

***THE RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF VICTORIA BEACH  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SHORELINE AND  
BEACH MANAGEMENT***

***What You Told Us  
A Report on the Public Consultation Process***

***September, 2011***

In July of 2011 the Council of the Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach appointed a committee to advise it on shoreline issues in the Municipality. This RM of Victoria Beach Council Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management (the Committee) consists of seven municipal residents, representation from the Manitoba Shoreline Erosion Technical Committee (SETC), and an independent Chairperson. <sup>1</sup>

The mandate contained in the Committee's terms of reference<sup>2</sup> consists of the following tasks:

- To canvass the opinions and perspectives of community residents;
- To consult with expertise familiar with the types of shoreline issues confronting the RM;
- To produce a report that documents the public's views, the specifics of local shoreline problems, ideas originating in the community for solving these problems, and experience gained in similar situations elsewhere; and
- To make recommendations to the RM Council on possible models for erosion control, beach preservation and flood protection; on possible regulations that could facilitate a "made in Victoria Beach" approach; and on public education programs focused on shoreline management issues.

The public input to the Committee's work originates from three sources: oral presentations to public hearings held by the committee, written submissions received from residents (including e-mails), and any written comments from respondents to a questionnaire<sup>3</sup> commissioned by the RM council and distributed to all residents of the RM.

In addition the committee as a group has toured all shoreline areas of the municipality on land as well as by boat. The committee during its shoreline tour and on other occasions spoke with residents who were interested in discussing their particular shoreline issues.

The following report presents a summary of the content from the three streams of feedback.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Committee held 3 public hearings at the Victoria Beach Seniors' Centre on July 24<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> and August 8<sup>th</sup>. All three sessions were well attended and a total of 38 oral presentations were received.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Committee membership is listed in Attachment 1.

<sup>2</sup> The Terms of Reference, issued by the RM Council, are contained in Attachment 2.

<sup>3</sup> A copy of the questionnaire is appended as Attachment 3

<sup>4</sup> A list of presenters is contained in Attachment 4.

There were 11 written submissions and 18 e-mails addressed to the committee.<sup>5</sup> Written comments on more than 250 survey responses were analyzed as of September 9th; the deadline for response is September 15<sup>th</sup>.

This report has been organized to document each of the sources of community response separately. For its reporting on the public hearings the committee grouped the feedback into three categories: those areas on which there appeared to be general agreement (and that does not mean that every presenter raised the particular point, or that there was absolute unanimity of opinion), areas about which there is clearly differences of opinion, and ideas that were raised by a limited number of individuals which did not fit into either of the first two categories. The survey comments are not so categorized because the responses will be statistically analyzed professionally and a report presented to council from that source at some future date. The committee's analysis was of a more general nature, noting whether or not the survey comments reinforced points raised at our hearings, and focusing on ideas that were not raised at the hearings. A similar approach was taken to written submissions including e-mails.

Since this is a summary of what we heard at our hearings, and from the other two sources, the committee exercised discretion in distilling many hours and many pages of information into a brief but we hope accurate document. There are no attributions in this report. The summary statements of converging and diverging views we heard at the public hearings are the committee's attempt to synthesize a number of statements into one, and represent our interpretation, for which we take full responsibility. A summary report cannot hope to capture every detail of the public presentations; we have tried to capture the highlights.

Although our final report, due in December, is to contain recommendations to council, the committee identified some issues that it felt were time sensitive and that should be brought to council's attention as soon as possible. We have therefore made 3 interim recommendations to the RM and these appear in the last section of this report.

## **THE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

The following points appear to have *general community acceptance*:<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The written submission and e-mail authors are listed in Attachment 5.

<sup>6</sup> This does not imply unanimity of opinion but represents a judgment by the committee; these points represent potential common ground upon which the community can build a "made in Victoria Beach" solution to local shoreline problems.

