

**Attachment 4: Public and Stakeholder comments:
revised Environmental Conservation Master Plan (ECMP)**

The following public and stakeholder comments are comments received on the revised ECMP document which was posted on the Parkland County website in early May 2014. Council may consider the following comments when reviewing the ECMP document.

Respondent names and contact information have been removed due to Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Legislation requirements – and have been identified as (Name removed) throughout the attachment. Contact information can be provided by Administration at the request of Council.

From: (Name removed)
Sent: Friday, May 16, 2014 4:01 PM
To: ECMP; luf@gov.ab.ca; information@devon.ca
Subject: Late submission

16 may 2014
4:00 pm mdt
devon ab ca
friday

hi
sorry for the late submission on environmental matters and plans

heres it is, see attached pdf

rather than continually repeat myself
i've compiled the sum of my thoughts on various

issues, its organized by way of spheres and has a
history component as well,
see contents page,
please search it and find the info applicable to your interest or concern.

its a little more global in nature but use what you can

thanks

(Name removed)

NOTE: *The attached PDF mentioned above is over 200 pages in size. The author did not highlight specific relevance to the Environmental Conservation Master Plan. A copy for Council's review can be made available at Council's request.*

From:

Sent: Wednesday, May 21, 2014 11:00 PM

To: Martin Frigo

Subject: ECMP

I have not yet had input into the ECMP, but would like to express my concern for the following three areas:

1. ATV use. I don't have any problem with individuals enjoying these vehicles in a responsible manner, but I frequently witness individuals using these vehicles in an extremely aggressive manner, ripping up vegetation and disturbing the wildlife (not to mention residents). It appears that there is little enforcement of the laws restricting the use of these vehicles.

2. Destruction of wetlands. I was able to stop the filling in of a wetland on Twp. Rd. 511 (Graminia Rd.), approximately one km. West of Hwy 60 by calling the county (thank you!), but now there is development west of that, perhaps an oil well.

3. Gravel pit development in the river valley. The proposed development that I am referring to occurs in the county of Leduc, but it is my belief that if it has a profound effect on the residents of Parkland County, we need to be at the table. Collectively we need to protect this precious wildlife corridor and recreational resource - on BOTH sides of the river.

Thanks for considering my input.

(Name removed)

From:

Sent: Monday, May 26, 2014 4:51 PM

To: ECMP

Cc: Martin Frigo

Subject: Lake Isle concerns

Good afternoon,

My name is (Name removed) and I live in Summerview Heights which is a subdivision within walking distance of Lake Isle. I am writing this letter because I have grave concerns for the long term survival of Lake Isle and the surrounding area.

My family beginning with my father has lived along the shores of Lake Isle since 1935. Over the years the state of the lake has declined substantially to the point where it will die soon if intervention does not take place now.

Back in the day my father hunted and fished along the lake, and has said he was able to drink water from the lake. In the 1970's or early 80's concerns were voiced by many people over the condition of the lake. Proposed subdividing and building along the shore was stopped by the County for environmental reasons.

Today Lake Isle is in serious jeopardy ... I'm not sure if we even have fish left in the Lake after this last winter. Word has it that there was again winter kill and fish were found dead during early spring. Signs are posted every year warning of the dangers of swimming in the lake due to the blue green algae.

In the past few months, a meeting was held at the Pineridge Golf Course ... the owner of which has proposed a 212 unit RV resort be built on the peninsula just off the Kokomoko Campsite reaching north along the shore as well. To do this they will have to clear all of the land in order to put in these RV site. This will destroy the natural habitat of deer, moose, small animals, nesting birds some of which I understand are unique and rare as well as plant life including tree. It will also increase use of the lake by boats, sea doo's and any other water craft.

I believe in order for the lake and surrounding wetlands & forests to have a chance at survival steps need to be taken today to stop what has been happening and has only worsened over the years.

Please take a few moments to consider the concerns many of us in the area have ... it would tragedy to see this unique area completely destroyed.

Sincerely,

(Name removed)

From:

Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 10:18 AM

To: Martin Frigo

Cc: AnnLisa Jensen; *(Name removed)*

Subject: Clifford Lee Sanctuary

Martin:

I am a founder of the Sanctuary and welcome its inclusion as a regionally significant ESA. However, I believe I speak for the Management committee when I say that the failure to include a buffer along the western boundary is a concern. I note on the map that the ESA does not extend into the 75 acre parcel owned by Mr *(Name removed)* it does extend somewhat into the parcel lying immediately north of the *(same property)*. (This 85 acre parcel used to be owned by the Evanoff family but I am not sure of the current ownership).

