

**INFORMATION PREPARED FOR THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
VICTORIA BEACH COMMUNITY, JANUARY 12, 2011**
(Collated and Created by the Juzda Family (204) 756-2228)

SECTION 1: E-MAIL ABOUT PROPERTY VALUES

From an e-mail dated December 18, 2010, signed by Mark Tooley and Mary & Gregg Hanson, to a group they were attempting to interest in the erosion barrier:

[...] “Wolf had talked to Melodie Ateah of Ateah Realty and she indicated that cottages on Sunset had decreased in value since the October storm and it is her opinion that they would continue to remain lower if some restoration work was not done on the bank.” [...]

That is a statement by the group proposing the erosion barrier. They clearly state that their concern is their property value.

On the following pages, there are documents and statements explaining the potential effects this barrier will have on our beach, destroying the way of life that we have enjoyed down here for generations.

Please peruse the information provided herein and draw your own conclusions about the policies that we at Victoria Beach should be following.

SECTION 2: SCIENTIFIC E-MAILS ON EFFECTS OF EROSION BARRIERS (LETTERS FROM PROFESSOR PILKEY AND PROFESSOR DAVIDSON- ARNOTT)

Open Letter from Orrin H. Pilkey (James B. Duke Professor of Geology Emeritus, Duke University, Division of Earth and Ocean Sciences), a specialist in lakeshore erosion, to the Victoria Beach community, January 5, 2011, with accompanying vita:

To whom it may concern:

I am a coastal geologist, a retired James B. Duke Professor from Duke University. I have written a number of books on coastal hazards and beach processes on ocean shorelines as well as technical papers on problems created by seawalls and other forms of hard stabilization. One of the books was on the Lake Erie Shoreline (1987, Duke Press). I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment from afar, regarding the proposed hard stabilization of the Victoria Beach shoreline.

There is a great deal of experience globally with stabilization (holding in place) of eroding shorelines. The bottom line is that placing a seawall on a retreating beach will almost always cause the eventual total loss of the beach. The reason for this is that the seawall does not address the cause of shoreline erosion so the beach continues to retreat, getting progressively narrower until it disappears. When that happens the seawalls often have to be reinforced because the average wave height during storms increases when the beach is gone.

The time span required for beach loss is highly variable – months to decades. Since there seems to be little experience with hard stabilization there, there is no experience database on the rapidity of beach loss in front of seawalls.

Six US states (Maine, Rhode Island, North Carolina, South Carolina and Oregon) have outlawed seawalls although the issue remains a politicized one.

I would caution against use of experimental or temporary structures. One approach used in SC and NC has been to allow giant sandbags (provided they are removed after a couple of years), but enforcing the removal requirement has proved almost impossible and it turns out sandbags have the same impact on beach loss as concrete seawalls.

A second important impact of the revetment on Victoria Beach as proposed will be the loss of sand (and hence erosion) on adjacent beaches. As the beach narrows, the longshore transport system carries less and less sand until the sand transfer to adjacent beaches is halted all together. The seawall becomes a dam blocking sediment flow. The importance of this on Victoria Beach beaches depends on the volume of sand that is normally transported laterally by the wave-formed currents. On most lake shorelines this sand transport mainly occurs during storms.

A third "truth" about seawalls and revetments is that once you start you can't stop. Seawalls always beget seawalls in large part because of the frontal and lateral erosion problem they have caused. In addition, once the barn door is opened and the legalities and objections overcome for one seawall, it is politically difficult for a governing body to turn down future requests for similar structures.

Thus on most eroding beaches, on lakes as well as along ocean shores, the long-range choice is clear. You can have beaches or you can have beachfront buildings but you

can't have them both. Perhaps the relocation alternative would be a better one, if survival of the recreational beach is deemed important to the community

Is preservation of a dozen houses worth it; houses owned by those who were imprudent enough to build next to an eroding shoreline? Is it the public's responsibility to pay for this protection?

