minutes / Procès-verbal  
September 3, 2009  
Grand-Pré national historic site of Canada /  
*Lieu historique national du Canada de Grand-Pré*

1 pm - 3 pm / 13 h à 15 h

Meeting Chair/ *Président de session*: Gérald C. Boudreau

**Voting Members Present**

Peter Herbin (Co-chair)	Community Member and Co-chair
Gerald Boudreau (Co-chair)	Société nationale de l'Acadie (SNA)
Erin Beaudin	Kings Community Economic Development Agency
Stan Surette	Société promotion Grand-Pré (SPGP)
Beth Keech	Kings Hants Heritage Connection
Mike Ennis	Municipality of Kings County
Hanspeter Stutz	Community Member at large
Barbara Kaiser	Community Member at large
Robert Palmeter	Grand Pre Marsh Body
Madonna Spinazola	Destination Southwest Nova Scotia

**Ex-Officio Members Present**

Claude DeGrace	Parks Canada
Bill Greenlaw	NS Department of Tourism, Culture and Heritage
Neal Conrad	Nova Scotia Economic Development

**Alternate Members Present**

Christophe Rivet	Parks Canada
Marianne Gates	Kings Community Economic Development Agency
Victor Tetrault	Société promotion Grand-Pré (SPGP)
Louise Watson	Nova Scotia Economic Development

**Resource Members Present**

Chrystal Fuller	Municipality of Kings County- Planner
-----------------	---------------------------------------

**Voting Members Absent**

Greg Young	Eastern Kings Chamber of Commerce
Chief Shirley Clarke	Glooscap First Nation

**Ex-Officio Members Absent**

Vaughne Madden	NS Office of Acadian Affairs(OAA)
Brian Banks	Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency (ACOA)

1. Welcome / *Mots de bienvenue*  
The meeting was called to order at 1:10.  
Peter Herbin was welcomed as the new co-chair.
2. Approve agenda / *Approbation de l'ordre du jour*  
The agenda was approved as circulated by consensus.
3. Approve minutes from previous meetings / *Approbation des notes de la réunion précédente*  
The minutes were approved as circulated by consensus.
4. For discussion and approval / *Pour discussion et approbation:*
  - a. Community survey / sondage auprès des residents
    - Chrystal Fuller highlighted the circulated report and proposed the following motion.

**MOTION:**

Given the number of concerns relating to holding a vote and the level of consultation held to date to assess community issues and concerns, the Steering Committee is recommending that the Advisory Board not hold a vote and puts forward the following motion for

- *Whereas the Nomination process already includes significant public consultation and engagement that aims to address the concerns and issues of all stakeholders, including the local geographic community, Acadians and First Nations;*
- *Whereas the board believes that a vote may create divisiveness within the local geographic community when it appears there is a high level of consensus regarding the value of the Nomination proposal;*
- *Whereas the World Heritage Nomination is commemorative in nature;*
- *Whereas the Community Plan currently under development will address any potential land use changes through established democratic processes and will involve significant input from the community before it is considered for adoption by Council.*

**Be it resolved that the Nomination Grand Pre Advisory board not hold a community vote on proceeding with the nomination of Grand Pre as a World Heritage Site.**

**Amended motion:**

**Be it resolved that the Nomination Grand Pre Advisory board not hold a community vote on proceeding with the nomination of Grand Pre as a World Heritage Site at this time.**

- Madonna Spinazola moved an amendment to the motion to include “at this time” to the motion to allow for reconsideration in the future.
- Gerald asked for a vote on the amendment following discussion.
- All voting members were against the amended motion with the exception of Mike Ennis who abstained from the vote
- The amendment was defeated.
- A lengthy discussion occurred.

**MOTION:**

The motion was accepted with one abstention (Mike Innes).

- b. Name of the proposal / nom de la proposition d'inscription
  - Christophe circulated a report on this subject.

- Following discussion it was determined that additional input was required, perhaps with a local school contest. The steering committee will complete consultations and bring back to the Advisory Board.

The meeting was “in-camera” for discussion on the following two items.

- c. RFP translation, editing, and design / demandes de propositions: traduction, édition, et design
- d. RFP interpretation / demande de proposition pour l’interprétation

The meeting was removed from in-camera.