We would like to see the ESA extend into the *(property noted above)* so as to comprise a 10 acre swath all along its eastern boundary, abutting the Sanctuary. Such a buffer would extend approx 100 meters into the *(property noted above)* parcel and provide a measure of protection for the Sanctuary from possible sub-division intrusions from the *(same property)* parcel in the future.

Regards,

(Name removed)

From: *(Name removed)*

Sent: Tuesday, May 27, 2014 2:13 PM

To:

Subject: BURNCO proposed gravel pit in Parkland County on the North Sask River

Attached are my comments in regards to Burnco wanting to develop a wet gravel pit in Parkland County on the North Sask River in a flood plain and an environmentally significant area.

There is a review of the NSR taking place right now, there is a new land use amended plan being put together right now, secondary highway 627 is a death highway, historical resources will be destroyed and wildlife species put at risk.

Burnco is trying to "jump the gun" and get grandfathered before new legislation and a new NSR plan are in place just to make a profit with all costs to the environment, agriculture, residents at risk.

This is copied to provincial MLA's for culture, highways, agriculture and environment.

Let's do what's right - not just provide profits to big business

(Name removed)

BURNCO HWY 627 SOUTH PROJECT comment sheet

Home of the “PITS”

Submitted by XXXX RR#1 Duffield, AB T0E 0N0

Parkland County Residents on the 3rd generation farm with 4th generation children who currently have no future in Parkland County if this “Pit” is approved

Burnco produced notice of an open house, and Parkland County addressed the mail and sent it by Canada Post. This was sent to registered owners only, not renters or interested parties or groups. This impacts everyone, those direct neighbors more, but if you live 3 km or 30 km away and are impacted in any way, it matters. It matters to The City of Edmonton as they drink the water from the NSR.

Burnco has not changed their plan from last application except to get bigger, closer to the river, and to have a private road so they can eliminate Parkland County and Parkland County Gravel Officers from being involved in their operation and avoid spring weight restrictions.

Burnco wants to develop right down to the North Sask River, allowing only the barrier set out by Alberta Environment. This is an environment nightmare. Just upriver a current gravel development, Mixcor, has a major flood and bank erosion issue, with Alberta Environment instructing them on how to “Fix” their problem- which is our entire problem as it added serious contaminant to the NSR River., cutting off water supply to Capital Power at Genesee. Burnco’s web site states: “The aggregate mining industry is very tightly regulated and companies that mine aggregate must adhere to many environmental laws and regulations” Burnco had floods in Calgary and Genesee just a year ago and now they want this side of the river –located in an environmentally significant area. This is a wet pit- not a dry pit. It must be treated differently.

Burnco says 40 trucks per hour entering 627, the DEATH HIGHWAY. 40 are there and back-so 80 trucks per hour. Even if twinned 627 cannot handle this volume with the gravel trucks that are already on this road, including the traffic to Sundance and Keephills TAU. How many more deaths? How many more flower bouquets? My daughter has to drive around our range road to get to a friend’s place north of 627 as it is not safe now. I have been snow blinded by trucks to traveling too close together now on 627- add 80 more an hour?

This “Pit” area is a flood plain. It can never be a golf course. . This land had a development proposed for a subdivision in the past, and it was turned down as this is a flood plain. It will be open pits filled with water just as the old County pits are today on the Assinger property located directly attached. This area did flood in 2013, and in 1986 flooded completely back to the old Parkland County gravel pits from the river, creek included. At this time fish were deposited in these old pits and are a spawning ground for jack fish, which also act as feed for many of the birds (and other fish) including at risk species. Dewatering will destroy the fish and birds.

Gravel pits across the river in Genesee and in Parkland County flooded as recently as 2013. This contaminated the NSR. This whole area is an aquifer with the Wabamun (Whitewhale) creek and the river and is a water shed area all around.