Another alternative approach besides moving buildings back is beach replenishment. This costly approach replaces the lost beaches with new sand either from offshore or from on-land sand pits. This is a perpetual expense once it is started as replenished beaches disappear much faster than natural beaches.

As I read the situation, this is a very critical decision for Victoria Beach. The community has reached a turning point and whatever choice is made, it will have a big impact on future generations.

Orrin H. Pilkey
James B. Duke Professor of Geology Emeritus
Duke University
Division of Earth and Ocean Sciences
Durham NC 27708
919 684 4238
opilkey@duke.edu

Orrin H. Pilkey
October 2008
Email: opilkey@duke.edu
Phone: 919 684 4238

Orrin Pilkey is a research professor, James B. Duke Professor Emeritus of Earth & Ocean Sciences, and Director Emeritus of the Program for the Study of Developed Shorelines (PSDS) within the Division of Earth and Ocean Sciences in the Nicholas School of the Environment and Earth Sciences at Duke University.

Pilkey received his BS degree in Geology at Washington State College (he was a Missoula smokejumper during summers), his MS degree in Geology at the University of Montana and his PhD degree in Geology at Florida State University. From 1962 to 1965 he was an assistant research professor with the University of Georgia Marine Institute on Sapelo Island, Georgia. Since 1965 he has been at Duke University with one year breaks with the Department of Marine Science at the University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez and with the U.S. Geological Survey in Woods Hole, Massachusetts. His research career started with the study of shoreline/continental shelf sedimentation, progressed to the deep sea with emphasis on abyssal plain sediments and back to the nearshore with emphasis on coastal management. He has published more than 250 technical publications and has authored, coauthored or edited 39 books.

In 2007, PSDS became a joint program with Western Carolina University. PSDS research continues to focus on beach nourishment, the impact of seawalls on beaches, evaluation of the validity of mathematical models of beach behavior, and global principles of barrier island evolution.

In 1987 he was awarded the Francis Shepard medal for excellence in marine geology and in 1991 he was the N.C. Wildlife Federation Conservation educator of the year. In 1992

he became an honorary member of the Society for the Study of Sediments (SEPM) and was awarded the George V. Cohee Public Service Award by the American Association of Petroleum Geologists. In 1993 he was awarded (jointly with William Neal) the American Geological Institute award for outstanding public communication. In the same year, he received the Jim Shea Award for Public Service from the National Association of Geology Teachers. In 1999 he received the Outstanding Public Service Award from FEMA. In 2000 he was awarded the Geological Society of America's Public Service Award. The Priestly award was granted in 2003. In 2008 he was awarded the Lifetime Achievement Award from the NC Coastal Federation. Previously he was president of SEPM, the Society for Sedimentary Geology, president of the North Carolina Academy of Science, a member of the council of the Geological Society of America, and editor of the Journal of Sedimentary Petrology. He is co-editor and sometimes co-author of the ongoing 22 volume, state specific Living with the Shore series published by the Duke Press, as well as two 1996 volumes: The Corps and the Shore (Island Press), Living by the Rules of the Sea (Duke Press), A Celebration of the Worlds Barrier Islands (2003)m How to read A North Carolina Beach (2004) and Useless Arithmetic (2007). He has also been featured in New York Times Magazine, Esquire, Oceans Magazine, The American Way, Fifty Plus, Smithsonian Magazine, Der Stern and The Chronicle of Higher Education.

E-mail sent by Robin Davidson-Arnott (Professor Emeritus, Department of Geography, University of Guelph) to Stuart Juzda, January 10, 2011:

Hi Stuart,

I have finally had a chance to look at a few of the articles in the Winnipeg Free press and to track down Victoria Beach on Google Earth. I probably need to see some ground shots of the beach and bluff before I can comment in detail and even then I would likely only be able to make some general statements. I don't want to go out on a limb when I have not visited the site myself. That being said, it is evident that there are some serious issues here and ones that are all too familiar from Ontario and from the East coast of the US.

