

A14  
Brian Johnston  
P.O. Box 88  
Beaconia MB R0E 0B0

November 15, 2010

Environmental Assessment & Licensing Branch  
Manitoba Conservation  
123 Main Street, Suite 160  
Winnipeg MB R3C 1A5  
Fax: (204) 945-5229  
Email: [Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca](mailto:Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca)



Ref: File 5486.00 - Rettie Boat Access

Dear Bruce,

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the above referenced Environment Assessment Proposal (EAP) Report and project in general. I am against the proposal.

I am dumfounded as to why the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) would have originally agreed to such a proposal. On paper the proposal may appear to have merit but as any long time resident of the area knows such a concept is without merit for several reasons. Additionally, the original request was shortsighted because it did not include the now proposed boat launch and dock.

The proposed boat access channel depends on the mouth of the Beaconia Marsh for lake access. A well-known fact is that the marsh mouth depth varies according to the lake water level as well as the height of the lake deposited shifting sand in the mouth. Often I can paddle a canoe through the marsh mouth but not without touching bottom. Beach walkers, including myself, wade between the eastside lake beach and Beaconia Beach by crossing this shallow mouth. The depth does increase during high water but the increased depth is caused by strong waves and winds moving water south and into the south basin, which often results in a lake state unsuitable for pleasure craft.

In Appendix 1 of the Rettie EAP report, even though DFO stated that "no excavation/dredging will be required in the existing bay" they also stated "at the mouth of the bay, a 3 m (10 ft) by 1.5 m (5 ft) area will be excavated at the shoreline to connect the proposed channel to Lake Winnipeg." Regardless of DFO's contradictory statements, it is foolhardy to think that this excavated/dredged mouth

will stay open. The lake will deposit sand and the mouth will revert to its previous state—un-navigable to motorized craft.

Moreover, the Rettie EAP report clearly states on page 11 that he “would require a 10’ access through 20’ of weeds” but that access magnitude has quadrupled. On page 2 the report states, “The excavating will be done entirely on our property except for the 80’ access to the lake.” This 80’ is in clear contradiction of the DFO statement “no excavation/dredging will be required in the existing bay” and clearly grossly exceeds the 10 ft by 5 ft excavation noted at the mouth. Unquestionably, the proposed project to DFO and the final or constructed project are not one in the same.

As a final statement on the viability of proposed boat access channel using the mouth of the Beaconia Marsh for lake access, I direct you to the Rettie EAP Appendix 4, Green Spaces Environment report. It stated “one could walk” because “the water was just about knee-depth, slightly lower if there was no wind.” The Green Spaces Environment report also stated, “It is worth noting that many Carp were trapped in the lagoon this year when the entrance was plugged.” Even though it is well-known that the lake levels have exceeded the 715 ft high level all summer is comes as not surprise to local residents that the mouth access was plugged. From the start, this concept was without merit.

As Manitoba Hydro regulates Lake Winnipeg water levels between 711 and 715 feet, and because the wind effect on the lake also greatly alters the lake levels, a five foot deep access channel, depending on its elevation, could be either dry or overflowing with its berm underwater.

It is no surprise for avid users of the area to find the causeway road to Beaconia Beach impassable as the lake levels greatly vary. As the Green Spaces Environment report noted, “Lake Winnipeg is famous (notorious) for its terrible windstorms...the road along the south side of the lagoon was covered by more than a meter of water...” During such conditions, I question the integrity of the boat channel, especially the berm.

I reiterate that by only using the likes of maps (such as Appendix 6 of the EAP report), this boat launch and channel may appear viable, but upon a more in-depth investigation, it may be determined that such a proposal is without merit. I would like to know where the actual beach shoreline edge was in relation the excavated channel because DFO specifically stated, “the boat access channel will be excavated on land...along the existing tree line and will be above the high water mark.” The channel was to be construction along the tree line, where as to me it appears that it has been dug out of the marsh. It is of concern that neither DFO nor the Selkirk & District Planning Area Board permit in the EAP Appendix 9 required Grade Elevations. Obviously, elevations are most critical in this project. Likewise, there was no indication that a survey certificate was required. Any project of this

magnitude and scope, notably construction along the property boundary above the high water mark, should require confirmation of that those benchmarks.

For visual overview as well as for confirmation of various concerns and issues, I direct you to the photographs of 16-19 August via the link posted at the East Beach Conservation Coalition (EBCC) website, <http://ebconservation.ca>, which clearly shows numerous problems and violations including the failing plug, failing fencing, and overland flooding to the high water mark.