- The RFP for translation will be awarded following clarification from the selected consultant. This decision was approved by consensus.
- The RFP for interpretation will be re-issued. Local community members who have already been involved in the Nomination process will be asked to sit on an ad-hoc committee to re-define and re-issue this RFP. This decision was approved by consensus.

5. For information / *Pour information* :

The agenda order was changed to allow item 5c to be discussed first:

5c. Community engagement and planning report / rapport sur la participation communautaire et la planification

- Chrystal indicated that the Management Plan has no jurisdiction and requires support from the Community Plan as well as other levels of government.
- The municipality has appointed the “Community Association” as the group to work with the project planner.
- Throughout the summer, the planner wrote the Community Plan through discussion with the Community Association and was hoping to have the draft brought to the community at large this fall.
- The Community Association has determined that they require additional time to work on the plan. They are still very committed to the process.
- The municipal process requires about 8 months from the time the community association releases the plan.
- The municipal process was clarified:  
Municipal council appoints → Community Association develops → Community Plan → feedback through community consultation → Municipal council adopts

a. Presentation of the first draft management plan / Présentation de la première ébauche du plan de gestion

- Christophe presented the management plan.

b. Financial and administrative report / rapport financier et administrative

- The financial documents were accepted as circulated.

c. Community engagement and planning report / rapport sur la participation communautaire et la planification

- See above notes

d. Participation at the Congrès mondial acadien 2009 report / rapport sur la participation au Congrès mondial acadien 2009

- The Nomination Grand Pré Project had a booth at the Congrès manned by Gerald and Christophe.
- There were 1000's in attendance who were informed about the project.
- 600 forms were completed indicating support for the project with \$648. collected in a free will donation

- e. Project manager's and progress reports / rapports d'étape et du directeur de projet
- Christophe highlighted the circulated reports.

6. Other business / *Autres affaires*  
None

7. Open floor (time limited by chair)/ *Plénière (temps limité par le président de session)*  
None

8. Next meeting / *Prochaine réunion*  
November 5, 2009 at 1:00, Grand Pré National Historic Site

9. Adjournment / *Levée de séance*  
The meeting was adjourned at 3:30



**TO: Nomination Grand Pré Advisory Board**

**From: Steering Committee**

**Date: November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**RE: Recommendation on governance**

---

## **Background**

The nomination proposal requires a description of how the area is managed. In the case of multiple authorities, it is essential to demonstrate how these authorities work together to manage the area. Finally, the nomination proposal needs to demonstrate commitment from the different authorities to manage effectively this area, irrespective of a successful designation. The rationale on this last point is that if the area is indeed important, then authorities and stakeholders should be committed to protecting it even without a World Heritage status.

The Management Working Group discussed the matter of governance for the property and has recommended setting up a standing advisory committee.

## **Proposal**

### *Mandate*

The Committee has two distinct roles: to manage programming activities relating to the site and to provide advice to regulators. Specifically, the mandate of the committee will be to:

1. Deliver advocacy, education and programming activities related to the area of significance.
2. Coordinate the implementation of the management plan;
3. Manage the monitoring and reporting requirements of UNESCO;
4. Provide advice to regulators on issues related to the protection, interpretation, promotion of the area of significance;
5. Facilitate two way communications on issues and concerns between stakeholders and the regulators;
6. Review management direction in the management plan;

### *Structure and Operation*

The Committee is chaired and set up as a sub-committee of the Kings RDA who provides support. It operates on a fixed budget to carry out standard activities and has the flexibility to apply for additional funding to carry out special projects.

The Committee meets at minimum twice a year and as needed at the call of the Chairperson.

