

SOUTHEAST LEAMINGTON SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT STUDY

Summary of Public Comments – Draft Strategies Report **(dated: December 6, 2006)**

Notes:

1. The following summarizes the main public comments received regarding the Baird DRAFT Sustainable Management Strategies Report (dated: December 6, 2006).
2. Responses are provided to address the comments and/or issues.
3. A complete list of actual comments submitted and related responses is attached (refer to page 5).

Comment:

It has been mentioned that there is no “preconceived” notion of what the final decision will be regarding which concept is ultimately chosen. There appears to be a “slant” of the report towards Concept D.

Response:

- There was no preconceived preferred concept for this project. At this time, four (4) DRAFT concept strategies have been presented and a preferred concept plan has not been selected. Public feedback/input on these concept plans is now being reviewed/considered to help this initiative move forward to determine a preferred long term sustainable management strategy. The findings of the study have, however, confirmed that severe down cutting and erosion is occurring along this shoreline, that biodiversity is in decline within both the Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee and landowners within the affected drainage schemes have clearly identified that the estimated costs to repair these schemes are not affordable without funding assistance. As a result of these and other concerns, it appears cost prohibitive and/or impractical for some current land use activities to continue in a sustainable fashion. Accordingly, Concept D proposes alternative land uses for portions of the affected area.
- The strategy objectives for this study were based on the 3 pillars of sustainability (natural environmental factors, economic considerations, and social factors). In addition, feedback from area stakeholders gathered from the mail out survey and public workshops were also used in formulating the objectives. These objectives were used to develop screening and evaluation criteria that were used to assess to expected beneficial outcomes from each concept. Based on these screening and evaluation criteria, Concept D will generate the most benefits and is balanced in all aspects of sustainable management. Accordingly, the findings of the study have identified that Concept D provides the most benefits when compared to Concepts A, B, and C.

Comment:

If a restoration concept is selected and properties are to be purchased over a 20 to 25 year period, it seems unreasonable to expect residents to pay for the required drain repairs.

Response:

- While people continue to inhabit the interior floodprone areas, flood protection structures must be maintained to a proper standard. Under all concepts, it is possible that people could remain in these areas for many years.
- The drainage schemes within the study area were constructed under the provisions of the Drainage Act. In accordance with the Drainage Act, the properties that benefit from the drainage works are assessed the cost related to same. At this time, funding sources

have not been found to help affected property owners with the costs of the required repairs. Typically, if maintenance works are undertaken, the costs would be assessed in accordance with the current drainage reports to the owners of the affected properties. We are unaware of a mechanism that would allow these costs to be assessed to other parties. The municipality may have additional information regarding this matter.

Comment:

Does the estimated cost for Concept D include the cost to purchase the properties within the proposed restoration area? How and who will determine the value of our property?

Response:

- Magnitude of cost estimates for Concept D that are presented in the DRAFT Sustainable Management Strategies Report include property acquisition costs. The property values are based on 2006 MPAC values. Ultimately, if a concept is selected that includes property acquisitions, it is anticipated that property values would be based on appraisals prepared by a certified property appraiser.

Comment:

How will a restoration area be sustainable without substantial and continued investment in maintaining the ditches, pumps, etc.?

Response:

- If Concept D were selected, it is understood that a large scale restoration project would require future maintenance. It is therefore suggested that funding should be obtained upfront for future capital works and/or long term maintenance works.

Comment:

It has been suggested that a minimal natural corridor connection should be considered between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee National Park. It has also been suggested that the minimum natural corridor could be located on the west side of Mersea Road 18/19 to reduce the number of properties that are impacted.

Response:

- The restoration area shown on Concept D is conceptual. With regard to overall sustainability and the size/location of a natural corridor, some issues that must be considered include the following:
 - potential adverse impacts of drainage scheme maintenance costs on the interior lands
 - minimum hydraulic and terrestrial linkages between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee
 - long-term flood and erosion protection
 - ingress/egress issues, etc.

Ultimate configuration of the area and the affect on properties would be determined in future design if a restoration concept were selected.

Comment:

How soon can a selected concept be implemented?

Response:

- At this time, four (4) DRAFT concept strategies have been presented and a preferred concept plan has not been selected. Public feedback/input on these concept plans is now being reviewed/considered to help this initiative move forward to determine a

preferred long term sustainable management strategy. The current report will be finalized by the end of February 2007. Ultimate implementation of a selected concept will result pending discussions with provincial ministries, federal agencies, local municipality, affected landowners, etc.

Comment:

Is funding available for any of the Concepts?

Response:

- At this point in time funding sources have not been secured for any portions of the DRAFT concepts and potential funding sources are unknown. The DRAFT Baird report has been circulated to various provincial ministries, federal agencies and non-government organizations for their comments on same and to obtain information and direction on potential funding sources.

Comment:

Who will own and manage the restoration area?

