

## CEAA COMMENTS

FEB. 14, 2021

**CEAA has a mandate to establish all impacts, both negative and positive and to establish economic and social impacts.**

**This appears to be missing in this report.**

1. Springbank is a huge land mass. One air monitoring station is not enough with the massive winds we have daily. I think you will need monitoring in each direction.
2. Springbank has no parks or public access to any water bodies. The number one ask from the community and Calgary is for water access. We request water access by the public be reviewed and commented on by CEAA on its environmental impacts and why it is not being allowed. Glenmore Dam was designed many years ago and of course they did not think to design recreation into the plans. Later, they had to try to get pathways in and it was costly work. Today, we are still not designing future pathways into a public infrastructure dam. It is a sad statement of poor planning practices and that we are not learning by past mistakes.
3. For Albertans that are travelling the number one tourism highway in Alberta and maybe Canada, the exposure of this crown land will be very public. We request that adequate planning for a public use staging area be done for the number of vehicles that are now going to be parking to access this massive crown land area. Otherwise, we are going to have cars parking on the highways that are already busy with vehicle traffic and biking.
4. Rescuing wildlife before a major flood is not possible unless there is a much better and more expensive system in place to gauge and forecast the flooding in the mountains. Is that system included in the budget? We all saw how fast the flood came in 2013. Is the Alberta taxpayer paying for the wildlife rescues? How will the government access enough qualified biologists on short notice? Where will the rescued animals go? I guess the Alberta taxpayer will pay for facilities to look after the misplaced animals?
5. Climate change has been ignored in the environmental assessment of CEAA. All the studies say we are now going to have more rain, more quickly and more drought. The money being spent on a dry dam that is not sustainable is embarrassing when we know that drought is coming and fires are increasing. I quote the Chaps and Chinooks Book of Springbank and area written in 1976.  
“ The wet years from 1901 to 1907 had a deterrent effect upon irrigation development, especially upon small schemes, but the return of a cycle of dry years beginning with 1909 and 1910 re-kindled a warm interest in the subject. This point illustrates the difficulties of promoting irrigation in a semi-arid country like the basin of the South Saskatchewan. In wet years, the farmers see no need for irrigation and conclude the investment thereon is wasted. As soon as the dry years recur they swing to the opposite opinion. **This was to be expected in the initial stages of settlement but the collection and tabulation of rainfall records over a long series of years, gives the farmers reliable data upon which to base conclusions as to the value of irrigation. Since 1883 such records have been kept by the Meteorological Service of Canada, and they indicate a regular alternation of wet with dry years.**”  
Page 65, Chaps and Chinooks.

Building irrigation canals in this semi-arid area began in 1875. A book written in 1976 knew we can make better decisions based on data since 1883 that profiles alternating wet and dry cycles. But here we are in 2021, ignoring climate change and wet/dry cycles with infrastructure that only serves in the wet cycle.

The time will come for drought and fires and we will have wasted millions on a dry dam infrastructure project that is useless.

6. This area is rich in history. Settled before Alberta, the early settlements and special places are in this vicinity and need to be researched before the early history of Alberta is allowed to be destroyed. The historical structures, special places and crossings have not been protected and need to be designed into the infrastructure to protect the special places and celebrate them.

7. I have large concerns with the number of springs, hence the name Springbank and the fact that our aquifer could be affected. There is nothing from CEAA monitoring or protecting the communities' wells that are on the massive Paskapoo aquifer. Should our wells be altered, what is the process of monitoring and compensation should our wells change during and after construction?

8 I understand that the berms must be kept free of roots and borrowing animals to maintain the integrity of the 4 km of 8 storey dirt. This again, is outside the construction project so who will pay for the maintenance of this massive area?

9. In many areas of the document, CEAA states, the construction phases and how toxic silicates, other dust, water, springs and aquifers etc will be monitored. The document needs to be reviewed and include all monitoring and processes required to protect the surrounding communities including Calgary after the construction phases end. Including the transparency of reporting and the responsibilities of the each relevant body responsible to Albertans and the surrounding communities for maintaining the clean air, water and wildlife we have today.

10. How will the government test for springs that may be under the 4 kilometers of berms, thereby compromising the berm to hold water? What monitoring will be done and at what cost?

11. I did not find enough references to evacuation procedures and the cost to taxpayers when residents must be evacuated when the dam is used? What is the criteria, how will the large number of residents and Kamp Kiwanis be notified and who pays for their food and lodging? At the 2013 flood people were not allowed homes for weeks as the bridges were closed.

13. California is having massive dust storms and health issues attributed to toxic silicates and dust in the air that is travelling many miles. California is now spending millions to clean up silt left behind by dams. Why are we creating a silt dust storm on purpose outside of Calgary? I do not believe the economics and cost to taxpayers of maintaining the silt without dust storms in the chinook winds and dry years addressed with due diligence.

14. Bulldozing will be required for drainage and tackifier is suggested for dust. But tackifier once will hold down the dust to only leave a smoother impervious surface for even more dust to fly in the next season. Tackifier will become a yearly cost to taxpayers.

15. I would ask that CEAA add as a condition that the dam must be deconstructed and the land returned to its natural state once decommissioned.

16. Is there an independence advisory panel proposed to administer the workings of this infrastructure and to transparently address the communities at regular intervals during the lifetime of this infrastructure?

17. I have very large concerns that Alberta taxpayers are on the hook for a very large yearly price tag should this project proceed. I did not see that CEAA had addressed the economics in enough detail.

In closing, we need you to take care of our history, our health, and loss of tourism with a more thorough analysis of the economic and social consequences to Albertans.

Thank-you, Jan Erisman