- Everyone loves the beaches of Victoria Beach. It is one thing that everybody has in common and that is integral to the shared sense of community.
- Regardless of view held on what should or should not be done to deal with shoreline issues, the policies and decisions should be science based.
- The RM Council needs to engage appropriate world class, neutral technical expertise on the shoreline issues to inform its future actions.
- Lower lake levels than those experienced in 2010 and 2011 are critical to the future shoreline health in the RM.
- Manitoba Hydro needs to be brought more fully into the discussion of immediate remedies, and there needs to be a critical and neutral appraisal of modifying the operating regime to better accommodate shoreline concerns. The RM Council needs to participate in the upcoming hearings of the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission on the possible finalizing of Hydro's operating license for the regulation of Lake Winnipeg.<sup>7</sup>
- Although there were differing views on the potential for a compromise solution to the property protection vs. beach preservation controversy, if there is such a solution it would have widespread support. The committee was urged to "find a solution that works for everyone".
- Those opposing structural solutions still expressed empathy for lake front property owners affected by 2010-2011 storm events. The right to protect private property was not disputed, although the limits to such actions clearly were.
- There is also recognition that "not one size fits all" and that each beach area is affected differently because of its geography (wind exposure, currents, location relative to other landforms, etc.) and geology (soil types, soil profile, terrain, rocks, etc.). This in turns leads to the conclusion that decisions must be grounded in an informed scientific understanding of the forces at work in each location.
- There seemed to be significant support for "thinking big", to not limit the possible options, at least initially, by cost considerations. That wasn't an invitation to ignore the monetary implications, and several ideas were presented for future funding (and of course there was no consensus on just what might be funded in the future).
- There is probably no "magic bullet" to make everyone happy but if there is to be a resolution of the outstanding shoreline issues, it will have to involve the full community. The "made in Victoria Beach" label seems to have struck a chord with most participants. The community is at a crossroad - where to go from here is a critical decision point.
- The RM needs to develop a comprehensive plan that goes beyond dealing with individual situations on an ad hoc, case by case basis.
- Non-confrontational community dialogue can have a useful role to play in developing an overall plan.

---

<sup>7</sup> As of this writing no dates have yet been established for these hearings.



- The RM also requires a contemporary, more formally described, transparent and consistent process by which to assess and control proposed changes to shoreline.

The following issues are clearly *points of disagreement in the community*:

- There is obvious disagreement concerning property “rights” including the actual legal constraints associated with the various types of property ownership in the RM (and there are several), and the possible use of municipal or crown land to construct protection works. One such issue is already before the courts. Some suggested a community referendum should be held if it is proposed to construct any private protection works on crown land.
- The nature of the interaction of revetments and beaches was a matter of dispute. On the one hand specific local examples and experience were cited to confirm both the effectiveness of revetments in preventing erosion while not adversely affecting beaches; and on the other scientific literature was referenced to support the view that revetments destroyed adjacent beaches.
- What should be done about eroding shoreline upland of the local beaches is a question about which there is a sharp division of opinion. Most lakefront property owners favor a structural intervention, while several presenters advocated letting nature take its course. Beach replenishment and moving lakefront cottages were two alternatives to structural approaches that were presented; the latter being criticized by some as being infeasible. Government acquisition of at-risk properties over time was also suggested.
- The Lake Winnipeg Shoreline Management Handbook published by the Province of Manitoba was quoted to support divergent opinions indicating there is disagreement about what the handbook actually says (or means).

A number of interesting and useful ideas, observations and opinions were presented at the hearings *that did not fit into either category of consensus or dispute* but were certainly worthy of note:

- One suggestion for criteria to be met by any shoreline protection:
  1. Emulates successful examples
  2. Affordable
  3. Compatible with the environment
  4. Has an acceptable (not too large) footprint
- Some complaints were raised about the current RM process for vetting proposed projects.
- No credible study has been conducted of feasibility and costs of relocating/moving some shoreline cottages.
- Specific proposals were presented for the following:
  1. Beach replenishment using the Amphibex ice breaking/dredging machine to add sand to beaches;

2. Corrugated sheet metal as bank facing to dissipate wave energy;
  3. Steep slope bank armoring utilizing bank toe reinforcement.
- 2000 Shoreline Advisory Committee report recommended provincial legislation to govern shoreline management; this recommendation was not implemented.
  - Regularized monitoring of beaches and shoreline is required so that changes can be tracked in a systematized way.
  - Install a gauge at the pier as a handy reference for anyone wanting to know the real-time lake level.
  - Possible sources of funding to carry out studies and actions:
    1. The government of Manitoba
    2. The government of Canada
    3. Cottagers and residents (shoreline only for some costs, all ratepayers for others)
    4. Private-Public Partnerships
  - Preserve remaining municipal shoreline land.
  - The committee's mission is to "save our sand, protect our homes".
  - Highway 59 at the south end of the RM and Sunset Blvd. from the clubhouse to the pier were cited as examples of revetments that work as evidenced by the beaches alongside these roadways (disputed by other presenter indicating that beach along 59 is a sand spit and not susceptible to erosion).
  - The study of Elk Island for useful analogous information about beach processes was recommended.
  - Some guidance for dealing with shoreline issues:
    1. Delineate and manage risk
    2. Balance short and long-term benefits from any actions
    3. Monitor to track what's happening.
  - The process of completing a new development plan for the RM scheduled for this fall offers an opportunity to take a broader and more systematic view of shoreline issues.
  - Although better more up-to-date bylaws may be required to meet current shoreline challenges, the municipality needs to enforce its existing by-laws that relate to activities affecting the shoreline (implying that it does not now systematically do so).
  - Protecting property, private and public, upland from the beaches is an important element in beach conservation and requires more attention (discouraging or banning vegetation removal in sensitive areas, active re-forestation, etc.).
  - The committee should consider holding a hearing in Winnipeg this fall to accommodate VB ratepayers unable to attend the July-August hearings in Victoria Beach.
  - The committee should send a copy of its report to Ministers and officials of the Manitoba Departments of Water Stewardship and Conservation.