Response:

- At this time, as a concept has not been selected, it is premature to ascertain future ownership of a restoration area.
- Ultimate use, activities and the need for future management committees/groups within a restoration area would be determined as part of a future implementation plan if a restoration concept is selected. It is premature to anticipate the makeup of future management committees/groups at this time.

Comment:

Have you considered the potential tax loss to the Municipality of Leamington under a restoration scenario?

Response:

- It is understood that Concept D may have an impact on municipal taxes. At this conceptual stage, it is not possible to quantify the impact on municipal taxes. Reasons include but are not limited to the following:
 - The ultimate configuration of a restoration area has not been determined;
 - The number of properties affected and the impact on each property has not been determined;
 - Should a restoration proposal be undertaken, the municipality's future cost assessments for maintenance works under the Drainage Act may be reduced;
 - In some cases, owners of restoration or natural areas compensate municipalities with grants in lieu of taxes. This type of scenario could be considered for areas within a restoration concept.

Comment:

How can there be money to buy out landowners, but not to fix the dykes, Hillman Marsh, pumphouses, etc.

Response:

- At this point in time funding sources have not been secured for any portions of the DRAFT concepts and potential funding sources are unknown. The DRAFT Baird report has been circulated to various provincial ministries, federal agencies and non-

government organizations for their comments on same and to obtain information and direction on potential funding sources.

- Currently, grants are available to the municipality for portions of the costs related to municipal drainage works. For additional information regarding municipal drainage grants, contact should be made with the municipality.
- The Conservation Authority annually applies to the province for funding through the Water and Erosion Control Maintenance Program (WECI). Through the WECI program, projects are ranked and funding is allocated by a provincial wide committee to Conservation Authorities for specific projects. Last year, ERCA was successful in obtaining approximately 50% WECI funding (approx. \$700,000.00) for repair and improvements to Mersea Road 1 and the related flood protection dyke. To date, the Municipality as chosen not to proceed with this project until all issues related to this overall area (the "Big Picture") are known.
- Many shoreline protection projects have been undertaken along the Great Lakes shorelines on both private and public lands. Typically, projects on public lands are paid for with federal, provincial or municipal funding and projects on privately owned lands are paid for by the private land owners. In the 1980's and early 1990's government funding sources were available for private flood and erosion protection projects. When these funds were available, the ERCA was very successful in obtaining same and many projects were undertaken to protect privately owned properties. The funding sources for these types of projects are now very limited and are generally only provided for maintenance of previous projects.

Comment:

If proposal D is selected, we do not want the 20-25 year buyout. It would be better if this were done immediately.

Response:

- Based on comments and responses from the landowner mail out survey and the June workshops, it was identified that people wanted to stay in the area. Twenty-five years was selected for Concept D as a reasonable timeframe for people to enjoy the use of their property. This timeframe has not been finalized and would require further consideration should Concept D be selected as the ultimate concept.

Comment:

The parties who benefit the most should pay for the upgrades.

Response:

- We agree that it is reasonable to suggest that the owners of properties which benefit from shoreline and/or interior improvements should be assessed a portion of the related cost.

Comment:

Comments were received in support of all Concepts.

SOUTHEAST LEAMINGTON SUSTAINABLE MANAGEMENT STUDY

Comment Cards – Draft Strategies Report (dated: December 6, 2006)

Notes:

1. The following public comments were submitted in writing regarding the Baird DRAFT Sustainable Management Strategies Report (dated: December 6, 2006).
2. Where necessary, minor edits have been made to ensure that the comments are presented in an anonymous form.
3. Responses are provided where applicable.

Comment:

How soon can this be implemented? Do you realize you have put a stop on the sale of our property? No one is going to buy when they know what you are proposing.

Response:

- At this time, four (4) DRAFT concept strategies have been presented and a preferred concept plan has not been selected. Public feedback/input on these concept plans is now being reviewed/considered to help this initiative move forward to determine a preferred long term sustainable management strategy. The current report will be finalized by the end of February 2007. Ultimate implementation of a selected concept will result pending discussions with provincial ministries, federal agencies, local municipality, affected landowners, etc.

Comment:

In Concept "D" the Baird Group have included "hunting and fishing" to the list of activities. I concur with this recommendation and wish to register my support.

Comment:

How and who will determine the value of our property? Will the price we paid for the property plus any and all repairs/improvements be considered? We purchased the property as our retirement home and have been making the necessary improvements/repairs for this to be our permanent residence this year (2007). With all the negative publicity regarding the Lake Erie shoreline, our property value has been drastically affected... was it the intention of ERCA to circulate negative lakefront concerns in order to lower the price of properties for the purpose of acquisition?

Response:

- If a concept is selected that includes property acquisitions, it is anticipated that property values would be based on appraisals prepared by a certified property appraiser. The property values presented in the DRAFT Sustainable Management Strategies Report are based on 2006 MPAC values.
- The purpose of the study was to determine a long term sustainable management strategy for the affected area that was based on the best available science. Impacts on property values were not an initiating factor for the study.