It is with great concern that the original DFO issued guidelines were not adhered to with respect to the length, width, or depth. In fact, they were grossly exceeded. For example, the 700 ft length more than doubled and became 1,600 ft long. Likewise, the 15 ft wide blossomed and almost doubled to 25 ft.

Furthermore, DFO required that “a plug of untouched soil” be used, but at the site I saw excavation that indicated that beach material was unused as part of the plug. Continuing, DFP stated, “that the ‘plug’ should be of sufficient size so that it does not blow out during a high wind set-up or rainfall events.” It is a well-known fact that the plug did in deed fail and had to be re established.

Additionally, DFO required that the owner “consult a riparian specialist, such as Native Plant Solutions to help you determine the type of plants best suited for your area.” I noticed coniferous planted along the shoreline—the only coniferous trees visible. All other trees in the vicinity are deciduous and the planted evergreen trees look out of place. In fact, the Rettie EAP report states “the area excavated consists of grasses, bushes and small maple trees” but then states “spruce trees, which have been planted.” Moreover, the Green Space Environment report that was included in the EAP states, “...the woods are dominated by ash. The woods are primarily deciduous with a small amount of Balsam Fir.” Clearly, the owners are planting what they wish and are not heeding the specialists’ report nor the DFO requirements.

The increased eastern shoreline height may act as a dike as lakeshore properties drain to the lake.

As indicated by the Green Spaces Environment report, the marsh is a sanctuary, for flora, fauna, amphibians, birds, and reptiles, as well as residents and tourists who choose to observe all that this pristine area has to offer. To quote the Green Space environment report, “The tranquility of the setting, aptly described as ‘nature’s paradise’, was transformed by the construction of the long trench and berm.” Nothing more should need to be said. It is of great concern that the owners will to expand on the project by constructing a boat launch and dock which is in direct opposition to the Green Space Environment report statement, “The challenge now is to try to harmonize this intrusion with its surrounding and attempt to mitigate for the environmental changes.” I fail to see how the construction a boat launch and dock will harmonize the surrounding and mitigate environmental changes.

Irrefutably, the EAP proposal includes numerous differences in specifications and scope from the original plan submitted to DFO.

I have also been informed that EAP report in question is incomplete for the following reason:

- "Appendix 6 - Land Use Designation for Site and Adjoining Land Plan" was not included
- The required 90' setback from the ordinary high water mark was not adhered to, which has yet to be confirmed
- There has been no drainage plan provided as required by the Selkirk & District Planning Area Board permit.
- There was no consultation with the public nor with the Lakeshore Erosion Technical Committee as required by Selkirk & Area District Planning Area Board requirements.


It saddens me that all this destruction and development is allowed to progress, in spite of blatant disregard for the rules and regulations as well as the reality that such a concept is without merit given the nature of the locale.

A more viable option, which is also marsh and community friendly, would have been to proposal a boat launch on the north side of the property, which could be used during certain times when the lake levels permit safe egress from the marsh. Access to a northern site boat launch could be via a path or private lane/road from the south. As stated in the EAP report, "the north end of the property has a deeper and more direct access to the lake."

The most effective alternative would be to utilize the public pier and boat launch at mile road 100, less than two miles away, to launch and perhaps even store the boat at a berth. This is the option exercised by most residents. Furthermore, there are other public boat launches in the east beaches area such as Sunset Beach, Grand Beach, Belair, Hillside Beach, Victoria Beach, etc.

It is clear that this project has been amiss since its conception. I encourage you to protect the Beaconia Marsh and deny any further development. As the Green Spaces Environment report affirmed, the marsh is a pristine sanctuary for flora, fauna, folks, and families to inhabit and visit. To quote, "The tranquility of the setting, aptly described as 'nature's paradise', was transformed by the construction of the long trench and berm." This region begs to be restored to its original virgin state. It is requesting your. Help save Beaconia Marsh.

Sincerely,



Brian Johnston

**Webb, Bruce (CON)**

---

**From:** redcats@mymts.net on behalf of Stu McKay [redcats@mts.net]  
**Sent:** November-15-10 2:39 PM  
**To:** Webb, Bruce (CON) BW  
**Subject:** Wetland Distruction?

