

Webb, Bruce (CON)

From: biccumj@mymts.net
Sent: October-02-11 1:06 AM *Bl*
To: Webb, Bruce (CON)
Subject: R.M of Strathclair - Salt Lake Water Level Control Project (File 5538.00)

I am the owner of a trailer on the beach at the south end of South Salt Lake. This year I could not use my trailer until the middle of July and even then I had to wear rubber boots. If the existing outlet on South Salt Lake is left as is and the North and Central Lakes are lowered to an elevation of 566 meters, I believe the cottages and trailer would be flooded completely. Last year the existing culvert was supposed to have been replaced with a 36" culvert, a smaller culvert was poorly installed. This project would only work if a control structure is also built to allow water out of South Salt Lake at the proper time of year. When completed this project should not be controlled by The RM of Strathclair.

Having spent 48 summers at this beach it is sad to see the damage that could have been prevented.

Strathkelton N.B.

Sept 28 2011

41

Environmental Assessment
Licensing Branch.



Dear Sir or Madam

The announcement that had been printed in our local newspaper brings great cause for hope we have been flooded out for 6 years. Our drive way (lane) has been washed away & is causing us great concern, as it is slowly receding. It is our only way out of our yard onto the highway 16. We are seniors who live on a farm. We have lost miles of fences & many many acres of pasture, also the loss of great many trees. We do hope that you will listen to our concerns and go ahead with your proposed controlled structures.

Thankyou.

Fraser, Barbara Poffet
Box 29 Strathkelton N.B.

ROT200 Ph 365-5302

Box 61
Strathclair,
Oct 6/2011

Re Project File 5538.00 (Salt Lake)

Dear Mr. Welt. PJ

My husband & I are listing why we do not want the H₂O project to go forward @ this time.

- 1) Our farm (3-16-22) is located on the east & south side of South Salt Lake. We will lose income from renting the land to the cabin owners if they are flooded again and decide to leave. This year we lost land on the east side from 30-40 ft. banks falling in the lake from erosion when the lake was high.
- 2) Our drinking H₂O changed this year when the flooding of South Salt Lake occurred. The lake H₂O rose 1/2 the distance from the well that is up previous to the flooding (from 1000' to within 500' approx.) When tested on Aug 12th 2011 manganese was .143 (.05 recommended) lead was 847 (200 rec.) sulfate 1130 (500 rec.) TDS 2040 (500 rec.) and it was brownish in May - June (iron in Aug < .10 (.30) Unless all the Lakes have ~~the~~ H₂O testing done in the spring & prior to the swimming season, by agency other than the R.M., and is tested for bacteria, heavy metals & pesticides water should not enter South Salt Lake.

- 3) The 30" culvert that was in South Salt Lake maintained the water level prior to 2010. When the R.M. dug their ditch thru 22-16-22 1 cabin was flooded before they (in their infinite arrogance) replaced the culvert with a 30" culvert. Because of the ^{high} H₂O level in 2010 with a 36" culvert we do not believe a 36" culvert with the sufficient in keeping the H₂O level on South Salt Lake @ a non-destructive level. It is not the R.M. of Strathclair should have

②

Control of any gated culvert on SW 27-16-22W as they do not have any credibility as to operating by any rules set out by H₂O stewardship in other projects. ex. license # 2674 re town effluence not reaching South Salt Lake.

4) Permission from us was not asked nor given to flood our land or to lose land into South Salt Lake. We are downstream from the project. (3-16-22)

5) If this project goes forward the town effluence would enter South Salt Lake. If this effluence route has to be changed that proposal should be brought forward & approved first. If it comes directly south from the lagoon it would go thru 35-16-22, 26-16-22, 23-16-22, 15-16-22, 10-16-22, 11-16-22 then it enters our land @ SE 3-16-22 where it will flood us out. License # 02-DR-269 was granted we have had excessive H₂O in the spring. For the past 2 yrs a crop has not been able to be planted and the R.M. will not change the culvert on SE 11th @ the South corner as it goes under a boundary road into Blouhard R.M. They did however lower & may have changed the size of the culvert going from 11-16-22 into us @ 3-16-22 anticipating that the effluence with a canal will change!

6) Until a project downstream of South Salt Lake is completed we ask that this project not be allowed.

South Salt Lake was a self-contained lake with natural springs @ the North end of it. Solving a problem north of Highway 16 and @ middle salt "Lake" slough will kill this lake @ this time if the project proceeds

6.

Webb, Bruce (CON)

From: John and Donna [jdgill@mymts.net]
Sent: October-10-11 2:39 PM
To: Webb, Bruce (CON) *JBW*
Subject: Strath water proposal

Attention: Bruce Webb re file:5538.00

We are writing in support of the proposal to regulate the high water levels in North & Center Salt Lakes by the R.M. of Strathclair. We appreciate the councils futile attempts to alleviate this chronic challenge as it has affected our farmland and our neighbours for several years now. We have lost roads at both ends of the Salt Lakes and if this problem is not addressed highway#16 could be in jeopardy as well in the future. This proposal looks to be a viable solution for this longstanding issue and the least damaging for the area. We hope this project will move forward as the present situation is very counter productive in a farming community.

Sincerely,
John & Donna Gill

36

REPRESENTATION AGAINST the ENVIROMENTAL ACT PROPOSAL
 filed by the R.M. of Strathclair to regulate high water levels on
 North and Central Salt Lakes

Prepared by Debby Lee (resident of the R.M. of Strathclair and life
 long user of South Salt Lake

Introduction

I was born and raised in the R.M. of Strathclair and have lived here my whole life except when I went to University and worked in Winnipeg till age 28 when I returned to take over the family farm. I farmed until 2 years ago when I retired. South Salt Lake has been used by my family since the early 1930's with my Grandfather Henderson purchasing property on the west side (Henderson's Beach). Generations of this family have used this lake for recreational use since then including my own family.