- Lake Winnipeg fishermen are a good source of anecdotal information on the currents; sediment transportation and other forces at work in the lake over their many years of experience.

### **WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS (INCLUDING E-MAILS)**

A total of 12 written submissions (not presented at the public hearings) and 19 e-mails were received and reviewed by the committee. Much of the content reiterated what we had already heard at the hearings; however there were some thoughts that were either completely new or that stood out more forcefully than what was presented publicly.

- Some strong concerns were expressed about the questionnaire distributed to VB cottagers and residents. These included that some of the questions concerning preferences were premature and that the survey risked over simplifying very complex issues.
- There should be a provincial regulatory body charged with regulating all shoreline protection works.
- There were “rebuttals” presented to some of the technical information presented at the public hearings.
- Criteria were suggested for evaluating any potential solutions:
  1. They respect & address the interests and values of all VB residents;
  2. Based on best practices;
  3. Grounded in recommendations from independent experts;
  4. Specific to the geography of each area;
  5. Give serious and due consideration of environmental impacts; and,
  6. Take future generations into account.
- The RM should develop an educational document(s) for residents about shoreline issues and possible remedies.
- The RM needs to prepare and document a case to take forward to the upcoming Lake Winnipeg Regulation hearings of the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission.
- Many of today’s problems have resulted from unplanned or poorly planned past development. The RM needs better zoning and associated development controls going forward with a view to severely restricting future development in the municipality.
- Beach and shoreline management is “not a one-time deal”. It is an on-going activity that requires continuous attention.
- Residents of VB need to be kept up to date with what is happening. What plans have been approved? What is the status of legal proceedings? What options are being explored? Are there plans/options to deal with damage already done to beaches?

## **THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

The questionnaire distributed to residents was prepared by and for the RM Council. The committee felt, notwithstanding that there has been some criticism of its timing and content, it would be useful to review the written comments accompanying many of the surveys; and to summarize what we gleaned from the review of these comments provided by respondents (rather than the multiple choice answers to the survey questions). In doing so we have emphasized those highlights that either strongly reinforce (or contradict) what we have already heard, and any other points that offered fresh insight.

- The survey results strongly reinforced the opposing views concerning shoreline protection and beach preservation that were voiced at the public hearings. If anything, the divide as expressed in the survey was even deeper than what the committee had received through the verbal and written submissions.
- Consistent with our other sources, there were a diversity of views on who should pay for whatever actions are required to deal with shoreline issues.
- There was also a much more forceful expression of displeasure with the present operating regime of the lake, the need for lower lake levels on a more consistent basis and the need to force Hydro to take more responsibility for the shoreline effects. This was the strongest theme of the feedback, with no dissenting views.
- The committee's time frame was considered by some to be unrealistic and that the work was far too complex to complete a final report and recommendations by December 2011.
- Some respondents were critical of the survey – either that there was a bias in the questions asked, or that it was premature given the level of understanding of shoreline issues in the community.
- The questionnaire responses revealed a strong sentiment that the Province needed to be involved in shoreline management – more than it is perceived to be at the present time.
- Many feel that areas of sandy banks are being threatened by excessive traffic, and that more needs to be done to ensure more responsible use. The restoration and preservation of shoreline vegetation was an issue also raised by several responders.
- Many responses highlighted the need for a better scientific understanding of specific shoreline situations in the RM and the need to engage technical expertise to advise the RM.

## **OBSERVATIONS**

The committee is at this stage simply reporting on what was presented to us by the community through the medium of our 3 public hearings, written submissions and

e-mails and results to date from the RM questionnaire to residents. None of this material represents a point of view or position of the committee. We are, as we were urged to do by several presenters at the hearings, keeping an open mind.

We did however, make several observations at the hearings, and did form some general conclusions as we digested the large volume of material presented to us.

The demeanor of the presenters and the audience at the hearings impressed us all. This was truly a community dialogue. A respectful ear was given the presenters, who in turn were articulate and well prepared. Several attendees indicated to us that they felt a touch of the community spirit at the three hearings, so strong in the past but under strain in recent months. We felt that this was a good start to our work.

We also had a strong sense that the community recognizes that the committee's work can only provide support to what has to be a local solution to a local problem. We used (perhaps overused) the phrase "made in Victoria Beach solution"; but it did seem to strike a positive note with VB residents. Nonetheless it is clear that there remain deep divisions in the community.