My guess would be that the whole area is likely to be erosional over the long-term if the coast is developed primarily in sediments (not bedrock). Just how erosional depends in part on how consolidated the sediments are, their grain size, and the magnitude of the net alongshore sediment transport - this in turn depends on the wind and wave climate. I would also guess that this is directed southward but that it is not very high otherwise the impact of a single storm on cottage owners would not likely have been as great.

I also assume from what I can see on Google Earth, and from the newspaper discussion, that there are big issues of beach access for those owning cottagers that are not actually lakefront property.

Anyway, I can say that, in general, in this kind of situation armouring the beach in front of the cottages will likely lead to a reduction of, or elimination of the sand beach and lead to discontinuities where people have to walk in the water to get around the armouring. The armouring of the shoreline also increases reflection of waves and this in turn tends to move sand offshore, thus further limiting beach width.

Construction of a proper armourstone revetment requires the services of a qualified coastal engineer with experience in this and is neither simple nor inexpensive. Placement of any kind of material on the beach and/or construction of shore protection structures should never be carried out by unqualified persons and it should only be done after a full environmental assessment of the potential impact on the beach and nearshore processes both in the vicinity of the proposed works and especially downdrift. If the coast is erosional then any structure is like to have a significant impact downdrift and any agency that is required to give approval for this should ensure that a full study is carried out.

If shore protection is put in, it should only be carried out as part of a coordinated plan so as to avoid issues of flanking and discordance at property boundaries and care must be taken to properly tie in both the updrift and downdrift ends of the length of shore protection in order to avoid end effects. A properly designed shore protection scheme also has adequate provisions (including funding) made for maintenance and renewal. I do not get the impression that any of this is being done and it is critical that your group insist on this. The process of undertaking a proper environmental impact assessment usually provides the necessary background information on which an informed decision can be made and it also serves to bring out all the potential hazards of going this route. Such a study should be carried out by competent coastal engineers and/or coastal geomorphologists

There is a lot about rights of shore property owners and this is always a thorny issue. Based on what you have said, it would seem to be a little simpler at Victoria Beach since the Crown land extends inland of the high water mark and thus the structures would be placed on Crown Land. I would think that this would make it easier to adopt a policy of not permitting shore protection unless a house is actually in imminent danger and then only as a temporary expedient until the structure can be moved. In Ontario the Shoreline Management Policy discourages the use of any form of shore protection, especially on a sandy beach system. The rationale for this is simply what I have stated above with respect to the potential impact on other coastal properties as well as preservation of beaches for public use.

I will be happy to enlarge on any of these points if you would like.

cheers

Robin

--

Robin Davidson-Arnott

Professor Emeritus

Department of Geography

University of Guelph

Guelph, ON, CANADA

N1G 2W1

(519) 824-4120 ext 56719 (secretary) home (416) 231-2110

FAX (519) 837-2940

<http://www.geography.uoguelph.ca/faculty/Robin/research/index.shtml>

SECTION 3: CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN TOM FARRELL, OUR REEVE, AND STUART JUZDA CIRCA DECEMBER 23, 2010

Tom was kind enough to speak with me on this date. In our conversation, he advanced the following reasons for supporting this project. The following is a paraphrased summary of his points and my responses.

1. The beach will look unattractive this summer because of felled trees that resulted from the storm this past autumn.

My response: Two individuals with chainsaws could clear the beach in a day.

2. Sand will not disappear from the beach as a result of the erosion barrier, because there is sand at Albert Beach where there is a structure.

My response: The structure at Albert Beach is a high-water dyke built from sand. To compare this structure to an erosion barrier is to compare apples to meat. His conclusion is therefore false and also in contradiction to the information in the *Shoreline Management Handbook*.

