

ASSESSMENT OF GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSE  
TO THE FLOOD OF 2011

CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOMES/RESULTS
<p>1. EFFORTS TAKEN TO LOWER LAKE MANITOBA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EMERGENCY CHANNEL (REACH 1)</li> <li>• FAIRFORD CONTROL STRUCTURE</li> <li>• SECONDARY CHANNEL FROM LAKE MANITOBA TO LAKE ST.MARTIN</li> <li>• DREDGING AT FAIRFORD DAM TO INCREASE EFFICIENCY</li> <li>• REACH 3 (LAKE ST MARTING EMERGENCY CHANNEL EXTENSION – BUFFALO CREEK TO WEST OF LAKE WINNIPEG)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COMPLETED ON TIME</li> <li>• OPERATED ALL WINTER, LAKE MB. LEVEL BELOW 814</li> <li>• SCRAPPED AT THIS POINT</li> <li>• UNDER DISCUSSION</li> <li>• COMPLETED BUT NOT USED</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOMES/RESULTS
<p>2. LAKE MANITOBA LEVELS AND ABILITY TO MANAGE DETERMINED OPERATING RANGE: (CURRENT OPERATING RANGE: 810.5 – 812.5 FT. ASL) CURRENT LAKE LEVEL 813.7FT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COMMITTEE ANNOUNCED HEADED BY Harold Westar</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NO REPRESENTATION FROM RM OF ST. LAURENT</li> <li>• NO DISCUSSION OF USE OF PORTAGE DIVERSION ON MANDATE.</li> <li>• LACK OF ADEQUATE PLAN FOR THE LONG RUN REGULATION OF LAKE MANITOBA WATER LEVELS LEADS TO CONTINUED UNCERTAINTY.</li> <li>• NOT EASILY WEB ACCESSIBLE INFORMATION ON THE PROCESS TO BE CONDUCTED, HEARINGS TO BE HELD OR OTHER MATTERS RELATED TO THE WORK OF THE LAKE MANITOBA AND LAKE ST MARTING REGULATION REVIEW, OPERATING ADVISORY COMMITTEE...</li> </ul>
<p>3. COMPENSATION FOR STRUCTURAL DAMAGE UNDER MASC PART C AND PART D AND REIMBURSEMENT FOR REPAIRS TO HOMES AND OTHER ASPECTS OF AFFECTED PROPERTY.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEE ATTACHED SUMMARY</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AS OF THE END OF FEBRUARY 2012, 75% OF TWIN BEACH PROPERTY OWNERS HAD NOT YET BEEN CONTACTED BY THE GOVERNMENT'S REPRESENTATIVES TO HELP WITH THEIR CIRCUMSTANCES</li> <li>• VERY POOR COMMUNICATION BY THE GOVERNMENT WITH PEOPLE AFFECTED BY THE FLOOD</li> <li>• MULTIPLE PROGRAMS AND MULTIPLE OFFICES MAKE THE COMPENSATION/REIMBURSEMENT PROCESS MUCH MORE COMPLICATED</li> </ul>

#3. continued

- THAN NEEDED. A SINGLE DESK AND SINGLE PROGRAM FORM ARE NEEDED.
- INEQUITY IN COMPENSATION STILL EXISTS BECAUSE OF THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN PRINCIPAL AND NON-PRINCIPLE RESIDENCE.
  - GOVERNMENT APPRAISERS STRUGGLING WITH FINDING COMPARABLES AND ESTABLISHING WHICH STRUCTURES BELONG TO WHICH OWNERS.
  - PRIVATE APPRAISALS DONE BY PROPERTY OWNERS CONFLICT WITH GOVERNMENT APPRAISALS.
  - PEOPLE ARE ONLY GETTING PARTIAL COMPENSATION BECAUSE OF THE DEDUCTIBLES AND BECAUSE CERTAIN EXPENSES BY GOVERNMENT WHICH ARE NOT RELATED TO REPAIRING OR RAISING HOMES ARE BEING DEDUCTED FROM REIMBURSEMENT.
  - FLOOD PROTECTION FOR 2012 AND REBUILDING OF STRUCTURES HAS BEEN FROUGHT WITH PROBLEMS, DUE TO DELAYS AND CHANGES IN DECISIONS MADE, IN RESTRICTIONS TO ACCESS TO PROPERTIES, TO CHANGES IN BUILDING CODES PART WAY THROUGH THE PROCESS ETC.

CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOMES RESULT
<p>4. WATER STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NO GPS, NO SURVEY EQUIPMENT, NO ADVICE, NO OPTIONS GIVEN TO SOME FLOOD AFFECTED PEOPLE.</li> <li>• SOME WATER STEWARDSHIP OFFICERS ARE PROCEEDING BY “I JUST KIND OF EYEBALLED IT” IN REFERENCE TO LEVELS OF HOMES AND LEVEL OF WATER FOR WHICH PEOPLE SHOULD PREPARE WHICH IS QUITE DISCONCERTING.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CONFUSION, DELAYS, ANGUISH</li> <li>• FLOOD LEVELS FOR FLOOD MITIGATION DOLLARS KEEP CHANGING. GETTING ACCURATE ESTIMATES FOR RAISING STRUCTURES IS NEXT TO IMPOSSIBLE. TWO INDIVIDUALS WERE TOLD THE LEVEL TO WHICH THEY HAD TO RAISE THEIR HOMES. THEY DID. THEN THE GOVERNMENT CHANGED ITS MIND AND ORDERED THE HOMES TO BE RAISED HIGHER.</li> <li>• SOME STRUCTURES ALREADY RAISED TO INITIAL LEVELS NOW NEED TO BE RAISED AGAIN AT AN ADDITIONAL COST TO THE OWNER. .</li> </ul>
<p>5. TEMPORARY ACCOMODATION PROGRAM</p> <p>#5 T.A.P. continued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GOVERNMENT HAS FAIRLY SUPPORTED TEMPORARY RESIDENSES DURING THE FIRST YEAR AFTER THE FLOOD FOR THOSE WHO HAVE LOST THEIR PERMANENT RESIDENCES.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAIR FIRST YEAR TREATMENT FOR EVACUEES NEEDING RELOCATION.</li> <li>• ONE YEAR LEASES ARE NOW CLOSE TO EXPIRATION WITH NO PROVISION FOR ONGOING ACCOMMODATIONS UNTIL INDIVIDUALS CAN RETURN TO THEIR HOMES OR REBUILD THEIR HOMES, OR GET A BUYOUT AND BUILD OR BUY A NEW HOME.</li> <li>• EVACUEES ARE TOLD TO GET A</li> </ul>