Although we heard a great deal from residents of the Victoria Beach Restricted Area, we also received feedback from other areas of the municipality. We are continuing to include the entire municipality in our mandate and are looking at the situation in all areas. And we have not concluded that there are any areas without unresolved shoreline and/or flooding issues.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The committee felt that the first two issues outlined below required urgent attention and had strong community support, and the third, from our initial review, was also worthy of action in the short-term from the Victoria Beach Council. Therefore, although our final report will contain recommendations, we felt that these three issues were time-sensitive enough to warrant our making three interim recommendations at this early stage of our work, as follows:

1. There is both the necessity and urgency for the RM Council to hire competent, neutral technical expertise to advise it - we concluded that this function needed to be adequately funded to be effective, and that it seemed to us unwise to rush into a shoreline pilot project as envisaged by the agreement between the RM and Manitoba Water Stewardship, in advance of having access to this technical advice. Therefore we have recommended to the RM that it seek permission from the Province to allocate as much of the agreement grant as is necessary to fund technical expertise.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Attachment 6

2. It is important that the RM make a presentation to the public hearings of the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission on the regulation of Lake Winnipeg by Manitoba Hydro (the committee inferred this conclusion from the widely held community view that Manitoba Hydro bore some responsibility for shoreline issues while using the lake as a reservoir for power production). We have recommended that the RM prepare a presentation to the CEC hearings now in order to be ready when the hearing dates are announced.<sup>9</sup>
3. In examining maps of the municipality it was evident that the Province of Manitoba has control over a significant amount of shoreline in the RM. We believe it would be unfortunate if the Province allowed, either through formal approval or lack of oversight, the establishment of permanent works on this shoreline prior to council, assisted by competent technical advice, putting in place a broader shoreline and beach management plan. Hence we have recommended that the RM request the Province to actively pursue its oversight of shoreline under its control to prevent such ad hoc actions.<sup>10</sup>

The committee is committed to complete its work in a timely manner. At the same time it is becoming apparent that tackling such a complex and important set of issues as set out in our mandate is a daunting task for a volunteer committee – a fact remarked on by several members of the community. We will do our best to complete our report with recommendations on time, but will not compromise the outcome if more time is required.

**NOTE: Copies of all attachments for this report are accessible through the Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach Website**

---

<sup>9</sup> Attachment 7

<sup>10</sup> Attachment 8

# ***ATTACHMENT 1***

## **MEMBERS**

### **RM VICTORIA BEACH ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SHORELINE AND BEACH MANAGEMENT**

Norm Brandson	Chair
Greg Thomas	Vice-Chair
Jennifer Engbrecht	
Linda McMillan	
Tom Rathwell	
Wisam Razaq	Chair – SETC
Gordon Ross	
Phil Trottier	
Alex Cross	

**RMVB Council Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management  
Terms of Reference**

**Be it resolved that:**

In accordance with Council Resolution #2011/47 an Advisory Committee governed and defined by the following protocols will be struck.

**Name of Committee**

The committee shall be known as: ~~The Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach Council Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management~~ (hereafter referred to as "the Committee")

**Committee Members**

The committee shall be comprised of the following:

- ~~A Chair~~
- 5 members from the community as follows
  - 2 representatives from the Kennedy Subdivision (restricted area)
  - 1 representative from the North Shore
  - 1 representative from Wanasing/Mike Bay/Pelican Point
  - 1 representative from Albert Beach
  - 1 representative from the local (permanent) community
- The Chair of SETC
- One other technical expert (as required)
- 2 Council seats in rotation on an ex-officio basis

**Responsibilities**

- The Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach Council Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management will be responsible for providing advice to the Council of the RM of Victoria Beach on issues revolving around shoreline protection and in doing so the Committee shall:
  - ~~advise Council of the key values of the community in respect to beach and shoreline property protection,~~
  - ~~advise Council on the development and implementation of a beach management plan for the various shoreline and beach areas of the RM of Victoria Beach,~~
  - ~~advise Council of Federal and Provincial regulations respecting shoreline protection and beach management,~~
  - ~~advise Council about matters relating to beach management including beach stabilization, growth methods and flood mitigation,~~
  - ~~advise Council of various sustainable shoreline erosion protection methods that incorporate the key values of the community~~
  - ~~advise on any other matters assigned to it by Council.~~