Comment:

Who will own and manage this area? Will conservation groups like Ducks Unlimited, Delta Waterfowl, Ontario Federation of Anglers & Hunters, Southwest Sportsmen, Windsor Sportsmen be on committees involved with the area? Keep Parks Canada off this area!

Response:

- At this time, four (4) DRAFT concept strategies have been presented and a preferred concept plan has not been selected. Public feedback/input on these concept plans is now being reviewed/considered to help this initiative move forward to determine a preferred long term sustainable management strategy. Since a concept has not been selected, it is premature to ascertain future ownership of a restoration area.
- Ultimate use, activities and the need for future management committees/groups within this area would be determined as part of a future implementation plan if a restoration concept is selected. It is premature to anticipate the makeup of future management committees/groups at this time.

Comment:

How can the cost of Concept C be less than the cost of Concept D when you are buying property in D? Have you taken into account the tax loss to the Municipality of Leamington with the exodus of this number of people? Who determined where to put the existing rock wall? Why was it not constructed on the property line which juts out into the lake? If the property line had been used, the homes on Pulley Road would meet the setback requirements as outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement and also would greatly cut down undercutting and shore erosion and would develop beach to aid the Point's recovery.

Response:

- In the Draft Baird report, Concept C is more expensive than Concept D. Property values have been included in the order of magnitude costs for Concept D. These property values were based on 2006 MPAC values. It is understood that Concept D may have an impact on municipal taxes. At this conceptual stage, it is not possible to quantify the impact on municipal taxes. Reasons include but are not limited to the following:
 - The ultimate configuration of a restoration area has not been determined;
 - The number of properties affected and the impact on each property has not been determined;
 - Should a restoration proposal be undertaken, the municipality's future cost assessments for maintenance works under the Drainage Act may be reduced;
 - In some cases, owners of restoration or natural areas compensate municipalities with grants in lieu of taxes. This type of scenario could be considered for areas within a restoration concept.
- It is understood that original property limits may extend beyond the current breakwall location. Ownership of the lake bottom does not imply or guarantee the right to fill in or develop this area. Proposals to fill in this area would trigger the need for both federal and provincial approvals and would be very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain.

Comment:

I am currently a hunter and fisherman in the target area of the Sustainable Management Strategy for Southeast Leamington. I sincerely recommend that the "D" plan be adopted and administered by MNR/ERCA. I will be watching for future development of the Plan.

Comment:

The option "D" suggests that the "best" solution is to purchase properties from "willing" sellers and turn the area into a bicycle trail on the east and a pony trail on the west. Who asked for that recommendation? The study was to determine the best way to protect the shoreline from erosion and therefore to protect the residential area. The "recommendation" now seems to suggest that the best way to address the problem of protecting the residences is to make them go away. Who is the customer here? Do you really care about the people or about money? Option "C", putting breakwalls or groynes out into the lake makes some sense to most of us along the lake. These mitigations would slow down the northeast and southeast rollers coming in and the groynes would force some sand up against the shoreline to protect it from further erosion. A "win-win" situation protects the shoreline while maintaining the residences that we have worked so hard to develop and maintain at a personal cost of many thousands of dollars.

Response:

- The purpose of the study was to determine a long term sustainable management strategy for the affected area that was based on the best available science. At this time, four (4) DRAFT concept strategies have been presented and a preferred concept plan has not been selected. Public feedback/input on these concept plans is now being reviewed/considered to help this initiative move forward to determine a preferred long term sustainable management strategy. The findings of the study have, however, confirmed that severe down cutting and erosion is occurring along this shoreline. As a result of these severe conditions, it appears cost prohibitive and/or impractical for some properties to meet current provincial standards for new development or redevelopment. Accordingly, Concept D proposes alternative land uses for portions of the shoreline.
- We acknowledge your support for and recommendation of Concept C.

Comment Card:

I have reviewed all pertinent information presented at public meetings, through mailings, and finally, with the Sustainable Management Strategy for Southeast Leamington Report. With no reservations, my vote is Concept C. I strongly believe that all necessary steps must be taken to protect the private and public investments and the natural heritage of the waterfront land in question.

Comment Card:

As this was a very detailed and lengthy submission, the main concerns, comments and questions are highlighted below:

- While it has been mentioned that there is no "preconceived" notion of what the final decision will be, you would have to be ignorant to not notice the "slant" of the report towards Concept D.
- Who "scored" the "Evaluation of Benefits"? Better yet – who came up with the questions?
- Case closed on the repairs – and since the repairs have to be done, it seems *unthinkably and unreasonably* unfair to expect residents to pay for repairs, all the while knowing they will eventually be bought out.
- Where is the money collected from the tax base over the past 30 years?