### *Membership*

The membership of the Committee is proposed to include:

- Municipality of the County of Kings
- Provincial government
- Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture
- Parks Canada
- Grand Pré Marsh Body
- Grand Pré and Area Community Association
- Société nationale de l'Acadie
- Kings RDA
- Local residents

### **Rationale**

#### *Why a new permanent committee?*

There is a need for a committee for 2 reasons:

1. We need to demonstrate that all stakeholders are committed to the long-term protection of the area, and although there are multiple authorities protecting aspects of the area, there is no coordinated approach to management. ***A committee would provide a permanent platform for communication, collaboration, support, and engagement.*** Once the site is designated, that committee can take on the responsibilities tied to promotion, education, and UNESCO's reporting requirements.
2. The nomination process has brought together multiple stakeholders that all care about this place and have invested their resources, knowledge, time and energy to work together. ***A committee would maintain those relationships and provide opportunities for the long term sustainability of the area through shared concerns about the future of agriculture, tourism partnerships, promotion, and protection of heritage.***

#### *Why an advisory committee?*

The committee needs to have an advisory role because:

1. There are a number of regulatory authorities that have the tools to protect the area but there is no mechanism to coordinate their action to ensure the protection of what is exceptional. ***An advisory committee will help coordinate those actions and advise authorities on the best way to protect the area.***
2. There is no need for an additional decision-making body in the area, but ***there is a need for a body that stays focused on protecting what is exceptional about the place and that provides a mechanism to engage stakeholders in those discussions.***

#### *Why an association to Kings RDA?*

The proposed committee will require resources to carry out its mandate. Kings RDA, as a community economic development agency, is mandated to do work in both the economic and community sectors of the region, making it a good fit. It is an established and viable organization that can be depended on over the long haul. A new organization would rely on volunteers that are already over-stretched. Kings RDA also has the ability to access funds to assist with projects related to the management plan. As much of the project is already administered with the Kings RDA, it makes the transition smooth.

## **Request to Advisory Board**

Since a clear commitment from all stakeholders of how the site is managed is necessary to be able to submit a proposal, the Advisory Board is approached by the Steering Committee to provide direction on pursuing this option.

The details of governance would require additional work that can only be completed in collaboration with those involved. However the principles, should the Advisory Board agree, would be the basis for discussion.

## **Recommendations**

The Steering Committee recommends that the Advisory Board:

1. *Agree in principle with setting up an advisory committee to be created based on the mandate proposed.*
2. *Direct the Steering Committee to begin negotiations with the Kings RDA, Parks Canada, the Provincial authorities, the Municipality of the County of Kings, and other stakeholders to establish a governance structure for the proposed World Heritage area.*

## **Proposed next steps**

- Discuss with Kings RDA options to establish the committee;
- Contact the regulatory authorities to begin the discussions;
- Prepare draft Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs).



<u>REVENUE</u>	<u>CASH BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL CASH</u>	<u>IN-KIND BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL IN-KIND</u>
ACOA	211,348.50	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Province of Nova Scotia	211,348.50	44,490.67	\$71,000.00	\$0.00
County of Kings	100,000.00	66,666.66	\$23,760.00	\$0.00
Kings CED	20,767.50	0.00	\$117,260.00	\$78,980.00
Parks Canada	0.00	0.00	\$511,980.00	\$0.00
SPGP	0.00	0.00	\$54,425.00	\$0.00
Private Donation	10,000.00	5,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Societe Promotion Grand Pre	0.00	2,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Moncton & Mount Allison Universities	0.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$6,700.00
	<b>553,464.50</b>	<b>118,157.33</b>	<b>778,425.00</b>	<b>85,680.00</b>

EXPENSES

	<u>CASH BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL CASH</u>	<u>IN-KIND BUDGET</u>	<u>ACTUAL IN-KIND</u>
<b>Communications &amp; Public Relations</b>				
Communications & PR Specialist	0.00	0.00	\$60,000.00	\$0.00
Communications Strategy	25,700.00	25,700.00	2,000	0
Website	0.00	0.00	5,000	0
Web Administration	1,000.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Communication-Related Materials	10,000.00	7,787.45	\$0.00	\$0.00
Translation	15,000.00	0.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00
International Brochure	2,500.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>54,200.00</b>	<b>33,487.45</b>	<b>77,000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Research &amp; Expertise</b>				
Heritage Planner	106,000.00	70,237.23	\$0.00	\$0.00
Archaeologists	33,000.00	21,390.33	\$95,000.00	\$6,700.00
Cartography	5,000.00	0.00	\$40,000.00	\$0.00
GIS	0.00	0.00	\$40,000.00	\$0.00
Historians	0.00	0.00	\$80,000.00	\$0.00
Archaeological Surveys	0.00	0.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00
Archival Research	0.00	0.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00
Conservations Services	0.00	0.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00
Sub-Committee Meetings	20,000.00	16,261.59	\$0.00	\$0.00
Air Photos	4,000.00	189.90	\$0.00	\$0.00
LIDAR	0.00	0.00	\$12,000.00	\$0.00
Comparative Study	22,500.00	1,800.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00
Background Research for Management Plan	5,000.00	4,887.34	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>195,500.00</b>	<b>114,766.39</b>	<b>\$317,000.00</b>	<b>\$6,700.00</b>
<b>Consultation &amp; Stakeholder Relations</b>				
Stakeholder Relations	0.00	0.00	\$104,425.00	\$78,980.00
Permanent Display	5,000.00	1,173.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Meetings	4,000.00	1,696.20	\$0.00	\$0.00
Meeting Documents	4,000.00	306.59	\$0.00	\$0.00
Translations Services	0.00	0.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>13,000.00</b>	<b>3,175.79</b>	<b>114,425.00</b>	<b>78,980.00</b>