Concerns

1. How will massive amounts of water being diverted through South Salt Lake affect this body of water? The R.M. of Strathclair has stated the problem of high water levels in North and Central Salt Lake that are flooding agricultural land.(Part 1, page 7) In the report, increased drainage(Part 1, page 8) has been stated as one of the main culprit in conjunction with the wet period the area is experiencing. In this report there are no maps showing the watershed that drains into either North or Center Salt Lake. There are no maps showing the change in the watershed over the pass 10-15 years, when the flooding problem was beginning. Their solution to the plan is to create permanent ditches that will pass the problem on. If increased drainage of agricultural land is part of the cause here, why is it not being addressed? Will these permanent ditches just encourage further drainage? If so, the

problem of flooding will continue. They will or perhaps contribute agricultural land from an

landowners who do not agree with their plan.(part 2, page 23) Then the water will be passed into South Salt Lake and further on regardless of the damage that may be caused to this lake, its shores and lake shore cabins due to erosion, water quality and quantity affecting recreational use. Losses do not stop there. After putting masses amounts of water through this lake, no ditches have been planned to prevent further flooding once the water leaves the west side of the lake. Agricultural land on the west side will be affected. Whose farm land is more important?

2. Who is monitoring the water levels and deciding how much and when this water release can be done? My understanding is the R.M. of Strathclair council (of whom none have any expertise in water management) will be the control personnel in this release. Their pass record of not applying for licenses for culverts, calling states of emergencies for water drainage and not following ministerial orders to either change culverts to their proper size or closing up ditches properly after they where dug by the R.M. questions their ability to operate this proposal if given a license to do so.

Possible Solutions

1. Close any illegal ditches draining water into the Salt Lakes.
2. If some drainage has to done to alleviate the current problem, have some of it done this fall with a temporary ditch monitored by the Water Stewardship Branch.
3. Install the proper sized culvert in the west side of South Salt Lake and at a depth that lowers this lake to a correct level.
4. Look at draining water through Nip Creek Proposal, preventing some of the water going into North Salt Lake.

Thank you for considering my argument against the R.M. of Strathclair's Environmental Act Proposal.

Debby Lee

2

Webb, Bruce (CON)

From: amcnish@mymts.net on behalf of Allyson McNish [amcnish@mts.net]
Sent: October-16-11 9:12 PM
To: Webb, Bruce (CON)
Cc: blanshardcdc@inetlink.ca
Subject: Project File 5538.00 - RM of Strathclair Salt Lake Water Level Control
Attachments: File 5538 Objection Letter.docx

Importance: High

Dear Mr. Webb,

Please find attached a letter submitted for the "Notice of Environment Act Proposal" review process in regards to "Rural Municipality of Strathclair – Salt Lake Water Level Control Project (File: 5538.00).

This is our formal objection to this proposal.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, or require any additional information, please feel free to contact us at (204) 761-5606 or by email; amcnish@mts.net.

Sincerely,
Terry & Allyson McNish
RM of Blanshard
NE 28-15-22W; SW 28-15-22W; SE 28-15-22W,

October 16, 2011

Environmental Assessment & Licensing Branch
Manitoba Conservation
123 Main Street, Suite 160
Winnipeg, MB R3C 1A5

3/2

Dear Sir/Madam;

RE: **OBJECTION TO RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF STRATHCLAIR – SALT LAKE WATER LEVEL CONTROL PROJECT**
FILE: 5538.00

This letter is in direct response to the Environment Act Proposal that was filed by the Rural Municipality of Strathclair for a project to regulate high water levels on North and Centre Salt Lakes. Let it be known that herewith, we are submitting our formal objection to above quoted proposal (file #5538.00).

We are the legal land owners of the properties known as; SW 28-15-22W, NE 28-15-22W, and SE 28-15-22W of the Rural Municipality of Blanshard. We have recently purchased this land with the possession date being August 1st, 2011.

Our impressions of this property are that there has been improper/negligent drainage and poor land management in regards to water drainage and stewardship. We have obtained property maps from Agriculture Canada that show the bodies of water that are naturally occurring and should be on the land; we also have physically seen the amount of water on our land and have obtained internet images of the land that is more current than the maps provided by Agriculture Canada. The directing of water via large culverts installed on the east side (NE 28-15-22W) which is a naturally occurring stream; which should be flowing directly through the property and exiting out the most northern corner of that quarter section; is not "flowing" right through the property, but rather, "backing-up" on our property. Although there seems to be a few factors involved in this impediment (dikes & ditches), the fact is that water that did not exist on this land 10 years ago has now become a series of small "lakes" that are not receding via water movement. Water that should be "moving" through our land is now "sitting" on our land. Our conclusion is that this is due to man's manipulation and infrastructure and not nature itself.

It is the writer's intent to let it be known that we are not in agreement with this proposal, and that our land is not a "reservoir" to be used for drainage purposes of the municipalities to appease land owners that are being effected by aggressive & lucrative farmers who are "draining" their land of naturally occurring sources of water and overloading the naturally existing water systems in our province. We understand and are sympathetic to the plights of area farmers that have a primary income dependant on grain/oil seeds crops etc., (as we also are farmers) but cannot agree to environmental manipulation that changes the natural terrain of the land and benefits some, but not all people.

As we have only had possession of these properties since August 1st, 2011, our initial impressions/opinions could be erroneous, but at this time agreeing to such a proposal would be both foolish and negligent. We are not willing to risk the backing-up of additional water on our land.

Sincerely submitted,

Terry & Allyson McNish
RM of Blanshard - Municipal Land Owners