

Morning ladies and gentleman

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you today. As a private citizen with a vested interest I am afraid that I do not have a very flashy PowerPoint slideshow, not will be the most polished presenter.

I am passionate about the land use and lake water topic that will be the focus of Stantec's presentation to you next week. It will appear that I am not a supporter of their report because I do not agree with how the report is constructed, but I agree with most of the recommendations and intent that they will present.

So I will break my presentation into 3 parts.

- The reports

- The issues

- The solutions

I sincerely hope that their presentation will reinforce what I am saying here this morning. I am however going to present you an alternate solution.

The reports: I have gone through

Wabamun lake Sub-Watershed land use plan technical report, and Draft Wabamun Lake Sub-Watershed land use plan.

I need to take a step back

I am reading a great book it's called thinking fast and slow by Daniel Kahneman. This Nobel Lauriat studied of how people perceive the world as opposed to its reality. In his book there was a one study of a tea set that was sold on EBay. The incomplete set was set up for action and bids came in from various buyers around the world. Then the authors included the details of all the damage of the missing pieces in great detail. The bidding price went up. What this tells us is that we view extra data as value added. But really what is the value of a broken cup or dish?

Even mark twain is quoted as saying "I haven't got time to write you a short letter so I will write you a long one"

These studies would do more by me if they understood that a brief should be brief and be a longer outline of the table of contents. These reports would be half as volumus if the repetition was removed and more clear if the structure was leading to supported conclusions.

I was so confused when I got to the "Tools /Procedures /Organizations" that was about to retype all of the data into a table and organize it when the though hit me that this seems deliberately confusing. It seems to draw conclusions but honestly I stopped reading. It is 30 pages of 62 page report and did not lead me anywhere.

I understand that as a consultant they want to show you that your money was well spent. They will have a flashy Slide show full of dazzle

and bling with well-rehearsed presenters and standby experts to answer any question you may have. All consultants strive to give you the answers to the questions you are looking for. Otherwise you will not want to rehire them.

Now it may sound as though I do not support their initiatives, far from it, I agree with every goal outlined in the brief of the technical report. What I learned from this report, that was most impactful to me, was that the land ownership and justifications are complicated, and that the lake is a like a large bowel where the water will not exchange itself in the remaining lifetime of the majority of the lake area property owners.

So how do we really solve this multijurisdictional nightmare? My gut tells me to bump this up, not push it down. This is not a fact based argument but so far in the short time that I have lived here I have whiteness excesses of local governments that are in complete contradiction to the real wishes of the majority of residents. So I am biased towards not letting things get resolved at the lowest levels. I prefer a top down model where the rules are applied to all of the stakeholders evenly. Clearly not without their input, but in a way where if the next change of local government cannot change their minds about being included.

Secondly I believe that having people volunteer to comply with regulations may be against behavioral science norms. Land owners can get their back up pretty fast if you start changing their use or cost them money to comply with a problem that they might not fully understand.

So what do we do? It seems to be uphill both ways in a blinding snowstorm with no shoes! But really the steps forward are simple and straight forward.

Start monitoring the water coming into the lake, measure contaminants and trace the contaminates back to the source. Quarantine or treat the water before it gets into the lake.

Measure water quality of the lake and start taking steps to clean it. Force lakeside residents to stop discharging sewage or grey water into the lake.

The future of the lake will require intervention to remove evasive species, and algae. The water may need to be treated. To be honest that is the job of the environmental scientists. I want us to take action, but I am not sure what action to take.

I do not stand for junk science. All proposals need to be back by double blind studies and modeled by others experiences that lead to successful conclusions.

As an example there will be environmentalists that may say they we need to allow more of the native vegetation to return along the shoreline. If you have a study that shows that native species filter more toxins from ground water then a grass lawn does, I will say yes otherwise no.

We need to keep in mind that the use of the lake will be increasing. We need to take steps that will ensure the use and future of this area.

Clean up will take funds, and as a lake user I support funding the cleanup. Not at \$20 per day that is being charged for a pre-existing federal government Warf but a levy per season per vessel even per day for day users.

In return people will want to see things happening and eventually may even be proud of the clean-up efforts.

This plan needs teeth and must be top down supported from the federal and provincial governments. I suggest that you look into creating an organization similar to a Harbour Authority. It is a federal organization that can have enough teeth to do what is necessary.

You have a hard choice to make. A hard choice is defined as one with no clear solution. There are multiple outcomes possible, and each has its pros and cons. There will be a feeling that to make a more informed choice more research is required. That may not be true. Good Science means as one question is answered new questions emerge that need answers.

The way that this report was constructed does not lead me to a level of comfort with any path forward. How can 30 pages of recommendations lead you anywhere but to do more study?

In my opinion that is not the answer, even this report quoted that this is one of the most studied lakes. We do not need more public consultation.

My push is to have a federal government body like a harbour authority, mandate sensible requirements with good clear monitoring and a clean-up plan that is based on real science.

Thank you for your time. If there is any time left I will answer any questions you have.