Attention; Mr Bruce Webb,

Would you be so kind as to elaborate as to what exactly is the intentions are for the massive destruction of the lands involving Beaconia Marsh?

Please see link below for information on this subject.

<http://www.ebconservation.ca/>

As a lifelong resident of Manitoba and the region, I have great concerns regarding the future health and welfare of our precious wetlands.

I have to then assume that all documents are in order and all permits are in place in order for this destruction and interruption of this pristine wetland to proceed.

As a concerned resident, I once again repeat my question by politely asking you to elaborate as to what is the intended or future use of this site.

Look foreword to your reply.

I remain,

Stu McKay

**Webb, Bruce (CON)**

**From:** Mo Tipples [motipples@shaw.ca]  
**Sent:** November-16-10 11:49 AM  
**To:** Webb, Bruce (CON) *BN*  
**Subject:** Beaconia Beach

Hi Bruce,

I am a very concerned cottager who is part of the Grindstone Provincial Park community and also an activist on environmental Water Issues. Our group called Save Our Lake ( SOUL) as part of our cottage community, tries hard to educate and inform our cottagers about appropriate environmental stewardship. I am therefore astounded to hear about the Beaconia Beach and Marsh situation on the eastern Lakeshore. I understand that the RM of St Clements has already allowed the construction of a very long and wide channel to be constructed by heavy machinery through the Beaconia Marsh area. Some question also arises about whether or not further development of another housing development will be constructed on the private land behind this lake shore work. I hesitate to call it a cottage development as this is not the norm these days! Where or from whom has advice been solicited for this any of this lake shore destruction ? Do Federal and Provincia regulations not have to be adhered to even before work begins?

- Given that the Province recently announced and received federal money for the construction and restoration of Wetlands in the Province, the construction/ destruction in the Beaconia area is contrary to the Policy of our government. How can this happen?  
What sort of example does this set? It has been proved by various studies that Wetlands have an intrinsic value as agents in removing Nutrients from the water as well as being an area of protection for wildlife and fauna. Why therefore are we allowing a wetland, which is also shoreline habitat to be destroyed?
- What has happened to Environmental assessments for such projects? Where is the paperwork and instructions from F&O Canada? I know from personal experience at our lot at Grindstone several years ago that NO heavy equipment can be used on the shoreline. I have a letter from F \$ O informing us that **one rock**, which we wanted to move slightly, had to be rolled...no machinery! This was also to be monitored by Conservation if we proceeded. It remains where it was!  
Where was Conservation or Water Stewardship in this whole Beaconia destruction episode? I believe they were informed fairly early that it was happening.
- My husband and I travelled the SW corner of the S Basin last week to see first hand the damage caused by the Weather Bomb. It was very interesting to see how destructive the power of the wind and subsequent waves could cause so much damage to areas close to the Lake. Any future development on the E shore could be subject to equally as much damage.  
The Province has frequently in the last few years been subject to claims for water damage by any number of flood prone cottage and housing areas. Is it wise to add even more potential disaster sites to an already burgeoning problem?

I find this whole matter extremely disturbing. A mixed message is being given out to the public that it is OK to break the regulations if you want and face the consequences after. Perhaps be faced by a meager fine, which with the present topics being discussed would be a drop in the bucket ! Are their some rules for the general public and others for those with connections and deep pockets? Is it OK for the Province to have a new plan for Wetland construction and restoration only to be broken even before work begins?

I urge the Province to think profoundly about what is going on in this situation. If you open the door here it could be followed by a profusion of other similar situations. Regulations will become a joke. Take a firm hand and show strong leadership, please !

Sincerely, Mo Tipples.

**Webb, Bruce (CON)**

---

**From:** Hugh A [hark@mts.net]  
**Sent:** November-16-10 3:14 PM BW  
**To:** Webb, Bruce (CON)  
**Cc:** Water Stewardship, Minister (LEG); Conservation, Minister (LEG); ebcc@live.ca  
**Subject:** File 5486.00 Rettie Boat Access

Dear Mr. Webb:

I note that the family which has severely damaged the Beaconia Marsh for the frivolous purpose of seasonal, intermittent, recreational boating is now fully expecting your office to approve ongoing construction. To do so would enable provincial authorities to pursue the same stupid course of action as the federal and municipal authorities who have already bungled this file. Larry, Curly and Moe would be proud.