3. Threats of lawsuits if the municipality does not act.

My response: These are public crown lands, and no individual can insist on destroying them to protect their private property. No municipality is obligated to provide this form of assistance to its members.

4. The proposal to build these barriers would be paid by private funds.

My response: If these barriers are built, there will be continuing costs of maintenance and liability associated with them, which the municipality (i.e. taxpayers) would no doubt have to assume.

5. People have a right to protect their private property.

My response: They have no right to use public land to achieve this goal. Only Council can grant this privilege, and this decision involves the rights of all of us to the resources that would be used for this purpose.

SECTION 4: TOM FARRELL'S VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THE 'FREE PRESS'

From *Winnipeg Free Press* story, 'RM approves first step to shield beachfronts' by Bruce Owen. December 21, 2010:

"Reeve Tom Farrell said the council can't always be asking for public input, which in this case could delay construction for a year."

Stuart's Comment: Haste makes waste. This proposal, first came to council on December 4th. They approved it on December 20th. This is totally inappropriate. As far as I am aware, the Council had done absolutely no research on the effects of the erection of this barrier on the beach. The deleterious affects of environmental degradation have not been assessed by qualified professionals with expertise in the field, nor have questions of liability. If the Council has consulted a reputable scientist on its effects, please make the information public. Additionally, public input is essential to this process as the consequences of this decision will affect the entire community. This is not a routine council decision. There are alternatives called soft engineering (ie. plastic wave breakers, etc. that will not effect the beach).

From *Winnipeg Free Press* story, 'Meeting will hear views on lakefront plan' by Bruce Owen. December 26, 2010:

"Farrell said the beach, as it is now, is about 25 metres wide from the water's edge to the exposed cliffs; the rock wall would take up almost a third of that. The proposal also calls for a public pathway to be built on top of the structure."

[25 metres is about 82 feet.]

Stuart's Comment: The width of the beach varies along its length, and changes throughout the day, from day to day, and from year to year, according to water levels. This statement is therefore not accurate and appears, from my own observations of King Edward Beach over fifty years, to reflect the rare moments when the beach is at its widest. It is frequently much narrower. Secondly, the structure that will be built from the sand cliffs will occupy the beach to a width of 32'-37' feet (the final dimensions have not been confirmed) — i.e. definitely more than one-third of its width even using Tom's own generous estimate. At high water levels, there will be no beach.

SECTION 5: E-MAILS SENT TO VB COUNCIL AND SETC BY STUART JUZDA

E-mail sent by Stuart Juzda to the Victoria Beach Council, December 17, 2010:

To the members of the Victoria Beach Council,

It has come to my attention that a number of individuals are attempting to convince Council that it is a good idea to construct a barrier on King Edward and Alexandra Beaches in an attempt to prevent further erosion of the sandbanks.

I believe, given the information I currently have available, that this is not necessarily a path we should follow. My objections are, firstly, that the proposed barrier will destroy the natural beauty of the beaches.

Secondly, because the proposed barrier will interfere with the natural process of build-up and erosion, that the current sand beach that we have may turn into one of rock. A measure with the intent of preventing erosion may actually lead to the destruction of the beach as we have known it. The formation of the beach has been the result, and continues to be the result, of the complex interaction of wind, water, and sand. The unfortunate outcome of the proposed construction may lead us to a beach consisting of stone, rock, and clay, as the sand is swept away and not replenished. This will be the greatest change to the beach and should therefore be undertaken only with the greatest deliberation. Once done, we cannot undo it.

Thirdly, the barrier itself may or may not be effective at its intended goal.

Fourthly, it appears to me that the attempt to quickly get this project approved by Council and work started on it before it becomes generally known to the community of the Beach is not the way to proceed. I believe that if there are sufficiently cogent reasons to proceed with this work, that the matter should be discussed during the summer of 2011 and, if it appears to be the will of the community to proceed with it, that the work be done the following winter or as the Council decides. There may also be alternative approaches to this situation, which might emerge as the issue is discussed in a larger forum.