The NSR right out front of this proposed site and just downstream, is the natural spawning grounds for the Lake Sturgeon- aging up to 80 years of age. This area is home to wildlife such as moose, deer, coyote, beaver, badger, birds such as pelicans, osprey, blue heron, sand hill cranes, all varieties of eagles, numerous duck species including the harlequin duck, pileated woodpecker, owls, swans, and Canadian geese, fish including the lake sturgeon, jackfish, gold eye, perch and many more, flora such as lady slippers, orchids, heart leaved twayblade, high bush cranberry, clematis, iris, Saskatoon's, wild raspberry, crocus, etc. This development will injure, kill and possibly eliminate many of these species- many being protected and endangered.

This land is currently viable farm land. To meet growing agriculture markets in Asia and the closer to market demands we must retain viable land. We have rented adjacent land for 25 years. If the road is closed we cannot move our cattle to pasture, dewatering will not allow the cattle to have drinking water. This is reducing my income and way of life.

There are old trading forts in this area, fossils including dinosaur, ammonites, petrified snails, fossils, and amber dating 60-80 million years old, the largest buffalo skull was found within a mile dating 8500 years old. Preserve history, do not destroy it. Ammonites are found on the creek.

How much more airborne pollution can our bodies take? Silica, diesel fumes, noise and vibration? This will go from 10 decibels to a constant rattle and shake- 24 hours a day. This will have serious health and adverse and harmful effects on human life, animal life including my cattle. The cattle will be spooked and put my life in danger being around them as they will not rest with the 24 hour sounds.

Parkland County receives a "levy" for every tonne of gravel removed from a gravel pit within the County- except Parkland's own pit and Alberta Transport pits. Burnco's facts on revenue to Parkland are false and misleading. Burnco shows more income from royalties from this pit alone than Parkland receives from all existing pits today.

There are at least 7 properties for sale in the immediate area and at least 5 more located on 627 to the east. Burnco's deep pockets have bought a few properties to eliminate any complainers in the area. This "Pit" will de-value our property in the millions of dollars. We own a mile and ¼ of river front with part looking straight down a 120 foot bank to the "Pit". Potential of future developments for recreational will be hindered being next to a "Pit". We will not be able to farm as we have with changes to the water act so in future our land will change. What sells better- quiet natural river front or environmentally careless operations that beep, rattle and grind 24 hours a day with 80 trucks a minute running past the farm? Parkland County has shown my farm as a proposed green golf course on past development maps. This "Pit" will de-value property.

Keephills School and community hall are important to the area. You lose a school or hall- you lose property value. With all the homes for sale, with all the land Burnco has bought, there is no chance of this school or hall surviving. The school currently has outdoor classrooms right on the creek. This “Pit” will not allow this to continue.

I asked Burnco to come see me as a direct neighbor- they said fill out the little box on the form and we will get back to you. This just proves how they will not be good business.

Burnco wants this gravel out now- why? Because they know our government is going to start protecting our river valleys. From Burnco web site“” Sand and gravel deposits occur in a limited number of locations and both quality and quantity of particular sites vary widely. The timely extraction of this resource prior to intensive surface development is necessary to prevent shutting in developable aggregate reserves, thus allowing future generations to successfully and economically meet the public and private construction requirements of tomorrow.” This site will not ever be covered in houses. Burnco is a company that wants to make a profit. They want the closest to market gravel. This is all so they can increase profitability and undercut competition in particular with building of the natural gas plants in the area. The Burnco pit flooded across the river in 2013 with pictures of their equipment under water. They even flooded their environmentally friendly bee hives. They already have a gravel pit in operation at Genesee and at Smithfield. This 627 “Pit” is not necessary today. Burnco just wants to get in ahead of Provincial changes in legislation and results from the North Sask River plan.

Already we were told there would be another open house to discuss this “Pit” and now the new letter says application is being made this July. Another non-truth.

The water from the NSR is my drinking water, my bathing water. I swim in this water. My cattle drink this water. The environment in a whole uses this water. You drink this water.

If we keep approving new “Pits” to get grandfathered ahead of legislation to protect our environment, we will never recover as Parkland County. We will never start recycling every piece of concrete taking it back to gravel as we have the technology for. We will never look at alternative ways of hauling or extracting if we grandfather it all today. Take a boat ride down the river in Parkland County. The existing “Pits” are unsightly messes. Is this what we want Parkland County to look like? Welcome to Parkland County- home to the largest gravel pit and largest environmentally unfriendly community. Think of the brochures Parkland can make. Forget the Ag land- just gravel pits.