This exercise should not be an examination of the environmental issues as much as it should be a trial of the public servants who authorized this abomination. I want an apology. Because there can be no "explanation". Any first year Environmental Studies student could do a term paper on the nonsense of squandering marshes. (Aside to the proponent: the destruction of marshes in the Gimli area in no way dooms every other marsh on Lake Winnipeg to the same shabby treatment.)

You know, for several years we have been gnashing our teeth and wringing our hands over the eutrophic state of the lake. Its last line of defence is the marshes that form its shores. If you don't know why, look it up.

Furthermore, we as a province, have been beseeching other jurisdictions uphill from us to help "save our lake". Are you kidding me? What do you imagine their response is when we continue to soil our own shorts?

Approve this and say hello to Larry and Curly.

Yours truly,  
C. Hugh Arklie  
Box 126 RR 2  
Dugald, MB ROE OKO

**Re: Objection to Robert and Margaret Rettie Proposal – Rettie Boat Access (File:5486.00)**

A18

I am a resident of Island Beach, Manitoba and my property abuts the property of Robert and Margaret Rettie SE 16-17E Access in Beaconia. The first statement in the proposal indicates that the intent of Robert and Margaret Rettie was to build a canal for boat access from the Beaconia Marsh “near the north end of the property to a boat launch and docking area near the south end of the property.”

**a) flaws in the request to build a boat access.**

In their application to the DFO, Robert and Margaret Rettie make a **simple request to build a boat access into their cottage for their personal boat**. The Letter of Advice for this development stipulated that the channel was to be no more than 700 feet in length, five feet deep and fifteen feet wide. To date the channel extends along the shore line of Beaconia Beach from the road known as 98 N and extending well beyond 2500 feet. There is no indication that a channel is being built “into” the property. The channel is built “along” the shore line. In the request to the DFO there was no mention of a boat launch to the north and a docking area to the south. The DFO Letter of Advice is very clear in stating that any changes in plans needed to be submitted to the DFO before proceeding. From my perspective, this advice has been completely ignored and the Robert and Margaret Rettie have chosen to excavate the riparian vegetation by removing the bull rushes which are nature’s filtering system, the willows whose root system provide a very capable and strong protection for the shore line, and many large trees which have been for many years the nesting area for the bald eagles. It would appear to me that the Letter of Advice from the DFO has been interpreted by Robert and Margaret Rettie as they choose. They seem to have ignored the advice that any changes in their plans were to be sent to the DFO which would allow the DFO time to investigate and then provide any additional advice.

**b) ignoring the procedures of the Selkirk and District Planning Board re: permits**

The excavation of the marsh shoreline was well under way before it came to the attention of any of the residents in Island Beach, including myself whose property will be changed by this development. When this excavation was reported to the Selkirk and District Planning Board, Robert Rettie immediately went into Selkirk and within a few hours had all the permits required using as a lame excuse that since he was from Alberta he did not know that he needed permits. This display of ignorance of the rules does not sit well with me especially when all the policies and procedures are available on the internet. I was even more shocked when Mayor Strang stated on CBC radio that Mr. Rettie did not know the process since he was from Alberta, and that it seemed only right that he be given the right to build a channel into his property to avoid his boat being vandalised. What is an even greater shock to my intelligence is the speed whereby the Selkirk and District Planning Board issued the necessary permits – overlooking the need for an environmental impact study. By the time the permits were granted, Mr. Rettie had already exceeded the 700 foot restriction on the length of the channel and still a permit was granted which allowed him to extend the excavation to well beyond 2500 feet.

**c) excavating below the OHWM and non-compliance with the Fisheries Act**

From the description in a DFO publication concerning aquatic vegetation removal, the removal is to be by the use of hands of mechanical means that will assure that there will be a large release of sediments. In the removal of the riparian vegetation along the edge of Beaconia Marsh, Robert and Margaret Rettie used at least three giant land excavators and an equal number of caterpillars to strip away the vegetation of bull rushes, the trees and willows, and to use the earth from the channel to build a “new” berm. With the excavation taking place in the marsh, I am sure that damage and disruption to the aquatic species that would be in hibernation and whose future was not only put at risk but actually destroyed. In the document from the DFO there is a statement that I will quote, **“Under the Fisheries Act no one may carry out work or undertaking that will cause the harmful alteration, disruption or destruction (HADD) of fish habitat unless it has been authorized by the DFO. By following the conditions and measures set out below you will be in compliance with subsection 35(1) of the Fisheries Act.**

To this end, Robert and Margaret Rettie appear to have been excavating below the Ordinary High Water Mark. I see this as a blatant disregard for the legislation that is in place to protect and preserve the health of all aquatic life. In the proposal I see no evidence or indication that there was an attempt or a will to adhere to regulations that are in place for not just Beaconia Beach but for all wetlands and marshes and coastlines in our nation.