Thank you for your consideration,

Stuart Juzda

E-mail sent by Stuart Juzda to Shoreline Erosion Technical Committee, January 1, 2011:

To whom it may concern,

The erection of an erosion barrier at Victoria Beach should be opposed at this time for the following reasons:

Firstly, the erection of this barrier will occupy a large percentage of the current sand beach.

Secondly, according to all relevant scientific research, the increased and continued erosion in front of the barrier (as opposed to erosion of the area insulated behind it) without replenishment will lead to the destruction of the remaining sand beach, the deepening of the lake near the shore, and the appearance of rock and clay as the new beach.

Consequently, an area which has been known for its sand beaches will no longer have them, to the detriment of the local community and the province as a whole.

Thirdly, it appears that the Victoria Beach Council has acted hastily in recommending this project go forward without doing any environmental studies as to its effect on the ecology of the lake, including plant and animal life, and ignoring completely the scientific evidence on the question of erosion.

Fourthly, the questions of maintenance of the structure, which must be undertaken, and liability have not been adequately considered. If the barrier is not properly inspected and maintained, it will fail at its intended purpose while still having a variety of negative consequences.

Fifthly, a survey designating which lakefront area is Crown Reserve Land belonging to the province has not been done, and therefore the distinction between public and private lands is not resolved as of the current lake levels. Making this determination is a necessary step to planning for a project of this magnitude.

Sixthly, proposals have already begun to follow this proposed barrier with others on the other beaches. It is therefore all the more important that a proper procedure be followed here.

Seventhly, the question of the erection of this barrier has not been properly put to the Victoria Beach community, and has been rushed through in the absence of informed debate and discussion. My informal inquiries have revealed that this plan is, at best, a deeply controversial one with the majority opposed.

Finally, once done, this barrier cannot be undone. It is best to err on the side of caution and proceed in a manner that allows for other options to be discussed for the problems that people may face (e.g. moving back cottages) and that balances the positive and negative elements of any option in a manner that best serves the interests of the community, the environment, and the province.

Thank you for your consideration,

Stuart Juzda

Addendum: Other questions, not in the above e-mails, that Council should consider before proceeding relate to the liability issues that arise from the construction of a non-continuous barrier, which exacerbates erosion in its gaps and at its ends. The erection of an erosion barrier will affect other beaches. There are also personal liability issues in the event of potential accidents, which may result from the deposit of thousands of rocks upon a public beach which is used by adults and children of all ages for a variety of recreational activities. Imagine the consequences if this were done in a park where children play.

SECTION 6: EROSION HANDBOOK

Extracts from the *Lake Winnipeg Shoreline Management Handbook* (Manitoba Provincial Government Strategy for Lake Winnipeg Shoreline Management, 2001):

pp.32-33:

-“such structures (boulder revetments) do not encourage beach development, and may in fact accelerate the loss of beach due to wave reflection and scour.”

-"The protective structure should be designed to minimize impact in the beach environment in front of the property and on adjacent beaches. However, it should be recognized that it is impossible to build a structure within this zone without having a significant impact on the beach environment."

-"For many, "the beach" is a significant part of the attraction of shore front property. When landward movement of an eroding shoreline is arrested by a structure the unprotected area in the front of the structure continues to erode and deepen. On an

eroding shoreline, any beach in front of an armoured shoreline will normally diminish in width over time, as the near shore profile erodes, and the beach will eventually disappear. The beach loss maybe accelerated by wave reflection from the structure."

p. 50:

-“When the retreat of a cohesive shoreline bluff is stopped for a period of time by the construction of a protection structure, the downcutting of the nearshore profile lakeward of the revetment/seawall continues unabated. The lakeward profile continues to erode and to deepen and any beach that was present will gradually diminish in width and likely will disappear altogether.”

p. 57:

-“Revetments, like any other shore protection structure, have a number of disadvantages that must be considered. Revetments do not encourage beach development, and may in fact accelerate the loss of beach due to increased wave reflection and scour. Construction of a revetment requires access to the shoreline for large construction equipment. Revetments may severely limit access to the beach and water, and do nothing to increase the amount of recreation space.”