<b>Nominations Proposal-Production &amp; Follow-up</b>				
Graphic Design	25,000.00	0.00	\$15,000.00	\$0.00
Photography & Video	5,000.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Editing	20,000.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Translation	0.00	0.00	\$20,000.00	\$0.00
Printing	10,000.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Maps Production	5,000.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Interpretation & Presentation Supports	60,000.00	9,429.67	\$0.00	\$0.00
Professional Services (including Paris delivery)	27,500.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Attendance at World Heritage Convention	0.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Site Visit	5,000.00	0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>157,500.00</b>	<b>9,429.67</b>	<b>35,000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Project Administration</b>				
Project Management	30,000.00	6,172.68	\$150,000.00	\$0.00
Research Assistant	0.00	0.00	\$40,000.00	\$0.00
Data File Management	0.00	0.00	\$10,000.00	\$0.00
Office Supplies	0.00	0.00	\$5,000.00	\$0.00
Office Space	0.00	0.00	\$30,000.00	\$0.00
Board of Directors Operations	20,000.00	10,021.73	\$0.00	\$0.00
Conferences & Events	10,000.00		\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>60,000.00</b>	<b>16,194.41</b>	<b>235,000.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Total Expenses Pre-Contingency &amp; Taxes</b>	<b>480,200.00</b>	<b>177,053.71</b>	<b>778,425.00</b>	<b>85,680.00</b>
<b>Contingency &amp; HST(6.5%)</b>				
Contingency	17,134.50	6,317.63	\$0.00	\$0.00
HST (not applicable on Heritage Planner Expense)	56,130.00	3,270.92	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>Sub-Total</b>	<b>73,264.50</b>	<b>9,588.55</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>553,464.50</b>	<b>186,642.27</b>	<b>778,425.00</b>	<b>85,680.00</b>
<b>Anticipated Surplus/Deficit</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>(68,484.94)</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>



**TO: Nomination Grand Pré Advisory Board**

**From: Christophe Rivet, Project Manager**

**Date: November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**RE: Project Manager's Report 11 (for discussion)**

**GENERAL**

*Schedule and tasks*

- The comparative analysis is underway;
- Draft community plan underway;
- A 12 months communication strategy is to be completed by January;
- Letters were sent to authorities to discuss recommendations in management plan;

Phase	Task	Target date of completion	Status
<b>Justification for inscription</b>	Statement of OUV	December 2008	Completed
	Comparative analysis	February 2010	Ongoing
	Statement of Integrity and Authenticity	February 2010	Ongoing
<b>Develop protective management plan</b>	Management plan for the national historic site	April 2010	Ongoing
	Draft community plan	Spring 2010	Ongoing
	Management plan for the site	April 2010	Ongoing
<b>Funding</b>	Budget	July 2008	Completed
<b>Communication and public engagement strategy</b>	Communication and public engagement strategy implementation	April 2011	Ongoing
<b>Approval/ support process</b>	Municipal approval process	April 2010	On target
	Federal approval process	December 2010	N/A
	Canadian delegation approval process	January 2011	N/A
	Acadian Support	December 2010	Initiated
	First Nation support	December 2010	N/A
<b>Final proposal</b>	Other support	December 2010	N/A
	Final content	December 2010	N/A
	Final formatted document	January 2011	N/A

*Finance and resources*

See financial report.