**d) denied the right to access information on the ruse that this would contravene the Privacy Act**

I have had difficulty finding anyone willing to answer so many of my questions around the development under way in the Beaconia Marsh. Any mention of the word “development” has been met with denials and deceit. In the proposal now available from Robert and Margaret Rettie is has been very clear to some in places of political power and responsibility that their intent all along has been “development”. Attached to their proposal is a copy of the original Planning Board’s Permit which states that the channel was just an initial step for a larger plan. It is my understanding that when a parcel of land is to be developed this plan needs to be made public, there are to be hearings, and a property owner like myself whose land abuts that of Robert and Margaret Rettie’s property has the right to suggest and demand variances that would protect my privacy and safety. To develop that parcel of land will require landfill which places my property at risk from flooding. Furthermore, to develop this piece of land with homes and the possibility of at least three channels into the property will require piles being driven into soil that is basically a swamp. The potential of piles being driven into the soil would place the artesian well network beneath that area at risk – and this has every possibility of allowing contaminants to enter the drinking water that comes into my home, that supplies Island Beach, and indeed which also supplies drinking water to the larger community. I have raised my concerns around the potential danger of contaminating the water supply but my concerns seem to have fallen on deaf ears at almost every level. This includes the Water Stewardship, the DFO, the Conservation Department, the Municipality of the RM of St. Clements. I want answers to my concerns as to who will be responsible for the protection of the drinking water supply in this area.

**e) new information and/or information withheld re: the development with a boat launch and dock and potential damage to aquatic life and the environment**

In the proposal submitted by Robert and Margaret Rettie that began with a simple request “**to build a boat access into their cottage for their personal boat**” there are attachments revealing the building of a boat launch that will be in the northern portion of the channel and dock built in the southern portion of the channel. Both of these structures are of a size that means there is every possibility that they will jut into the Beaconia Marsh – placing at greater risk the aquatic life of the plants, fishes, and other species. To maintain any degree of stability I am confident that several piles will have to be driven into the marsh and this again contravenes the Fisheries Act. Although Robert and Margaret Rettie maintain that there will be no need to dredge the channel between Beaconia Beach and Island Beach, the truth remains that the channel is a shallow channel and the winds and waves off Lake Winnipeg create sand bars. This will mean that dredging will be a necessity. Dredging would interfere with the beach area of Island Beach where many families use for swimming. I do not believe that this has been fully investigated and I would want reassurance that dredging would never be required – nor that permission to dredge would ever be granted.

**f) inaccurate definitions of the vegetation in the marsh and the sand used for the plug**

In the proposal there is a map of the marsh where Robert and Margaret Rettie have identified the growth in the northern portion as **grass** and in the southern area near Beaconia Beach as portion identified as **weeds**. Am not a scientist but I believe the **grass** really are bull rushes and the **weeds** are reeds. Surely these are essential and natural elements that have the unique task of filtering toxins from the water. In another part of their proposal they identify the area known as Island Beach as a sand bar (which I know the sand from that area was used to build the plug and I have several pictures on the EBCC Website showing the Bobcat in action , and which I believe is in reality Crown Land. When this was reported to Water Stewardship we were told that the sand was inappropriate for the building of the plug. The action taken by Water Stewardship was to issue a stop work order. In the proposal there is no mention of being issued a work order. I wonder if this is another breach in the process where the owners chose to pursue the development without the necessary steps being taken. The RM of St Clements do have a bylaw which states hat it illegal to have an ATV or other vehicles on the beach with fines that could be up to \$1000.00 and the possibility of confiscating the vehicles. I guess it is okay to turn a blind eye on such details! I do know that the soil at the base of the plug came from inland and was later covered with the sand from Island Beach. It has been my understanding that it is illegal to remove sand from beaches – especially when the beach is a coast line. To date I have heard of no action being taken against Robert and Margaret Rettie for this intrusive activity.