		<p>MONTH TO MONTH LEASE WHICH IS NOT EASILY ATTANABLE IN THE WINNIPEG MARKET.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOME RTM's ARE BEING PROVIDED ON A TEMPORARY BASIS</li> <li>• FOLLOWING MONTHS OF DELAYS, WAITING LIST HAS NOW SHRUNK FROM MORE THAN 50 TO 17.</li> </ul>
<p>6. COMPENSATION TO FLOOD AFFECTED BUSINESSES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOME SUPPORT TO BUSINESSES THAT HAVE HAD STRUCTURAL DAMAGE TO THEIR PLACE OF BUSINESS AS A RESULT OF THE HIGH WATER LEVELS.</li> <li>• NO ACTION TO DATE TO ASSIST MANY BUSINESSMEN WHO WERE DRAMATICALLY AFFECTED BY THE FLOOD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAME FRUSTRATION AND DELAYS FACED BY HOME OWNERS AND COTTAGERS.</li> <li>• ONLY BUSINESSES THAT WERE ACTUALLY TOUCHED BY FLOOD WATERS OR WHO COULD NOT OPERATE DUE TO ROAD CLOSURES OR LACK OF ACCESS.</li> <li>• NO CONSIDERATION GIVEN FOR BUSINESS LOSSES DUE TO EVACUATION OF RESIDENTS AND BEING SITUATED IN A FLOOD ZONE</li> <li>• NO ACTION TO DATE FOR COMPENSATION IN LOST REVENUE FOR AFFECTED RESTAURANTS AND STORES.</li> <li>• NO CONSIDERATION FOR SOME BUSINESSES WHICH WERE FLOOD AFFECTED BY HAVING WATER ON THE PROPERTY AND HAVING SEVERE LOSS OF BUSINESS SUCH AS THE MANIPOGO GOLF COURSE.</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOMES/RESULTS
7. PROPERTY TAXES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50% PAID BY THE PROVINCE FOR 2011.</li> <li>• REASSESSMENT FOR 2012</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• INITIAL 50% SUPPORT BY PROVINCE WAS FAIR AND EQUITABLE.</li> <li>• 2012ASSESSMENT HAS BEEN PROBLEMATIC AND MANY ASSESSMENT APPEALS LAUNCHED.</li> <li>• LAND VALUES GIVEN AN ARBITRARY 25% REDUCTION IN THE RM OF WOODLANDS AND 45% REDUCTION IN THE RM OF ST LAURENT. THIS DOES NOT REFLECT CURRECT MARKET VALUES.</li> <li>• STRUCTURAL VALUES AND LAND VALUES BEING JUGGLED TO REACH SETTLEMENT COMPROMISES.</li> <li>• CONCERN IN PARTICULAR OVER THE RM OF ST LAURENT'S FUTURE DUE TO IT BEING SO SEVERELY AFFECTED.</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOMES/RESULTS
<p>8. COMPENSATION TO AFFECTED RMS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LOCAL STATES OF EMERGENCY CALLED BY AFFECTED RMS</li> <li>• RM'S LEFT TO DELIVER AND CO-ORDINATED FLOOD RESPONSE</li> <li>• USE OF OFFICE OF FIRE COMMISSIONER</li> <li>• USE OF URBAN SEARCH AND RESCUE</li> <li>• RM HIRED FLOOD CO-ORDINATORS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WHILE COMPENSATION TO BRANDON HAS FLOWED SMOOTHLY IN PART BECAUSE IT IS A LARGE CITY AND HAS LARGE LOCAL STAFF AND EXPERTISE, MANY RURAL MUNICIPALITIES ARE EXPERIENCING DELAYS IN COMPENSATION.</li> <li>• VIABILITY IN DOUBT FOR THE RM OF ST. LAURENT.</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOMES/RESULTS
9. PORTAGE DIVERSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>INCREASED CAPACITY</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PROTECTED COMMUNITIES SOUTH OF PORTAGE</li> <li>ADDED MORE THAN 60% TO INCREASE THE LEVEL ON LAKE MANITOBA</li> <li>FLOW THROUGH THE DIVERSION HAS ADDED NITRATES, PHOSPHOROUS AND OTHER NUTRIENTS AND POLUTANTS TO LAKE MANITOBA.</li> <li>2012 DEMONSTRATED THAT INCREASED FLOW THROUGH THE PORTAGE DIVERSION NEEDS TO BE BALANCED BY MUCH IMPROVED ABILITY TO FLOW WATER FROM LAKE MANITOBA TO LAKE WINNIPEG AS A RESULT OF EXTRA WATER GOING THROUGH THE PORTAGE DIVERSION.</li> </ul>
10. MANAGEMENT OF ASSINIBOINE WATER SHED	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30% INCREASE OF WATER DRAINING OFF THE LAND IN MANITOBADUE TO DRAINAGLE PROGRAMS WITHOUT A BALANCE IN INCREASED WATER STORAGE.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NO BALANCE BETWEEN DRAINAGE AND WATER RETENTION AND STORAGE AS GOVERNMENT PURSUES DRAIN ONLY POLICIES</li> </ul>



CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOMES/RESULTS
11. HOOP AND HOLLER CUT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>THERE WAS A LACK OF A PROPER PLAN IN PLACE AHEAD OF TIME IN CASE OF THE EVENTUALITY OF FLOWS ALONG THE ASSINIBOINE RIVER WHICH ARE ABOVE THE CAPACITY OF BOTH THE PORTAGE DIVERSION AND THE ASSINIBOINE RIVER CHANNEL.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>THE HOOP AND HOLLER CUT'S EFFECTIVENESS IS IN QUESTIONS.</li> <li>WAS IT NECESSARY??</li> <li>FLOW OF SUPPORT TO AFFECTED PROPERTY OWNERS IS SLOW.</li> <li>LONG RUN PLAN STILL NEEDED IN CASE OF FUTURE SCENARIOS IN WHICH FLOW DOWN THE ASSINIBOINE RIVER TOWARD PORTAGE IS GREATER THAN THE COMBINED CAPACITY OF THE ASSINIBOINE RIVER AND THE PORTAGE DIVERSION.</li> </ul>
12. ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT ON THE LAKE MANITOBA BASIN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CLEAN-UP AND DEMOLITION OF HOMES AND COTTAGES DEEMED UNINHABITABLE</li> <li>CLEAN-UP OF LAKE SHORE AND LAKE MANITOBA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RM OF WOODLANDS COMPLETED</li> <li>AFTER MUCH DELAY RM OF ST. LAURENT TENDERS ARE NOW BEING AWARDED FOR CLEAN UP, BUT MANY PROPERTIES STILL LACK PRE-DOMOLITION PROCESS COMPLETION.</li> <li>MASC HOLDING BACK 10% OF SETTLEMENT DOLLARS UNTIL</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CLEAN -UP OF LAKE FRANCIS MARSH AND DELTA MARSH</li></ul>	<p>CLEAN UP COMPLETE AT TWIN BEACHES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CLEAN UP OF MANY FARM LANDS AROUND LAKE MANITOBA IS STILL INCOMPLETE WITH MUCH STILL TO DO.</li></ul> <p>NOT YET STARTED (LAKE TOO HIGH), BUT A CONTRACTOR HAS BEEN HIRED.</p>
--	---	---

CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOME/RESULTS
<p>13. PROTECTION FOR PROPERTIES SURVIVING THE MAY 31<sup>ST</sup> EVENT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AT THE RM OF ST LAURENT, INSTALLATION OF AN INNER DIKE TO PROTECT UNAFFECTED HOMES PROCEEDED WELL. HOWEVER, HOMES OUTSIDE THE INNER DIKE HAVE REMAINED UNPROTECTED.</li> <li>• “TEST PILOT PROJECT” FOR WAVE ATTENUATION BY USE OF GEO-TUBES.</li>   <li>• RM’S RECEIVED 2 – 4 MILLION DOLLARS FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND REMOVAL</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R. M OF WOODLANDS HAS COMPLETED INSTALLATION OF GEO-TUBES.</li> <li>• R. M OF ST LAURENT – FAILURE TO INSTALL SO MOST PROPERTIES ARE LEFT UNPROTECTED.</li> <li>• R. M OF PORTAGE (DELTA) ONLY PART OF DEVELOPMENT PROTECTED.</li> <li>• TIGER DAM PROTECTION LEVEL STILL REMAINS UNCERTAIN AS THIS TECHNOLOGY HAS PRIMARILY WAVE ATTENUATION BENEFITS AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH IT WILL ADEQUATELY PROTECT HOMES AND OTHER STRUCTURES REMAINS TO BE DETERMINED.</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	ACTIONS	OUTCOME/RESULTS
<p>14. COMPENSATION/REIMBURSEMENT /PROTECTION FOR AGRICULTURAL PROPERTIES</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOME AREAS OF COMPENSATION ARE WORKING, BUT OTHER AREAS ARE INEXPLICABLE MISSING – FOR INSTANCE AN INADEQUATE APPROACH TO SUPPORT LOST INCOME FROM RENTED LAND, FOR CLEANING UP DEBRIS, TO REPLACING A CALVING SHED AND TO SUPPORT FOR 2012 AND 2013 WHERE NEEDED BECAUSE OF THE TIME PASTURE TAKES TO RECOVER.</li> <li>• SHOAL LAKE HAS SUFFERED FROM MANY YEARS OF INDECISION AND INACTION.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SOME FARMERS SATISFIED, BUT MANY FARMERS ARE FEELING DISAPPOINTED AND LET DOWN BY THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT AND HELP.</li> <li>• FARMERS AND LANDOWNERS AROUND SHOAL LAKE ARE BEING BOUGHT OUT, BUT THERE IS A LACK OF A CLEAR LONG RANGE PLAN FOR SHOAL LAKE AREA.</li> </ul>

--	--	--