**PHASES (SEE PROGRESS REPORT 11 FOR OUTLINE)**

**Description of Area:**

Nothing to report.

Next steps: Complete draft section.

**Justification for Inscription:**

A first draft of the comparative analysis is underway. The meeting with experts is rescheduled in the Spring because of availability. Their comments and suggestions were collected and inform the current draft of the analysis. Current feedback confirms the general findings of the OUV report.

Next steps: Complete draft comparative analysis.

**Evaluation of present state of conservation:**

Archaeological field work is essentially complete. Some work will be carried out in discreet locations until December. The report to the advisory board on archaeological activities provides additional information on the outcome of that work.

A landscape analysis was initiated in August that identifies the components of the landscape (buildings, field patterns, geophysical features, etc.). This is essential to get a detailed description of the area and analyse the condition of the different components and of the whole.

Next steps: Finalize the landscape analysis. Draft the present state of conservation section.

**Assessment of factors affecting the property:**

Nothing to report.

Next steps: none.

**Monitoring plan:**

Discussion with the Heritage Division have led to outlining the contribution of that department to the development of a monitoring plan.

Other authorities are the Department of Agriculture, the Marsh Body, and Parks Canada.

Next steps: Engage the other authorities on developing the monitoring and reporting sections.

**Develop protective and management system for the proposal:**

*National historic site process*

Underway.

Next steps: draft management plan for Aboriginal consultation in November – December.

*Municipal process*

The Community Plan Liaison Committee is continuing to work with municipal planners to prepare a draft community plan that will be ready for consultation in the community.

Next steps: A meeting is scheduled in November to work on the draft.

#### *Management plan working group*

The strategy initially considered to present the management plan to the community was revised to allow time for the community plan to clarify its own direction. Instead a summary of the direction taken by the management plan was shared with local residents (see information about that action under 'Communication and public engagement').

The draft management plan will be consulted on with the different stakeholders.

The management plan working group has not met since July. Current expectations are to meet again in late Winter/early Spring and review actions based on feedback on recommendations.

Specific actions need to be discussed with specific stakeholders, such as visitors and dykelands with the Marsh Body.

The Heritage Division has committed to developing an archaeological heritage strategy for the area in time to support the nomination proposal. Work is underway to set up the team that will develop the strategy.

A meeting will take place in early November between the project manager and a cultural heritage risk preparedness expert to seek guidance on developing a risk preparedness plan.

Next steps: Consult on the draft management plan. Initiate work on the archaeological heritage strategy. Establish timeline and resources for the risk preparedness plan.

#### **Visitor and Interpretation:**

A new request for proposal (RFP) was issued and closed on October 30<sup>th</sup>. The RFP was prepared and reviewed in consultation with community members that had been previously involved in the UNESCO process.

Next steps: TBD

#### **Draft proposal:**

Nothing to report.

Next steps: Draft sections of the nomination proposal.

#### **Project administration:**

See financial report

Next steps: See financial report

#### **Communication and public engagement:**

There have been a number of activities since the last report.

A meeting between the Grand Pré and area community association and Nomination Grand Pré Steering Committee was organized on October 8<sup>th</sup>. This was an important opportunity for the two groups to meet and exchange perspectives on the UNESCO process and the community process.

A community meeting was held on October 22<sup>nd</sup> at the Horton Community Centre. This was a meeting that had been announced in May to follow up on the questions that were then raised by the community. It was attended by about 40 people. The meeting focused on providing answers to the questions asked at the meeting held May as well as providing

information on the draft management plan. A commitment was made to have a follow up meeting in the Spring.

Work has begun on the 'naming the project' activity and the poster activity. It is expected to be launched in January. See separate report on this.

A 12 months communication implementation plan is being finalized and will be presented in January.

Next steps: Prepare a community newsletter as a follow up to the October 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting. Launch the 'name the project' activity. Finalize a 12 months communication implementation plan.

#### *Engagement of the Acadian community*

Gérald C. Boudreau and Christophe Rivet attended the General Assembly of the *Fédération acadienne de la Nouvelle-Écosse* (FANE) on October 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>. The Nomination Grand Pré booth was on display. The General Assembly voted unanimously in favour of an unconditional support for the project and for the FANE to provide a financial contribution to Nomination Grand Pré.