### **g) ownership of the marsh: the proper delineation of the coastal wetland**

Robert and Margaret Rettie produced a map that I believe has no legal acceptability to claim the water and the land to be their property. There is a suggestion that possibly 5% of the development of the berm required them to impinge on Crown Land. **This needs to be verified and clarified.** There has been excavation in the existing bay. There has been soil taken from the inner portion of Robert and Margaret's land and this land has been dumped into the Marsh to build the base for the portion of the channel to the plug. I was present and watched this activity and must say that I was appalled. I have been one of the voices seeking a clear and accurate statement around the ownership of the coast line. In Robert and Margaret Rettie's proposal they seem to claim ownership of the land and the water area in the marsh. I expect a decisive and clear statement as to who owns the marsh. Also I expect a clear and decisive statement of what portion of the coast line would fall under the description of "Crown Land" and what portion of the Crown Land has been excavated. The original berm has been more than tampered with and a new berm has been built as part of this development. The newly constructed berm has not stopped the waters during the summer from flowing over it and being trapped inland. In fact the channel and berm that is now in place has trapped the water to the point where the trail from Island Beach to the shore has been under water most of the summer. When the winds were high in the past the water did cover the pathway – but the water soon subsided and one could walk on dry land to the lake. Not so this year! Not so since the channel has been constructed!

### **h) impact of the excavation on the wildlife and the environment**

In the proposal there is a hint that the excavation has damaged the wildlife, the wetlands, the health and well-being of Beaconia Marsh. However, one almost gets the impression from the proposal that the wild life, the vegetation, the aquatic life, and the environment will be enhanced by planting a boat launch and dock on the coast line and into the marsh. During the Spring and Summer months, I have noted that the Bald eagles have lost their nesting trees. There was one goose family as opposed to countless geese in past years. There were no blue herons, no ducks, no egrets and no pelicans. There were some beaver but they have moved inland and are now at work cutting down trees to create dams in the ditch near the Road known as 99N. There have been otters too but not in the numbers that were there in the past. The consultant clearly states that this damage is real and has no solid information that would indicate that the Marsh might be able to survive this rape. There is sufficient literature to indicate that such drastic impacts to the marsh can often provide room for invasive species that could in the long term be deleterious to the future health of what was a bountiful, lush, and attractive environment.

I believe that Robert and Margaret Rettie have damaged and destroyed much of the plant and aquatic life in Beaconia Marsh and should be responsible for restoring the Beaconia Marsh as close to its original state as is humanly possible. Further, I believe I have every right to have my property and water protected from any developmental plans. As well, I believe I have the right to be spared the risks of oil and gasoline spillages in this environment which is much like my back yard. With a boat launch structure and a very large dock in the plans, one can imagine there will be more than the one personal boat belonging to Robert and Margaret Rettie using the channel in the marsh to moor their boats which means as well that there will be noise factor to contend with. Hopefully all of this can be avoided by disallowing the boat launch and the dock to be built, and by permanently ending any further excavating channels inland.

Respectfully yours,  
Wayne Larstone,  
34 Frontier Drive,  
Island Beach, Manitoba

A19

**Webb, Bruce (CON)**

---

**From:** hobart1@mymts.net on behalf of Jean Speers [hobart1@mts.net]  
**Sent:** November-16-10 2:55 PM  
**To:** Webb, Bruce (CON)  
**Subject:** File 5486, Rettie Boat Access

3304 Assiniboine Avenue, Winnipeg MB, R3K 0B1

Telephone: 204-837-3492

e-mail: [Hobart1@mts.net](mailto:Hobart1@mts.net)

November 17, 2010

Environmental Assessment & Licensing Branch  
Manitoba Conservation  
123 Main Street, Suite 160  
Winnipeg MB R3C 1A5  
e-mail: [Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca](mailto:Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca)

Attention Mr. Bruce Webb

BW

## Re: File 5486.00 - Rettie Boat Access

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the above Environment Assessment Proposal Report and to advise that I am against the proposal.

Because marshes perform a vital role in the health of our environment and are to be a protected resource, the development of Beaconia Marsh affects me. My specific concerns are as follows:

- The proposal includes numerous differences in specifications and scope from the original plan submitted by Mr. Rettie.
- The proposal includes the Green Spaces Environment Report showing the huge diversity of wildlife which is at substantial risk due to this development.
- There are numerous issues with the process that was followed prior to the channel being dug, including lack of confirmation of the property line and the required 90' setback from the ordinary high water mark, which has also yet to be confirmed.
- There has been no drainage plan provided as required by the development permit, and the effects of this channel on the water table have yet to be determined.