I will oppose this pit. This letter is written to Burnco now, but Parkland administration and council will also read it.

If Parkland approves this pit- they are stating that the Parkland boundary for residence and quality of life goes west to Jackfish Lake and then stops to the west and south. Parkland is writing off the south west end completely for environment, quality of life and residents.

Copies are sent to government bodies so they are aware of this proposed development.

(Name removed)

From: *(Name removed)*

Sent: Wednesday, May 28, 2014 10:45 PM

To: Martin Frigo

Subject: ECMP Draft Report comments

Hi Martin!

I have read the report and am greatly appreciative of the time, energy and work that has gone into this. I support the findings, and have a few suggestions to add, including some inventory for the NSR Sturgeon Reach valley.

I am anticipating the judicious melding of the ECMP, MDP and ICSP, and the wonderful outflow of guiding principles, policies and by-laws!

Thank you!

(Name removed)

ECMP Draft Report Comments

This is a terrific report. I am heartened by the conjoining of the ICSP, ECMP and the MDP.

I agree with the findings, the BMPs, & the connectivity principles & discussion.

4.8, page 376: "Manage land with respect for the past, and as an investment in the future."

This should be imbedded as a guiding principle in the MDP. With supporting policies and by-laws.

Land use planning needs to protect water, natural spaces and resources for future generations - not only for current residents and industries.

I am strongly in agreement with 4.4.1 & 4.8 :

"avoid developing areas of ecological infrastructure providing watershed functions (floodplains, wetlands, riparian areas, alluvial aquifers, steep slopes, etc.)"

I would add to: "avoid the development of new sand & gravel mines in extremely vulnerable or sensitive areas (e.g., hyborheic exchange areas adjacent to rivers" with, 'or floodplains'

Floodplains require their sand and gravel deposits to mitigate flooding, and to filter water as it seeps into alluvial aquifers.

The North Saskatchewan River Valley - Sturgeon Reach shares the Beverly Buried Aquifer with Hasse Lake, and also shares the same concerns with groundwater contamination. Another reason to prohibit sand or gravel extraction in this valley.

1.2.10.3 Sand & Gravel Extraction

"Current operations exist along the north boundary of the county and some parcels along the North Saskatchewan River. Even though their land use is temporary, sand and gravel extraction sites in Parkland County should be strategically located away from sensitive adjoining land uses and environmentally significant areas. Future reclamation should also be carried out progressively, according to approved plans and regulatory requirements."

4.8.1 p378 Add: under Compliance & Enforcement - additional taxes for non-compliant residents, businesses (in addition to tax incentives)

Strongly agree with restoration & reclamation of ESAs and significant supporting lands/ waterways (recharge, drainage, filtration, etc.)

Agree with incenting landowners around water (lakes, creeks, wetlands, etc.) in addition to farmers - like ALUS, tax breaks, recognition

I would suggest adding to lake management plans by limiting some sensitive lakes to human-powered boats, and foot access only.

The Wetland BMPs are good, but should include no-go zones for development of any kind for some ESAs, particularly unique, and irreplaceable spaces.

The suggested 100 meter buffer around lakes is a great idea - to protect the lakes from unfiltered runoff.

OHVs should be restricted from ESAs. Perhaps an ESA could be found where an enforced trail system could be set up for OHVs - if this ESA were !

Recreation- create OHV parks at either end of county, restrict majority of ESAs to foot traffic only, educate and invent stewardship

Taking into account the recent report concerned the glaciers that feed our rivers, managing the certainty of water restrictions in our lifetimes is a moral imperative. Parkland County has some amazing spaces and waterways, even if some are in ill health. This report offers the county a great perspective for improving our natural spaces and waterways, and for safeguarding these resources for the tough times ahead.

Inventory missing:

historical trading fort in NSR Sturgeon Reach valley, sawhet owls, great grey owls, blue herons, merlins, kestrels, ladyslipper, natural springs in road & across valley (looks like seasonal creek), trumpeter & tundra swans staging in valley - I don't know if these have been seen in Burtonville, but these swans have been sighted in recent years in the Sturgeon Reach (possible creation of breeding area for trumpeters)

(Name removed)