SECTION 7: LAKE WINNIPEG FOUNDATION E-MAILS

The Lake Winnipeg Foundation is a non-profit organization of which Karin Boyd, member of the Victoria Beach Council, is the current Vice-President.

1. E-mail from Nancy Sarchuk to info@lakewinnipegfoundation.org, December 18, 2010

Hi,

I have an urgent question regarding a matter concerning the Victoria Beach shoreline. Is there anyone available to speak with me this weekend (Sat 18 or Sun19)? I would most appreciate it!

Nancy Sarchuk
LWF member and VB cottage owner.

2. Reply from Catherine Salkie after a phone conversation where Nancy explained the proposal facing the VB Council, December 21, 2010:

Hi Nancy,

I've tried to track down a few of our Board of Directors this afternoon, but this issue has taken everyone completely by surprise. We will try to find out what is going to be done by government(s) to address this matter. Aside from grossly altering shoreline morphology, I would think that creating a rock barrier of the type you described, would have serious impacts on near shore and upslope wildlife habitats, and severely impact existing wetlands and riparian areas.

We need to know exactly what was proposed at the Council meeting, and implementation dates. Please forward as much information as you are privy to, so that we can assess the situation and develop a response.

Thanks,
Catherine Salkie
Secretary, Board of Directors, Lake Winnipeg Foundation Inc.

3. E-mail sent by Catherin Salkie to Nancy Sarchuk and cc'd to all members of the Board of the Lake Winnipeg Foundation, December 22, 2010:

Hi Nancy,

I personally commiserate with the people on both sides of this issue ... from an aesthetic point of view I wouldn't want a high rock barrier ruining my lakefront view or my long walks at sunset; as an environmentalist I would worry about the impact of a high rocky barrier on near- and foreshore habitats and wetlands; but, from a cottage-owner's perspective I would choose bank revetment* to allay future damage to my property from waves, knowing that weather events are going to be even more frequent and severe than we've already experienced due to changing climate; as a seasonal-occupant, I would want/expect to be informed about issue(s) by my Council before it makes a decision that

would impact my property, in my absence; and, finally, from a Councillor's point of view, I would hope to choose a course of action that ensures property-holders' rights are respected, but that provides the best protection for the property owners I'm elected to represent.

*which isn't illegal; it requires getting approval from the Erosion Technical Committee and having an Engineer approve the plan
http://www.sclplan.net/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=35&Itemid=61

I feel empathy for all those involved in this horrible situation, but all I can do is pass on your concerns to the Board of Directors of the Foundation, for discussion at their next board meeting in mid-January.

Sincerely,
Catherine Salki

4. E-mail sent by Nancy Sarchuk to Catherine Salki, January 4, 2011:

Catherine,

I am writing to you in response to your e-mail of December 22 (found below). I must say that I am appalled that the Lake Winnipeg Foundation has chosen not to speak out immediately and forcefully against the Victoria Beach barrier proposal. After my initial telephone conversations with you and your e-mail of December 21 (see below), in which you spoke so passionately about the potentially disastrous effects such structures could have on the wildlife habitat of Lake Winnipeg, I believed that you had a genuine desire to act without delay and in the best interest of the lake. When I received this e-mail from you I was confident that I had approached the right organization for support on this issue. It seems, however, that I may have been mistaken.

Of course, I understand that your e-mail was an attempt to please all parties concerned, but I think we can all agree that "commiseration" does nothing for Lake Winnipeg. The LWF's mandate to,

"...actively promote the health of Lake Winnipeg", clearly does not rest in platitudes, but in direct action. This lake needs our protection!