- There was no consultation with the public nor with the Lakeshore Erosion Technical Committee as required by Selkirk and Area District Planning requirements. There has also been no complete scope on this and further development provided by Mr. Rettie.

Due to the above issues, I encourage you to protect our water resources, deny any further development and mandate the restoration of Beaconia Marsh to its original state.

Jean Speers

**Webb, Bruce (CON)**

---

**From:** hobart1@mymts.net on behalf of Jean Speers [HOBART1@MTS.NET]  
**Sent:** November-16-10 3:10 PM  
**To:** Webb, Bruce (CON)  
**Subject:** File 5486.00 -- Rettie Boat Access

3304 Assiniboine Avenue, Winnipeg MB, R3K 0B1

Telephone: 204-837-3492

e-mail: [tspeers@cc.umanitoba.ca](mailto:tspeers@cc.umanitoba.ca)

November 17, 2010

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

e-mail: [Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca](mailto:Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca)

Attention Mr. Bruce Webb

BW

## Re: File 5486.00 – Rettie Boat Access

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the above Environment Assessment Proposal Report and to advise that I am against the proposal.

Because marshes perform a vital role in the health of our environment and are to be a protected resource, the development of Beaconia Marsh affects me. My specific concerns are as follows:

- The proposal includes numerous differences in specifications and scope from the original plan submitted by Mr. Rettie.
- The proposal includes the Green Spaces Environment Report showing the huge diversity of wildlife which is at substantial risk due to this development.

- There are numerous issues with the process that was followed prior to the channel being dug, including lack of confirmation of the property line and the required 90' setback from the ordinary high water mark, which has also yet to be confirmed.
- There has been no drainage plan provided as required by the development permit, and the effects of this channel on the water table have yet to be determined.
- There was no consultation with the public nor with the Lakeshore Erosion Technical Committee as required by Selkirk and Area District Planning requirements. There has also been no complete scope on this and further development provided by Mr. Rettie.

Due to the above issues, I encourage you to protect our water resources, deny any further development and mandate the restoration of Beaconia Marsh to its original state.

Edward A. Speers, Ph.D., P.Eng.

A21

**Webb, Bruce (CON)**

---

**From:** Ron Cooke [RonC@caamanitoba.com]  
**Sent:** November-18-10 12:21 PM  
**To:** Webb, Bruce (CON)  
**Subject:** Rettie Boat Access / Beaconia Marsh

November 18 , 2010

Ron Cooke  
440 Burrows Avenue  
Winnipeg MB R2W-2A1

Environmental Assessment & Licensing Branch  
Manitoba Conservation  
123 Main Street, Suite 160  
Winnipeg MB R3C 1A5  
Fax: (204) 945-5229  
Email: [Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca](mailto:Bruce.Webb@gov.mb.ca)

BW

Re: File 5486.00 - Rettie Boat Access

Dear Bruce Webb:

I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the above Environment Assessment Proposal Report and to tell you I am against the proposal. Because marshes perform a vital role in the health of our environment and are to be a protected resource, the development of Beaconia Marsh affects me. My specific concerns are as follows:

- The proposal includes numerous differences in specifications and scope from the original plan submitted by Mr. Rettie.
- The report is incomplete as "*Appendix 6 - Land Use Designation for Site and Adjoining Land Plan*" is missing
- The proposal includes the Green Spaces Environment Report showing the huge diversity of wildlife which are at substantial risk due to this development.
- There are numerous issues with the process that was followed prior to the channel being dug including lack of confirmation of the property line and the required 90' setback from the ordinary high water mark, which has also yet to be confirmed.
- There has been no drainage plan provided as required by the development permit and the effects of this channel on the water table have yet to be determined.

- There was no consultation with the public nor with the Lakeshore Erosion Technical Committee as required by Selkirk and Area District Planning requirements. There has also been no complete scope on this and further development provided by Mr. Rettie.

Due to the above issues I encourage you to protect our water resources and deny any further development and mandate the restoration of Beaconia Marsh to its original state.