In addition, a number of Acadian organisations have approached the co-chair and indicated that they too will be providing financial contributions towards the nomination proposal.

These financial contributions were provided to support the engagement of the Acadian community. Specific activities and objectives have to be developed.

Next steps: Develop an Acadian community engagement plan.

#### **Economic development & interpretation strategy:**

Nothing to report.

Next steps: None

#### **Approval process for final document:**

N/A

Phase	Description of Area	Justification for inscription			Evaluation of present state of conservation	Assessment of factors affecting the property	Monitoring Plan	Develop protective management system			Visitor and Interpretation	Draft proposal	Final proposal	
Sub-phase		Identify criteria for inscription	Compare with other properties	Assess integrity and authenticity				Planning for the national historic site	Municipal planning exercise	Planning for the proposed area			Document	Formatting and copies
Objective	Describe the property proposed	Define why the property proposed has OUV	Compare value, integrity, and authenticity of similar properties	Identify resources, their integrity and authenticity	Describe the state of the resources supporting the OUV	Describe the pressures on the resources and the OUV	Describe how the condition is monitored	Manage and protect resources at the national historic site (NHSC)	Manage and protect resources in the Grand Pré area (excluding the NHSC)	Manage the resources supporting the OUV	Describe facilities available and if applicable, programs for interpretation	Draft of the proposal, excluding formatting, translation, bibliography, and images	Final editing; Final translation; Bibliography; Image database;	Container/package; Design; Printing;
Deliverable	Description and exact location; Maps;	Statement of OUV;	Comparative Analysis;	Statement of authenticity and integrity; List of resources;	Indicators; Statistical benchmarks;	List of factors; List of mitigation measures;	List administrative arrangements; Indicators; Compilation of results of previous monitoring exercises;	Management Plan; Conservation plan;	Plan and community vision;	Management system that integrates the different plans and focuses on OUV;	Description of facilities, funding, programs;			
Expected beginning date	July 2009	June 2008	October 2008	June 2008	September 2008	September 2008	September 2008	March 2008	July 2008	May 2009	November 2008	October 2008	November 2009	October 2009
Expected date of completion	December 2009	February 2009	February 2009	March 2009	December 2009	December 2009	August 2009	April 2010 (to Minister's office)	October 2009	February 2010	August 2009	September 2010	December 2010	January 2011
New date				February 2010	February 2010		March 2010		Spring 2010	April 2010	January 2010			
Status/activities	draft	Comparative analysis underway	underway	Archaeology underway	Archaeology underway	completed		underway	underway	underway	Data analysis	N/A	N/A	N/A
Issues	none	none	none	none	Requires federal/provincial/municipal strategy	none	Requires federal/provincial/municipal strategy	none	none	Completion depends on direction for recommendations	RFP will be provided			

Phase	Project administration		Communication and public engagement strategy		Economic development and interpretation strategy			Approval process			Support process			
Sub-phase	Project administration	Funding	Development of strategy	Implementation of strategy	Economic study	Tourism plan	Project	Municipal approval	Federal approval	Canadian delegation approval	Acadian support	Municipal support	First Nation support	Provincial support
Objective	Deliver administrative support to the project according to principles of transparency and accountability;	Funding and resources for the project;	Develop a brand, logo, media strategy;	Implement an effective strategy to engage stakeholders;	Understand the economic context;	Propose a strategy for the sustainable development of the community;	Celebrate the community;	Approve the municipal vision and plan	Approve the management plan for the NHSC	Approve the final document	Support the process and the final document;	Support the final document;	Support the process and the final document;	Support the final document;
Deliverable	Financial reports;	Budget;	Communication and public engagement strategy;		Economic study;	Economic development plan;	Project	Plan for the community of Grand Pré and surroundings	Management plan for the NHSC	Nomination proposal	Resolution; Letter;	Resolution; Letter;	Resolution; Letter;	Letter;
Expected beginning date	January 2008	March 2008	June 2008	September 2008	July 2008	March 2009	July 2009	April 2009	June 2009	December 2009	September 2009	October 2009	September 2009	September 2009
Expected date of completion	March 2011	April 2011	December 2008	April 2011	June 2009	February 2010	TBD	April 2010	April 2010 in Minister's office	January 2011	December 2010	December 2010	December 2010	December 2010
New date														
Status / activities	Active Manage funds		complete	ongoing	Complete	initiated	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Active	Active	ongoing	N/A
Issues	none	none	none	none	none	none					none	None	Guidance required to enhance engagement	