## **Purpose and Mandate**

- The Committee will bring together the expertise of technical advisors provided by the Province of Manitoba with representatives from the various areas of the RM of Victoria Beach under the guidance of an experienced chairperson for the purpose of:
  - providing a preliminary written synopsis of the wide variety of opinions and unique perspectives present in the community in regards to the issue of shoreline protection, flood protection, beach preservation and management, in the form of a "what we heard document".
  - providing a final written report of findings and recommendations to the RM of Victoria Beach Council which shall include:
    - a review of the community concerns regarding shoreline erosion and beach preservation and management, and flood protection,
    - a review of the geographic areas within the RM of Victoria Beach in regards to their respective shoreline erosion, beach management and preservation, and flood protection issues,
    - a review of possible shoreline erosion control methods and beach preservations methods presented at the community meetings,
    - a review of the development and implementation of beach and shoreline erosion management plans and flood protection methods in the province and elsewhere as deemed appropriate or feasible,
    - recommendations based on a consensus position to the RM of Victoria Beach Council on:
      - possible shoreline erosion and beach preservation and management, and flood protection models,
      - possible regulations respecting shoreline erosion controls methods and beach preservation and management, and flood protection,
      - possible educational programs to assist the community members understand shoreline erosion and beach management, and flood protection issues,
  - performing any other duties assigned to it by the Council.

## **Guiding Principles**

Committee members, as individuals and as a committee, are:

**Supportive**

- of the mission as laid out in the mandate for the Committee.

**Trustworthy**

- the Committee will earn public trust as an independent advisory body to the RM of Victoria Beach Council, and the public, supported by credible data and information.

**Fair**

- committee members agree to deliberate in the best interest of the citizens of the RM of Victoria Beach and to do their best in representing the committee's mandate from their own unique perspective and background, and in so doing shall not advocate their own interests or mandates.

**Transparent**

- the Committee will be visible and accessible with established processes to bring issues forward and to communicate the "Committee's" activities.

**Timely**

- the Committee will respond to issues in a reasonable fashion.

**Innovative**

- the "Committee" will bring together expertise and experience to find the best solutions to the shoreline erosion control, beach preservation and flood protection issues in the RM of Victoria Beach.

**Consensus Building**

- recognize that building a consensus perspective is mandated for the Committee. It is also understood that the Committee is responsible to provide advice in an acceptable time frame and in pursuit of such may need to use other democratic mechanisms to achieve such.

**Duties of the Committee**

The Committee has, subject to the direction of the RM of Victoria Beach Council, the following overall duties:

**Providing advice to the RM of Victoria Beach Council, and the public on the shoreline erosion control, beach preservation and management, and flood protection issue.**

The Committee will review issues, identify priorities and maintain a list of existing and emerging shoreline erosion control, beach management, and flood mitigation issues. The

Committee will make recommendations based on consensus to the RM of Victoria Beach Council and the public on the solutions to these issues. The Committee will provide policy advice to the RM of Victoria Beach Council.

### **Advocating for education and awareness**

The Committee will raise the awareness and understanding of the property owners and impacted individuals about shoreline erosion control, beach management, and flood mitigation issues facing the RM of Victoria Beach and encourage all property owners and impacted individuals to show leadership and to work together to improve shoreline erosion control, , beach management, and flood mitigation and protection in the RM of Victoria Beach.

### **Advising the RM of Victoria Beach Council and the public on research available on the issue of shoreline erosion control and beach management in a inland lake situation**

The Committee will gather research requirements from others, examine current research and identify potential research needs.

The Committee is required to make formal presentation and report to the RM of Victoria Beach Council in a timely manner based in a timetable set out and agreed upon by the RM of Victoria Beach Council.

### **Proposed Timeline**

June 21st, 2011	Announce the Committee's Mandate and protocols
July 1 <sup>st</sup> -5th, 2011	Release Info Booklet and Questionnaire to public
July 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2011	Announce Committee Chair and members
July 10 - 16th, 2011	Meeting in Victoria Beach Restricted Area
July 17 - 24th, 2011	Meeting in Senior Scene
July 24 - 31st, 2011	Meeting in Albert Beach
Aug 1- 7th, 2011	Fourth meeting if needed
Sept. 9 <sup>th</sup> , 2011	Final date for questionnaire return
Sept 30 <sup>th</sup> , 2011	"What we heard document" to be released to public
Sept - Dec, 2011	Report compiling and formalization



Dec 16th, 2011

Present report to Council

**Protocol for public presentations before the:  
The Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach Council Advisory Committee on  
Shoreline and Beach Management ((hereafter referred to as "the Committee"))**

In order to accommodate the various regions of the RM of Victoria Beach the Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management will host at least three meetings as follows:

- 1) The Victoria Beach Clubhouse
- 2) The Senior Scene
- 3) Albert Beach

Registration

All individuals or organizations wishing to make a presentation before the Committee must first register with the RM of Victoria Beach Municipal Office by means of email indicating their preference for which of the meetings they wish to appear. Confirmation of presenters' time and place of appearance before the Committee will be confirmed by return e-mail. A list of each meeting's presenters will be posted on the RMVB website and at a greeting table just inside the meeting room. The list will provide presenters an indication of their position on the list. Registered presenters will not be provided a given designated speaking time.