- If a road needs to be repaired within Leamington, Essex, Windsor, Toronto, etc....do the residents of that road pay for these repairs on their own or are the funds derived from the taxpayers of the area as a whole?
- Does the 118 million dollar figure include the landowner buy-out? Also, have the proper assessments been done to evaluate the true costs of Concept D?
- I don't understand how this (development of a restoration area) would work without substantial and continued investment in maintaining the ditches, pumps, etc.
- I think that Concept B with the addition of a minimal natural corridor connection between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee National Park makes the most sense for the area.
- We don't know what the expensive shoreline work in Concept C would do to the natural areas.

Response:

- There was no preconceived preferred concept for this project. At this time, four (4) DRAFT concept strategies have been presented and a preferred concept plan has not been selected. Public feedback/input on these concept plans is now being reviewed/considered to help this initiative move forward to determine a preferred long term sustainable management strategy. The findings of the study have, however, confirmed that severe down cutting and erosion is occurring along this shoreline, that biodiversity is in decline within both the Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee and landowners within the affected drainage schemes have clearly identified that the estimated costs to repair these schemes are not affordable without funding assistance. As a result of these and other concerns, it appears cost prohibitive and/or impractical for some current land use activities to continue in a sustainable fashion. Accordingly, Concept D proposes alternative land uses for portions of the affected area.
- The strategy objectives for this study were based on the 3 pillars of sustainability (natural environmental factors, economic considerations, and social factors). In addition, feedback from area stakeholders gathered from the mail out survey and public workshops were also used in formulating the objectives. These objectives were used to develop screening and evaluation criteria that were used to assess to expected beneficial outcomes from each concept. Based on these screening and evaluation criteria, Concept D will generate the most benefits and is balanced in all aspects of sustainable management. Accordingly, the findings of the study have identified that Concept D provides the most benefits when compared to Concepts A, B, and C.
- The drainage schemes within the study area were constructed under the provisions of the Drainage Act. In accordance with the Drainage Act, the properties that benefit from the drainage works are assessed the cost related to same. At this time, funding sources have not been found to help affected property owners with the costs of the required repairs. If maintenance works are undertaken, the costs would be assessed in accordance with the current drainage reports to the owners of the affected properties. We are unaware of a mechanism that would allow these costs to be assessed to other parties. The municipality may have additional information regarding this matter.
- Comments/questions regarding municipal taxes and road repairs should be directed to the municipality.
- Magnitude of cost estimates for Concept D that are presented in the DRAFT Sustainable Management Strategies Report include property acquisition costs. The property values are based on 2006 MPAC values. Ultimately, if a concept is selected that includes property acquisitions, it is anticipated that property values would be based on appraisals prepared by a certified property appraiser.

- If Concept D were selected, it is understood that a large scale restoration project would require future maintenance. It is therefore suggested that funding should be obtained upfront for future capital works and/or long term maintenance works.
- We acknowledge your support and recommendation for Concept B with a minimal natural corridor connection between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee National Park. The restoration area shown on Concept D is conceptual. Ultimate configuration of the area would be determined in future design if a restoration concept were selected. Please note that one purpose of the restoration area is to provide a natural corridor between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee. The minimum corridor width will need to consider both hydraulic and terrestrial linkages.
- Presently, approximately 1 hectare of natural area is being lost per year as a result of shoreline erosion. Concept C would stop this loss of natural area.

Comment:

I believe the fifth option/proposal was that of buying up poor soil farmland south of Wheatley in order to connect Hillman to Pt. Pelee. This option gets my vote, my agreement, my enthusiasm! Pt. Pelee National Park is in danger of losing more species because of being so small and isolated. The idea of connecting Hillman Marsh to it is a long overdue absolutely fabulous idea. I've always been upset that so much wetland between Pt. Pelee and Hillman Marsh was drained back around the turn of the century and turned into, onion fields. What's more valuable, tons of onions or a whole new habitat and slew of diverse species, which could possibly be Pt. Pelee's saving grace? I hope you are working or will work with Pt. Pelee and Parks Canada to really look at implementing this option. Possibly other groups such as Ducks Unlimited would get behind this as well (personally, I'm not very pro-hunting, but whatever boosts biodiversity and habitat is, to me, the bottom line). Do whatever it takes to reclaim as much of this area back to a connected wetland corridor which was essentially "stolen" from nature a century ago.

Comment:

As this was a very detailed and lengthy submission, the main concerns, comments and questions are highlighted below.

- I submit that in a case of expropriation (however gentle and protracted) in the name of the greater environmental good such as this, landowners should not face the financial loss attendant on so-called "fair market value" purchases, but rather be compensated generously, their emotional loss and the global ecological gain accorded the respect they deserve.
- I would vote for A-B-C rather than D. What I would really champion, however, would be a strategy I don't see here (though it's been discussed), that is the creation of a limited water/woodland corridor between Hillman and Point Pelee NP.