**TO: Nomination Grand Pré Advisory Board**

**From: Christophe Rivet and Katie Cottreau-Robbins, Rob Ferguson, Jonathan Fowler**

**Date: November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

**RE: Report on archaeological activities**

---

## **Background**

The nomination proposal requires information on the archaeological heritage of the area because it is related to the proposed outstanding universal value. Information includes location, type, and condition of archaeological features.

Archaeological work began in the summer 2008 and extended until the fall of 2009. There is still some work scheduled to take place until early December.

## **Scope of the work**

Although, the archaeological team focused primarily on the area being proposed for World Heritage designation, there is one site that was explored by one of the team that is located outside the proposed boundary. The purpose was to improve the existing inventory of archaeological sites by surveying the area and identify potential sites or potential locations of interest. Where appropriate, test pits were made to confirm the presence of archaeological features.

In 2008, work focused on better understanding the dyking techniques and strategies by testing areas of interest on the marshlands. In 2009, the focus was on the uplands. The scope did not include complete excavations and the work did not intend to complete the inventory.

## **Partnerships**

Partnerships were necessary considering the scope of the project. Archaeological work was carried out by three teams: one led by Katie Cottreau-Robbins (Nova Scotia Museum), a second led by Rob Ferguson (Parks Canada) and a third team led by Jonathan Fowler (St. Mary's University). These three teams divided the work and focused on different parts of the proposed area.

In addition to those partnerships, other organisations have also contributed their expertise. Dalhousie University's Earth Sciences program, through Dr. David Scott, has contributed its expertise in soil analysis. The Université de Moncton (campus of Shippagan) through Dr. André Robichaud, and Mount Allison University, through Dr. Colin Laroque, contributed their expertise in dendrochronology and tested the aboiteaux that were discovered recently.

Finally, and most importantly, this work was made possible by the cooperation and support of the landowners. They not only allowed access to their properties, but also shared their knowledge with the researchers and alerted the project to areas of interest.

### **Financial and in-kind expenses**

The project had a budget of \$ 33 K directed towards archaeology, plus in-kind contribution from Parks Canada and the Nova Scotia Museum estimated at \$ 105 K. In addition, an estimated \$ 20 K was identified for conservation services.

As of October 2009, a total of \$ 19,226.27 was spent in cash to hire staff for each archaeological team, support travel, and other related expenses. In addition, Dalhousie University contributed its staff to analysing soil samples. Université de Moncton (campus of Shippagan) and Mount Allison University contributed approximately \$ 6,700 of in-kind expertise.

### **Results: discoveries and significance to date**

There are four major discoveries resulting from the work to date:

- ***Aboriginal presence and use of the area:*** through the surface discovery of a 4,000 year old stone tool (more precisely a Middle Archaic, full-channeled ground-stone gouge (c. 4000 BP)), researchers are able to acquire additional insight into Aboriginal people's use of the area. It is a rare if not unique discovery in Nova Scotia. It provides an opportunity for additional research to determine whether there is a settlement in the near vicinity associated with this object and to understand the past landscape.
- ***Dyking strategy and aboiteaux techniques:*** through the testing of the dykelands and the study of three aboiteaux discovered accidentally by farmers in the past 3 years, the researchers were able to improve their understanding of how the marsh was dyked by locating what seems to be the first dyked area. All three aboiteaux date back to the 1680s which corresponds to the first years of European settlement in the area. The size and location of the aboiteaux provide insight into the techniques employed and yet raise questions about current knowledge concerning number of settlers and strategy used to dyke the area. Seven soil core samples, currently under analysis by the Earth Sciences Department of Dalhousie University, were taken at three sites within the marsh. It is anticipated that these will provide information on the development of the salt marsh and the changing environment over the past 5,000 years, as well as the impact of the Acadian dykes on the ecology of the marsh. These outcomes provide additional information to substantiate the argument that the creation and enduring use of the dykelands is exceptional.
- ***Acadian and Planter period settlement:*** archaeologists have uncovered evidence of Acadian period features and discovered remains of a Planter period structure in the vicinity of the supposed location of Fort Montague. This fort was built in 1760 and is directly associated with