I can also understand what an uncomfortable position your board must find itself in presently with the glaring conflict of interest of one of your board members (the one you and I discussed), as well as the presence of at least one other sitting board member who is also a lakefront cottage owner (!?). I can well imagine that this is having an impact on the Foundation's ability to act and will undoubtedly have a negative impact on the credibility of the Foundation if not addressed promptly. But more importantly, I'm afraid that the credibility of the LWF will suffer further if it fails to act on the barrier issue as an environmental organization, first and foremost.

I thus urge you and the board to discuss what is right FOR THE LAKE and its surrounding environment at your meeting in mid-January (if possible, before the public meeting on the issue on January 12?!), and come forward to the council of Victoria Beach

and all Victoria Beach cottage owners with a recommendation to delay the current proposal pending an appropriate environmental assessment as well as an in depth review all the many legal questions surrounding it (I thought it extremely narrow, incomplete, and, I believe, inaccurate to summarize the legal question as you did).

Catherine, I cannot know what transpired between our first fruitful conversations and your original e-mail and this last message of "commiseration". I can only wonder.

I can only wonder why you say that as a "cottage owner*" you would choose "bank revetment" over more ecological solutions. I wonder why this would be your choice when at least 1/3 of lakefront cottage owners at VB do not support the construction of a barrier. I wonder, too, why you would choose this solution before a comprehensive environmental impact study was carried out. I wonder why you wouldn't you look to other communities in Manitoba and around the globe who are rejecting such structures and who are opting for less destructive alternatives (like, for example, moving cottages back, or does that very idea ruffle the feathers of certain members of your board?).

I wonder why, as a "seasonal occupant", you would only "want / expect to be informed about issue(s) by my Council before it makes a decision that would impact my property". Why would you not expect to be CONSULTED on an issue of such magnitude? Certainly, my family and hundreds of others do.

I wonder also how you could convince yourself, as a "councillor", that putting the interests of 11 individuals above those of over a thousand cottage owners in any way "respects the rights of property-holders" given that councillors are responsible to ALL their constituents and not a tiny fraction thereof.

Furthermore, I wonder why, as a "councillor", you would even entertain the idea of destroying the inherent, natural beauty of one of Manitoba's most treasured stretches of sandy beaches, arguably the greatest assest to all cottage owners and the right of every citizen to enjoy.

In fact, Catherine, the points you make in your letter are, to me, so inconsistent with what I believed The Lake Winnipeg Foundation to be that, when I think about how my 6-year old daughter raised \$120.00 for your Foundation by completeing the Walk for the Lake last summer, I wonder why she even bothered.

Yours,
Nancy Sarchuk

P.S. I'd like to point out an inaccurate (and perhaps telling) choice of wording on your part here. You refer to the barrier proposers as "cottage owners" and everyone else as "seasonal occupants". Of course, as you must know, the vast majority of "seasonal occupants", like my family, are in fact cottage owners (of 50 years in our case), and that virtually all of the lake front "cottage owners" are only "seasonal occupants". The difference between "owners" and "occupants" does not seem insignificant to me and I hope you will correct this unfortunate distinction in any further communications.

Addendum: in subsequent phone conversations, Bruce Smith, President of the Lake Winnipeg Foundation, informed Stuart Juzda that the third e-mail above was written in his absence and does not represent the position of the Lake Winnipeg Foundation, which is currently developing a policy on lakeshore erosion. Mr. Smith indicated that there were problem with the e-mail's construction and content.

At the meeting of the executive of the Lake Winnipeg Foundation on January 8th, 2011, illustrating the highest standard of integrity, he asked Karin Boyd to recuse herself from participating in debate or voting on the issue of erosion barriers, due to her having an actual or perceived conflict of interest.

The inclusion of these e-mails is not intended to discredit the Lake Winnipeg Foundation or their fine work, but only to call attention to the words and actions of certain individuals.