Yours truly

Ron Cooke

Auto Travel Counsellor  
CAA Manitoba

(204) 262-6164



A22

**Webb, Bruce (CON)**

---

**From:** greenrl@mymts.net  
**Sent:** November-18-10 10:39 PM  
**To:** Webb, Bruce (CON)  
**Cc:** Premier (LEG); Entrepreneurship, Training & Trade, Minister (LEG); Conservation, Minister (LEG); Water Stewardship, Minister (LEG); Dewar, Greg (NDP Caucus) (LEG)  
**Subject:** Robert and Margaret Rettie- Rettie boat access File 5486.00

November 18, 2010

To: Mr. Bruce Webb, P. Eng. *BW*  
Water Development & Control Assessment Officer

From: Ron and Linda Greenwood  
Box 111  
Beaconia, Manitoba

Dear Mr. Webb:

We are in favour of the proposal at Beaconia submitted by the Retties.

We have owned lake front property approximately 2 kms. north of the Retties' site for 39 years. We have regularly kayaked into the area of the proposal and know the Beaconia Marsh well.

The marsh is definitely in trouble and in particular, the most northerly area including the Retties' property. When kayaking in this area, we have noticed in the last few years an increasingly pungent odor of rotting vegetation. It is my understanding that this is mainly due to Lake Winnipeg water level regulation. (High water and relatively constant levels are detrimental. Seasonal fluctuation is natural and necessary for marsh regeneration.) Where years ago the marsh was teeming with waterfowl, now other than migrating birds, there are few.

The channel proposed by the Retties will be beneficial to the marsh and will provide fish habitat where there was none.

We are talking about a very small portion of the Beaconia Marsh and the actual excavation is a very small percentage of that.

The vested interests and the credibility of the EBCC has to be considered. The long time locals of the area tell me that the very vocal EBCC was orchestrated by a few cottage owners who want to ensure their vista won't be spoiled sometime down the road.

I have never had any contact with the Retties but I have known the Chairman of the EBCC for many years. In fact, the first time I met with him was when he and his father were harassing my children and chasing them off the beach. They said they owned the beach. Not. Isn't it ironical that he is now such a vocal advocate for public access?

We trust that the decision in this matter will be based on environmental facts and not on politics. We firmly believe that this is an Environmental Plus.

Yours truly,  
Ron and Linda Greenwood

November 18, 2010

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

Dear Mr. Webb,

BW

**Re: File 5486.00 - Rettie Boat Access**

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the above Environment Assessment Proposal Report. I have visited the site of this excavation at the end of April, 2010 so have seen firsthand the location within the existing marsh. I am against the proposal for the following reasons:

- Marshes, in particular coastal wetlands, like the Beconia Marsh are very important natural tools to filter unwanted nutrients and chemicals from getting into the lake water. When the marsh is disrupted as it has been in the Beconia situation, that filtering capacity is diminished. The marsh plants that would absorb some of the excess nutrients and chemicals have been destroyed. The water quality will suffer as a result of more phosphorus and nitrogen and other chemical pollutants getting into the lake. As well the aquatic life that thrives in the marsh area has been negatively impacted and this, in turn, affects the balance of the whole aquatic ecosystem.
- The Manitoba government is currently considering the development of a policy related to the preservation and reconstruction of wetlands, in recognition of their tremendous value in filtering unwanted nutrients and chemicals as well their capacity to slow down the runoff of water in times of flooding, spring melt, etc. It seems inconsistent to allow the destruction of the Beconia marsh at the same time as the province is trying to put a policy in place recognizing and compensating for the value of marsh/wetlands.
- Lake Winnipeg is being considered one of the most eutrophic large lakes in the world. This is not a reputation that we want to have endure. If we are going to restore the health of the lake, we are going to have to ensure much more protection to a number of factors within the natural landscape of the lake's watershed. One of the most visible and important of those factors, is the treatment of the shoreline of the lake. If we cannot even offer protection to the very shoreline of the lake, how can we expect to persuade others hundreds of kilometres away to do the right thing.
- The development of the boat canal in the Beconia Marsh has generated much publicity and has become symbolic of the old attitude of "dig before you have permission and ask for forgiveness afterwards". This is not the only excavation for creating a boat channel that has occurred around the shores of Lake Winnipeg and other Manitoba lakes. I think that it will be important to stop any further excavation and expect Mr. Rettie to return this marsh, as much as possible, to its previous condition. If this is not the outcome, it makes a mockery of any policies related to shoreline protection and gives others the idea that anything goes.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments.

Yours truly,  
Vicki Burns

Coordinator, Foundations in the Lake Winnipeg Watershed Initiative, Community Foundations of Canada  
440 Waverley St  
Winnipeg, MB R3M 3L4  
[vickiburns@mts.net](mailto:vickiburns@mts.net)