Response:

- The property values used in the DRAFT Baird report are based on 2006 MPAC values. Ultimately, if a concept is selected that includes property acquisitions, it is anticipated that property values would be based on appraisals prepared by a certified property appraiser.
- We acknowledge your suggestion of a limited water/woodland corridor connection between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee National Park. The restoration area shown on Concept D is conceptual. Ultimate configuration of the area would be determined in

future design if a restoration concept were selected. As per your suggestion, a minimum corridor width will need to consider both hydraulic and terrestrial linkages.

Comment:

I am opposed to plan D. I don't want to lose my home. The costs for drainage and road upgrades are the same for all plans in our area so "affordability" is not an issue. Please consider a downscaled naturalization strategy, so all parties benefit to some degree.

Response:

- While people continue to inhabit the interior floodprone areas, flood protection structures must be maintained to a proper standard. Under all concepts, it is possible that people could remain in these areas for many years. Therefore, the required protection works for the interior lands are the same in all proposed options. In addition, if existing drainage works are improved to satisfy current provincial standards, previous experience suggests that possible funding sources may be available.
- Ultimate configuration of the restoration area and the affect on properties and structures located within same has not been determined at this conceptual stage.
- Ultimate configuration of the area would be determined in future design if a restoration concept were selected. Please note that the purpose of the restoration area is to provide a natural corridor between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee. To be effective a minimum corridor width will need to consider both hydraulic and terrestrial linkages.

Comment:

We moved into this area in 2000. We did not know that there would be a problem and neither did the Town of Leamington when they gave us a building permit. We built a new house and shop and tilled part of the farm and we enjoyed living here. Looking at it today, we feel the best concept would be "D" and we would be willing to sell both of our properties, the farm and the vacant building lot.

Comment:

There must be a better way to get water to the Point without disturbing homes. At one time, grants were given to the town/township for repairs. Apparently now ERCA receives these to distribute where and when they feel appropriate. How can there be money to buy out landowners, but not to fix the dykes, Hillman Marsh, pumphouses, etc. Government has protected the shoreline all along from Toronto to the Detroit River, Amherstburg, etc. Now they've decided to stop. **I do not wish to sell** but if proposal D is forced upon us, we do not want the 20-25 year buyout. It would be better if this were done immediately. Give owners replacement cost and extra along with one year to re-build elsewhere or find a suitable replacement (not a lease deal). Also, we refuse to pay for repairs if we are to be bought out eventually.

Response:

- One purpose of the restoration area shown on Concept D is to provide a natural corridor between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee to address declining biodiversity in these two natural areas. To be effective a minimum corridor width must provide for both hydraulic and terrestrial linkages. Ultimate configuration of the restoration area and the affect on properties and structures located within same has not been determined at this

conceptual stage. If a restoration concept is selected, the ultimate use and activities within this area would be determined as part of future design and implementation.

- Currently, grants are available to the municipality for portions of the costs related to municipal drainage works. For additional information regarding municipal drainage grants, contact should be made with the municipality.
- The Conservation Authority annually applies to the province for funding through the Water and Erosion Control Maintenance Program (WECI). Through the WECI program, projects are ranked and funding is allocated by a provincial wide committee to Conservation Authorities for specific projects. Last year, ERCA was successful in obtaining approximately 50% WECI funding (approx. \$700,000.00) for repair and improvements to Mersea Road 1 and the related flood protection dyke. To date, the Municipality has chosen not to proceed with this project until all issues related to this overall area (the "Big Picture") are known.
- At this point in time funding sources have not been secured for any portions of the DRAFT concepts and potential funding sources are unknown. The DRAFT Baird report has been circulated to various provincial ministries, federal agencies and non-government organizations for their comments on same and to obtain information and direction on potential funding sources.
- Many shoreline protection projects have been undertaken along the Great Lakes shorelines on both private and public lands. Typically, projects on public lands are paid for with federal, provincial or municipal funding and projects on privately owned lands are paid for by the private land owners. In the 1980's and early 1990's government funding sources were available for private flood and erosion protection projects. When these funds were available, the ERCA was very successful in obtaining same and many projects were undertaken to protect privately owned properties. The funding sources for these types of projects are now very limited and are generally only provided for maintenance of previous projects. Natural hazard policies were developed to ensure that new development is located outside of hazard areas and to put the responsibility for compliance with the policies on the property owner.
- Based on comments and responses from the landowner mail out survey and the June workshops, it was identified that people wanted to stay in the area. Twenty-five years was selected for Concept D as a reasonable timeframe for people to enjoy the use of their property. This timeframe has not been finalized and would require further consideration should Concept D be selected as the ultimate concept.
- If a concept is selected that includes property acquisitions, it is anticipated that property values would be based on appraisals prepared by a certified property appraiser. The property values presented in the DRAFT Sustainable Management Strategies Report are based on 2006 MPAC values.
- The drainage schemes within the study area were constructed under the provisions of the Drainage Act. In accordance with the Drainage Act, the properties that benefit from the drainage works are assessed the cost related to same. At this time, funding sources have not been found to help affected property owners with the costs of the required repairs. If maintenance works are undertaken, the costs would be assessed in accordance with the current drainage reports to the owners of the affected properties. We are unaware of a mechanism that would allow these costs to be assessed to other parties. The municipality may have additional information regarding this matter.