Presentation protocol

If a presenter that has confirmed their presence at the meeting is not present when their name is called, their name is dropped to the bottom of the list but ahead of late registrations. If the presenter is not present when their name is called a second time, their name will be removed from the list.

The Chairperson reserves the right to make decisions at the beginning of each meeting regarding whether or not certain groups of presenters will be allowed to make their presentations ahead of others. These include but are not limited to: out of town presenters, presenters with disabilities and presenters with special concerns.

Presenters are urged to provide a written submission to accompany their oral presentation. This written submission should be provided via email at least 72 hours prior to their appearance to allow time to distribute to Committee members.

Alternatively a presenter can provide a written submission at the time of their presentation. It is suggested that the presenter provide ten copies of the presentation to ensure all Committee members are able to follow their presentation.

There is no restriction on the length of a written submission but presenters are urged to provide a one page abstract or synopsis of any lengthy submission.

Oral presentations are permitted without written submissions but presenters should be aware that recording/transcription services will not be available for the Committee.

There will be a time restriction on all presenters of 10 minutes with an additional 5 minutes permitted to answer questions from the Committee. The Chairperson retains the right to limit a speaker to less than the allotted 10 minutes if they deem it to be necessary due to content of the presentation, the tone or the number of presentations registered for the meeting.

Questions of the Committee members by presenters will not be permitted. The only exception would be point of information requests directed to the Chairperson regarding procedural issues or concerns.

Questions or comments from members of the public in the audience will not be permitted. The Chairperson reserves the right to have disruptive individuals removed from the meeting if they deem it to be necessary.

Late registrations will be permitted. If an individual or organization attends a meeting and wishes to make a presentation they can register at the meeting and their name will be placed at the bottom of the list. If there is time permitting at the end of the meeting they will be asked to make their presentation.

At all meetings efforts will be made to allow presentation from all those wishing to appear before the Committee.

If an interested party wishes to make a presentation to the Committee but cannot attend any of the scheduled meetings they may forward a written submission to the Committee via email, fax or regular mail to the following address:

email: [vicbeach@mymts.net](mailto:vicbeach@mymts.net) under the subject line of: "Advisory Committee"

fax: (204)774-9834

regular mail:

Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management  
C/O The Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach  
303-960 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg  
R3G 0R4

All written submissions must be received prior to the adjournment of the final public meeting.

### Facilities

Presenter should be aware that audio visual facilities may not be available at all or any of the meetings venues. As such, if a presenter may wish to confirm the facility arrangements at their particular venue prior to their appearance or provide sufficient copies of their submission for members of the public as well as the Committee.

Recording/transcription services will not be available to the Committee.

### Public participation

All Committee meetings are open to the public subject to the protocols detailed above.

### Questions

Any question regarding the procedures of the Committee should be directed to:  
[vicbeach@mymts.net](mailto:vicbeach@mymts.net) under the subject line of: "Advisory Committee".

**We Want To Know What You Think: Questionnaire**

1. Which beach do you frequent? (please check all that apply)

- |   |                                      |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Albert Beach           | <input type="checkbox"/> Alexandra   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Arthur                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Clubhouse   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Connaught              | <input type="checkbox"/> King Edward |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Patricia               | <input type="checkbox"/> Sandy Bay   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wanasing               | <input type="checkbox"/> Yacht Club  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) | <input type="checkbox"/>             |

2. When I visit the shore/beach I like to: \_\_\_\_\_. (please check all that apply)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> sunbathe                      | <input type="checkbox"/> participate in motorized recreation     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fish                          | <input type="checkbox"/> participate in non-motorized recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> beach comb                    | <input type="checkbox"/> watch for birds or other wildlife       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> photography                   | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify _____)            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I don't go to the shore/beach |  |

3. I think that the shorelines in Victoria Beach are \_\_\_\_\_ threatened.

- not
- somewhat
- greatly
- not sure or no opinion

4. The following activity or factor is a threat to the shoreline.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
non-native plants/wildlife species	1	2	3	4	5
development/redevelopment of lots	1	2	3	4	5
road works/path	1	2	3	4	5
drainage runoff	1	2	3	4	5
lake water levels	1	2	3	4	5
climate change	1	2	3	4	5
unauthorized stairs/access	1	2	3	4	5
unauthorized use of banks (play)	1	2	3	4	5
other (please specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5



5. I have heard of and understand the application of the following shoreline protection methodologies: (please check all that apply)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> super sandbags         | <input type="checkbox"/> groins                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> dikes                  | <input type="checkbox"/> break waters                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> gabions                | <input type="checkbox"/> artificial reefs             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> rip rap/rock revetment | <input type="checkbox"/> submerged groins             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> beach replenishment    | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify _____) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> haven't heard of any   |   |

6. Based on what you presently know, what course of action would you prefer is used to protect the shoreline from erosion?