the settlement of the New England Planters. This is an exceptional find since the condition of the site seems to be remarkable, including a particularly rich sample of animal bones for dietary studies. It provides insight on the Planter settlement, a period somewhat overlooked in local archaeological heritage. As well, a pre-Deportation and Planter sites of significance may have been located in an area immediately outside the proposed boundary. These outcomes provide additional information about the location of important features linked to the enduring use of the dykelands and the people that worked on them. Finally, through the analysis of wood samples, archaeologists have a better understanding of the age of the wharf at Horton Landing, aboiteaux, and remains of dykes

- **Archaeological map of the area:** archaeologists have now improved their knowledge of the presence of archaeological features. It provides an overview of areas of interest. This is an important outcome since it is now possible to create a map of the area identifying where archaeological features were found and help guide future research and development. It is a useful tool in the management of the proposed property.

Additional discoveries of significance may still be made once all the data is analysed and artefacts are conserved, as well as through additional fieldwork.

### Outstanding issues and next steps

The following issues have been raised by this work. Some may constitute opportunities for future research and interpretation.

- **Artefacts:** a great number of artefacts, some large (such as the aboiteaux) and most smaller in size, have been collected in those two years. Objects found on private property are in the care of the Nova Scotia Museum, while objects found on federal land are conserved by Parks Canada. The aboiteaux are located at the national historic site. Recognizing that these aboiteaux are the result of an accidental discovery and the logistical challenges that those represent, there is currently no plan for their long term care. As well, many of these objects contribute to supporting the argument for outstanding universal value but there is no plan for special care. **NEXT STEP: *There needs to be a discussion at Advisory Board about the future of these objects and a long term strategy for dealing with accidental discoveries of significance.***
- **Research:** the work undertaken by archaeologists over the past 2 years has confirmed that there is a significant research potential in the area to study such topics as Acadian settlements, Aboriginal settlements, dykeland creation and use, Planter history, past environments, geology, and marine biology. Research up to this point has advanced knowledge about these topics but conclusions remain preliminary. Moreover, strong partnerships were created between government agencies, academic institutions, organisations, and local residents to carry out this research in a way that contributes to researchers and local communities. Ongoing understanding of the place and the pressures that affect it is essential to effective long term management. **NEXT STEP: *There needs to be a discussion at Advisory Board about fostering research in relation to future management requirements.***
- **Condition indicators:** The results of the archaeological work provided additional information on site condition. However, depending on who and where work was carried out, indicators are not

the same. **NEXT STEP: There needs to be a discussion between the provincial and federal authorities to develop common condition indicators for long term monitoring purposes.**

- **Archaeological heritage strategy:** The draft management plan for the proposed World Heritage site identified the need to develop an archaeological heritage strategy. The outcome of the archaeological work reinforced that argument by raising questions about management of archaeological heritage, building an archaeological inventory to assist in decision-making for long term management of the area, provide support to ensure effective protection of archaeological heritage, and reporting. Currently, discussions are underway in the Heritage Division (Province of Nova Scotia) to develop a strategy. **NEXT STEP: Complete a strategy that meets those objectives.**
- **Interpretation:** There is currently no opportunity in the Grand Pré area to interpret archaeological heritage and local history. There is some interpretation at the national historic site. The last 2 years of archaeological work have yielded new information, generated new and significant artefacts, and provided insight on significant aspects of human history in that area. This information is worth sharing and interpreting for visitors and residents alike. **NEXT STEP: Address the interpretation of archaeological heritage in the interpretation strategy.**

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the archaeological work carried out in 2008 and 2009 was successful in delivering key information to substantiate the outstanding universal value. This work represents an important investment by government agencies, academic institutions, and local community members which would benefit from a long-term strategy to **ensure that the management of the property remains informed by up-to-date information, nurture successful partnerships, create opportunities for visitor interpretation and experiences, and give back to the local community by interpreting local history.**