Comment:

The only viable option appears to be land acquisition.

Comment:

The "Do Nothing" concept is ridiculous. Anyone who believes we can just ignore what is happening to our shoreline hasn't been to the Wheatley Provincial Park in a while. Here you can see firsthand the extent of the erosion. In some areas, large amounts of land have "disappeared" into Lake Erie. Especially the cliffs of the Wheatley Provincial Park, where you can plainly see that over 30 or more feet of the cliff have disappeared into the lake. Where there used to be a road that curved around, close to the edge of the cliff, there are only a couple inches of the asphalt still visible and the long drainage pipes, that used to go under the road, are just sticking out of the cliff and hanging over the beach. Huge trees have collapsed from the cliffs onto the beach and into the lake. Some of our neighbours have lived in this area along the shoreline for 20 years. Storms have always been an issue and the 10 inches of rain that fell overnight in May of 2004 hit this area hard. But neighbours pulled together. Because there was no electricity, neighbours brought in portable generators to run the pumps that drain the water into the lake. But that was a freak storm, it may never happen again (let's hope not). In my opinion, Concept C seems to be the most beneficial to all concerned. Even if ERCA wanted to "buy up" all the properties in the area (a very costly endeavour), the erosion will continue if nothing is done to stop it. So money must be spent either way. Buying up the properties and turning the whole shoreline into a "nature area" will not stop the erosion. And in the end, ERCA will have spent a fortune buying out all the property and will still be left with land that is disappearing into Lake Erie. In Concept C, the plans for reinforcing the breakwalls/retaining walls, and putting in offshore breakwater/beach nourishment construction, seems to be not only fair to the landowners who have invested in this area, but will also (hopefully) save the shoreline.

Response:

- We acknowledge your support and recommendation of Concept C. In addition, we wish to clarify that ERCA's purpose for this study was to determine a long term sustainable management strategy for the affected area that was based on the best available science. The findings of the study have confirmed that severe down cutting and erosion is occurring along this shoreline, that biodiversity is in decline within both the Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee and landowners within the affected drainage schemes have clearly identified that the estimated costs to repair these schemes are not affordable without funding assistance. As a result of these and other concerns, it appears cost prohibitive and/or impractical for some current land use activities to continue in a sustainable fashion. Accordingly, Concept D proposes alternative land uses for portions of the affected area. If Concept D is selected, the future purchasers/owners of restoration areas are unknown at this time.

Comment:

On behalf of the 23,000 members Zone 3 Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters in Southwestern Ontario and of the 80,000 members of OFAH in general, we advocate the continued inclusion of hunting and angling as efficient and effective resource and land management tools with no significant adverse impacts, but many beneficial results. The application of hunting to the land use activities not only facilitates traditional uses, but also creates additional tourism and economic development incentives as well as cooperative stewardship potential. Option D is preferred to the extent that landowners are in agreement.

Comment:

Use concept A to keep the costs down. Do a study on the breakwall at Wheatley Harbour (when they put up the breakwall at the Sturgeon Creek Marina entrance, it eroded the shoreline all the way down to Paula's Restaurant. They had to take the playground equipment off of the Mersea Park Beach because the breakwall changed the currents and caused all the erosion) to see if it can be altered to prevent or lessen the erosion along the east shore. Get rid of your Concept D. Altogether, this would cost a lot of money. If there is still erosion going on along the beach, this money could go toward that issue in the future. As far as the shoreline in Point Pelee is concerned, they waste so much government money, let them take care of their own problems. As far as habitat for birds, there are enough birds around here already. I think you better put people before wildlife.

Response:

- We acknowledge your support and recommendation of Concept A with the inclusion of a sand management plan for Wheatley Harbour.
- You further recommend that Concept D should be abandoned since money spent on this concept could be used for future shoreline works. It is important to note that the purpose of this study was to determine a long term sustainable management strategy for the affected area that was based on the best available science. The study has confirmed that, not only are there severe shoreline issues, there are also concerns regarding biodiversity within both the Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee and landowners within the affected interior drainage schemes have clearly identified that the estimated costs to repair these schemes are not affordable without funding assistance. Consideration must be given to all of these issues and not just the shoreline. Based on the study findings, it appears cost prohibitive and/or impractical for some current land use activities to continue in a sustainable fashion. Accordingly, Concept D proposes alternative land uses for portions of the affected area. The strategy objectives for this study were based on the 3 pillars of sustainability (natural environmental factors, economic considerations, and social factors). In addition, feedback from area stakeholders gathered from the mail out survey and public workshops were also used in formulating the objectives. These objectives were used to develop screening and evaluation criteria that were used to assess to expected beneficial outcomes from each concept. Based on these screening and evaluation criteria, Concept D is balanced in all aspects of sustainable management and provides the most benefits when compared to Concepts A, B, and C. At this time, however, a preferred concept plan has not been selected. Public feedback/input on these concept plans is now being reviewed/considered to help this initiative move forward to determine a preferred long term sustainable management strategy.