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Do nothing and let nature take its course | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-structural solutions such as grading, vegetation, drainage improvement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> super sandbags                            | <input type="checkbox"/> groins   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> dikes                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> break waters   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> gabions                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> artificial reefs   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> rip rap/rock revetment                    | <input type="checkbox"/> submerged groins   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> beach replenishment                       | <input type="checkbox"/> a combination of methods   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> haven't heard of any                      | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please specify _____)   |

7. Shoreline/beach protection should be paid for by \_\_\_\_\_. (please check all that apply)

- property taxes
- drainage license fees
- whoever degrades the beach/shoreline should pay for the restoration
- other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- not sure or no opinion

8. Who should take responsibility for the stewardship of the backshore (area between the ordinary high water mark and private property lines.)

- lake front owners
- all users
- the municipality
- other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- not sure or no opinion



9. If programs were developed to share the cost of shoreline protection and restoration I would expect the following to contribute funding.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
federal government	1	2	3	4	5
provincial government	1	2	3	4	5
municipal government	1	2	3	4	5
lakefront landowners	1	2	3	4	5
all private landowners	1	2	3	4	5
other (please specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5

10. Beach restoration should be paid for by \_\_ (please check all that apply)

- property taxes
- drainage license fees
- whoever degrades the beach should pay for the restoration
- other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- not sure or no opinion
- 

11. I feel it is very important to include the following in a shoreline management policy:

	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
land use	1	2	3	4	5
sustainable use	1	2	3	4	5
restoration	1	2	3	4	5
regulations to protect shorelines and beaches	1	2	3	4	5
best management practices	1	2	3	4	5
education	1	2	3	4	5
other (please specify _____)	1	2	3	4	5

12. I consider developing a **shoreline management policy** for Victoria Beach to be \_\_\_\_\_ urgent.

- extremely
- somewhat
- not
- not sure or no opinion

13. I feel the following are effective strategies for shoreline/beach conservation:

	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree	No opinion
land acquisition (purchase)	1	2	3	4	5
awareness and education	1	2	3	4	5
laws and regulations	1	2	3	4	5
stewardship agreements	1	2	3	4	5
incentives	1	2	3	4	5
restoration	1	2	3	4	5

14. My usual residence is in a \_\_\_\_\_. (check only one)

- city
- town or village
- municipal district or county
- other (please specify \_\_\_\_\_)

15. Which area of Victoria Beach do you usually stay when visiting the RM?

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Albert Beach        | <input type="checkbox"/> Wanasing                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mike Bay/David Road | <input type="checkbox"/> Pelican Point               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sunrise Beach       | <input type="checkbox"/> Hampton                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sandy Bay           | <input type="checkbox"/> Restricted Area             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bayview             | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)_____ |

16. I currently \_\_\_\_\_property in the Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach.

- own
- rent
- have an interest in

**Please use over leaf for further comments**

## **ATTACHMENT 4**

### **PRESENTERS**

#### **RMVB ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SHORELINE & BEACH MANAGEMENT PUBLIC HEARINGS**

##### **July 24, 2011**

Bob Suderman

Greg Hanson (2)

Isbister Family

Phil Murray (2)

Nick Beaton

Ron Newcomb

Leanne Schewchuk

##### **July 28, 2011**

Elise Juzda

Tom Thorsteinsen

Mark Tooley

Mike Mason

Margaret Richardson

Brian Hodgson

Matt Heiman

Andrew Stelmack

Jim Conly

Paul Grover

Salley Lawler

##### **August 8, 2011**

Paul Cooley

Wolf Kraft

Blake Taylor

Stewart Juzda

Andrew Smith

Neil Carroll

Robert McLanders

Joanne Jonsson

Gord Patton

John Kaye

Terry Angus

Dick Dawson

Helmut Hess

Reid Anderson

Helen Forrest

Andrea Pratt

Nicolas Juzda

Fred Buffy

Bryan Purdy

Alan Keith

Brian Hodgson

## **ATTACHMENT 5**

### **WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS**

Ivan McMorris

Greg Hanson

Leslie Sarchuk & Derek Fewer

Kristan Bingeman

Karen & Gordon Paul

John & Mellanie Gow

JAC

Genevieve Richardson

Lorraine Diggle

Michael Dixon

Eleanor & Harvey Cramp

## **E-MAILS**

Donna & Ian Plant  
John Guenther  
Irene Helman  
Bob Suderman (2)  
Alan Glover  
Barb Hansford  
Trish Rathwell  
Peter Ingram  
Liz & Ken Olson  
Kim Zeglinski  
Paula Finkelstein  
Cathy Haining  
Todd Baigrie  
Hans Winkler  
Donald Paterson  
Deborah CoverntonIsobel Waters  
John Gibson

***RM of Victoria Beach***  
***Advisory Committee on Shoreline & Beach Management***

Recommendation to the Council of the Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach

After completing public hearings to gather the opinions and concerns of local residents about shoreline issues in the Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach, and initiating discussion with technical expertise in shoreline erosion and management, your Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management has formulated a recommendation concerning the use of funds under the Victoria Beach Aggradation Pilot Project Agreement with the Province of Manitoba.

While we heard several ideas for specific projects at our hearings, we also heard quite broad support for engaging technical expertise to “get the science right” for the specific and perhaps unique conditions experienced along the shoreline of the Victoria Beach peninsula. We are concerned that a single pilot project, undertaken without this advanced technical work, may not produce useful results.

Our initial assessment is that the work required of outside technical assistance is significant and should not be compromised by inadequate resources. This means in all probability that a significant portion of the resources available under the agreement with the Province will be needed to underwrite this task.

Therefore we recommend that the RM Council approach the Province of Manitoba, on an urgent basis, seeking agreement to use as much of the grant as necessary to engage competent shoreline expertise to advise the council and the community; and that having secured such agreement then act quickly to secure the appropriate services. We believe we may be able to assist council in doing so. This does not mean the abandonment of a pilot project, but at least its postponement for the time being. Section 11 under the Funding Support section of the agreement appears to anticipate possible changes of this nature.

Aside from “getting the science right” we believe that neutral technical expertise can be of great help in building positive dialogue within the community. The positive atmosphere that prevailed at our hearings we believe demonstrated the desire of most residents to at least explore the possibility of solutions that meet everyone’s needs, and to fashion a “made in Victoria Beach” outcome.

Although our final report will contain recommendations, we will continue to be on the lookout for time sensitive issues and if necessary make further recommendations prior to tabling our final report.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'N. Brandson', written over a horizontal line.

Norm Brandson  
Chair  
Advisory Committee on Shoreline & Beach Management

August 15, 2011



***RM of Victoria Beach***

***Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management***

Recommendation #2 to the Council of the Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach

As indicated in our letter of August 15, 2011 our committee will when circumstances warrant, make recommendations to council in advance of our formal reporting.

After reviewing all of the sources of community feedback available to us, we have concluded that there is a strong feeling among residents that the regulation of Lake Winnipeg by Manitoba Hydro is a factor that has to be taken into account in future planning to manage the shoreline and beaches in the municipality. There is significant support for the view that lake regulation is a factor in creating or exacerbating shoreline problems, and that the regulatory regime ought to be more sensitive to shoreline issues.

Manitoba Hydro has requested a final license under the Manitoba Water Power Act for Lake Winnipeg Regulation, making permanent the conditions under which the lake has been regulated under an interim license of August 8, 1972. Subsequently the Minister of Conservation has requested the Manitoba Clean Environment Commission to hold public hearings on this application, issuing terms of reference on September 1, 2011.

The committee is of the opinion that the RM of Victoria Beach, reflecting the views of its ratepayers, ought to participate in these hearings. Although the dates have yet to be announced by the CEC, in order for the RM to make an effective presentation, we recommend that council begin as soon as possible its preparation. This may have to involve engaging some assistance – that is up to council to decide – but we are prepared to provide our thoughts to council if that is felt to be useful.



---

Norm Brandson  
Chair  
Advisory Committee on Shoreline & Beach Management

September 13, 2011



***RM of Victoria Beach***

***Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management***

Recommendation #3 to the Council of the Rural Municipality of Victoria Beach

As indicated in our letter of August 15, 2011 our committee will when circumstances warrant, make recommendations to council in advance of our formal reporting.

During the course of our public consultation the question of control of shoreline in the municipality was raised. In following up this issue we were made aware of the attached map that shows which areas of shoreline are controlled privately, by the RM and by the Province of Manitoba. It appears that there is significant Crown Land and Public Reserve shoreline controlled by the Province of Manitoba.

We have not sought legal advice in this matter, however it appears that the Province could, without reference to the RM, approve projects in these areas. If this is indeed the case we would be concerned if permanent, non-emergency works could be approved before the municipality had completed its review of shoreline issues and made decisions concerning what should or should not be done for on-going shoreline and beach management.

The committee recommends that council formally confirm with the Province that they will not approve any permanent and/or non-emergency shoreline works while the RM is conducting its review, and that the Province take whatever steps are necessary to monitor areas for which it is responsible to ensure that no such unauthorized work takes place.



---

Norm Brandson  
Chair  
Advisory Committee on Shoreline and Beach Management

September 13, 2011