Comment:

ERCA is not considering all concepts available. Concept "E" could be 700 metres west side of County Road 37 towards the Airport from Hillman Marsh to Point Pelee. I do not understand why the government can find funding for a national park shoreline protection project but not for existing interior landowners. Concept E: 700 metres to the west of County Road 37. 1) The Town owns municipal pond property between Concessions A & B. 2) Restoration project between C & D, not many homes (maybe 12 total). The cost would be considerably less, the shoreline still needs upgrading, biodiversity is achieved, the park is extended and attached to Hillman Marsh. Land is for sale at the corner of "A" and County Road 37, this could be the inlet from Hillman to Point Pelee Greenway.

Response:

- At this point in time funding sources have not been secured for any portions of the DRAFT concepts and potential funding sources are unknown. The DRAFT Baird report has been circulated to various provincial ministries, federal agencies and non-government organizations for their comments on same and to obtain information and direction on potential funding sources.
- We acknowledge your suggestion that Concept D could be revised to provide a minimum width corridor on the west side of Mersea Road 18/19. Ultimate configuration of the area and the affect on properties and structures located within same has not been determined at this conceptual stage. With regard to overall sustainability, some issues that must be considered include the following:
 - potential adverse impacts of drainage scheme maintenance costs on the interior lands
 - minimum hydraulic and terrestrial linkages between Hillman Marsh and Point Pelee
 - long-term flood and erosion protection
 - ingress/egress issues, etc.
- These issues would be dealt with in future design if a restoration concept is selected.

Comment:

The shoreline is the first line of defense against interior land flooding. Who will benefit the most from the outcome of this study? *ERCA, Parks Canada, Tourism, Owners, General Public*. The parties who benefit the most should pay for the upgrades. If the project is to proceed over the next 20 years, who pays to keep private lands up to provincial standards in the meantime? What are the consequences to the property owners if they refuse to sell under "willing buyer, willing seller"? A large number of shoreline owners live on a fixed income. How will they be able to pay for any portion of any improvement for shoreline protection? Past and present owners paid for mistakes made in 1973, now they are asked to pay again while the parties that caused the problem don't have to pay. Present landowners will be penalized again. There are well-documented objections to the cannibalization of the lake bed by sand sucking which were ignored by senior levels of government at the time. The liability for mistakes made by others should not rest on the shoulders of current landowners. The cost for corrective measures should be borne by the entire province/country.

Response:

- The purpose of this study was to determine a long term sustainable management strategy for the affected area that was based on the best available science. Who will benefit the most from the outcome of the study was not a study objective. All aspects of sustainability (natural environmental factors, economic considerations and social factors) must be considered when assessing conceptual strategies. Utilizing this approach, it is possible to establish which conceptual strategy provides the most overall benefits and is balanced in all aspects of sustainable management.
- We agree that it is reasonable to suggest that the owners of properties which benefit from shoreline and/or interior improvements should be assessed a portion of the related cost. With regard to infrastructure that was constructed under the provisions of the Drainage Act, the properties that benefit from the drainage works are assessed the cost related to same. At this time, funding sources have not been found to help affected property owners with the costs of the required repairs. If maintenance works are undertaken, the costs would be assessed in accordance with the current drainage

reports to the owners of the affected properties. We are unaware of a mechanism that would allow these costs to be assessed to other parties. The municipality may have additional information regarding this matter.

- It is premature to comment on details of potential future property acquisition. Property acquisition would be dealt with through a future implementation strategy if a restoration concept is selected.
- Concept B proposes the adoption of a community based approach to implement flood and erosion protection along the shoreline. With a unified and collective voice, the shoreline communities can work together with ERCA and local government to design cost effective solutions that will extend the design life of existing protection. The amount of design life achieved by the upgrades will be directly proportional to the investment in the protection. Where individuals choose to live and how they afford the related costs are the responsibility of the individual. One objective of the draft shore protection concepts is to try and protect the investments that private individual have already made into their shoreline properties.
- One goal of the study was to understand the shoreline processes in this area. It was not an objective of the study to point or assign blame. The DRAFT Baird report identifies severe shoreline hazards management concerns along this reach of shoreline and presents draft concept strategies that consider same to varying degrees.

Comment:

Please find enclosed a petition of ratepayers opposed to concept D of the report. This is just a brief sampling of some of the people in the area. I did not have time to go door to door and talk to everyone. If you need more signatures, let me know and we can get someone to go door to door and get a 100% response. Since the majority of people are against concept D, I recommend that you rethink that proposal and look more closely at concept C where people are not being displaced. If senior levels of government can afford to spend 118 million on concept D, then surely they can spend 183 million on concept C, which, as mentioned by your staff, is the Cadillac of the 4 concepts. The general consensus is that government has to pay much more than just the MPAC assessed property values for concept D to even be considered. Thank you for your consideration of this petition. (Petition was attached to this comment. It contained signatures of 59 landowners, some of whom were occupants of the same residence.)

Response:

- At this time, four (4) DRAFT concept strategies have been presented and a preferred concept plan has not been selected. Public feedback/input on these concept plans is now being reviewed/considered to help this initiative move forward to determine a preferred long term sustainable management strategy.
- At this point in time funding sources have not been secured for any portions of the DRAFT concepts and potential funding sources are unknown. The DRAFT Baird report has been circulated to various provincial ministries, federal agencies and non-government organizations for their comments on same and to obtain information and direction on potential funding sources.
- If a concept is selected that includes property acquisitions, it is anticipated that property values would be based on appraisals prepared by a certified property appraiser. The property values presented in the DRAFT Sustainable Management Strategies Report are based on 2006 MPAC values.

Comment:

We understand the importance of doing things the right way and permanently. We further understand how important Point Pelee National Park and the environment are, but you are asking us to pick up our homestead and move somewhere else. This is a huge step for some people, especially us. We would leave if the "willing buyers" were very gracious. We would like market value and some little extras, like giving us some reasonable time to find a place to move into. We would need to have the money up front. This is not easy for us and we would like to do this as soon as possible as we are anticipating bad news from the auto industry. We are asking you to please be fair. If we do have to move, we do not feel that we should have to pay a share of the dyke and road repairs and the lake berms because this is not going to benefit us long-term. Our neighbours all agree with us that, if concept D is adopted, acquisition should take place as quickly as possible. We want fair market value for our homes, but also replacement-value compensation for our land and barns. Please realize that people love this beautiful area and will find it very difficult to leave. If we do move, it won't be to the Town of Leamington as they only care to help out business and not residents unless you live in town. I can't even get a pothole filled just to make my road a little safer to drive on. Anyway, if this is going to happen, please don't drag it on, come and see us and discuss a good, fair plan to help us start a new life as comfortably as we can. We are not going to try to "bleed" you, but we are also not going to let you treat us unfairly. No more pussy-footing around, please make a plan in the next couple of months, talk to each landowner personally, home to home. Some people are laid up at home on oxygen machines or have been unable to attend meetings due to work schedule conflicts. Buy out the ones who want to go now, make fair assessments and plans and we are sure that others will follow as soon as they see things will be good for landowners and their families. In talking to some people in the affected area, it seems they are concerned that this process will take so long, that they will be dead before anything happens. Please be honest and open with us and you may find that people respond better. We are ready to sell. Please show us you are serious.

Comment:

The new environmental corridor could be managed by ERCA or the MNR, to be managed with hunting (waterfowl) and fishing in mind. If the houses in Elmdale/Cotterie are purchased, this could be top Prow habitat. Will this concept "D" affect the Scap duck that overwinters here from Point Pelee to Hillman Beach? Trends show that this duck is in serious decline. My organization would like to be involved in the environmental corridor.

Comment:

The report is extensive and by and large, the rationale and proposed concepts make sense to me. The "100" year standards for flood and erosion are based primarily on unprotected shorelines and record lake levels, however, the situation today in our community is quite different. We all have "protected" shorelines of some type and have not experienced normal erosion levels. On the rare occasions where we have had flooding, damage is not significant and dangerous conditions were not evident. I see no justification to the suggested setback and building levels. I agree that "standards" are necessary and essential but they need to be more realistic. When I look at proposals "B" through "D", I see the necessary elements for a stabilized beach environment that approaches the beauty and natural loveliness shown in photos from back in the 40s. As originally designed and conceived, the Marentette Drainage Canal was supposed to include a lake outlet. For whatever reason, this didn't happen. As a result, the canal is a static bed of water acting as a reservoir for the farm acreage. During the wet season, it rises to the point of flooding. During the dry season, it drops as much as 2-3 feet. It is a stagnant cesspool and a breeding ground for insects. It is subject to contamination from the cottage septic systems

during the wet season. The solution to this could be to make the canal an integral part of the environment and by that I mean that the drainage systems should be utilized to maintain a natural flow from the Hillman area to Point Pelee Park. The drainage system should incorporate the ability to promote lake water "in" or "out". Pumping from the fields should be directed to needful marsh environments (i.e. park or "recovered" acres). Take advantage of the natural assets of future "concepts" by introducing boat access to lake shoreline recreation areas, especially, but not limited to beach drainage canals. I look forward to the subsequent development of this ambitious plan and have only one regret and that is that I will not be here to see the final results. Hopefully, my children will benefit from your efforts. Good Luck.