

In-Lake Technical Committee (ILTC) – A committee of the APLM Update – June 9th 2017

It is contemplated that the efforts of the ILTC in conjunction with APLM , PLWA and AEP will tie into the broad based plan for Pigeon Lake under the Pigeon Lake Watershed Management Plan (PLWMP). This plan has achieved very broad stakeholder involvement and collaboration. It provides a framework for public input and consideration of positive initiatives which can be implemented for improvement of the health and condition at Pigeon Lake.

Terms of Reference are under development with AEP with professional support of Hutchinson Environmental, which will guide the evaluation and scientific support in consideration of a range of in-lake alternatives. The Terms of Reference will be brought back to APLM for adoption. It can then be discussed with the broader public as work moves forward under its guidance.

A component involving the consideration of in-lake options is prudent given the significant contribution of internal phosphorous loading sourced from lake sediments. Research has indicated that the single largest source of nutrient feeding blooms exists within the lake bed already. A nutrient budget completed in conjunction with AEP demonstrates this reality. Given the significance of this contribution it would be imprudent to ignore options which may mitigate this contribution. It is also important to recognize that such cumulative availability of nutrient has a direct connection to what is done on the land in the watershed. Thus, it is critical to consider watershed management in a cohesive fashion which recognizes the undeniable connection between the land and lake.

As for In- Lake investigations, the following comments are appropriate;

There are no options identified which would diminish the need to fully commit to the land based initiatives.

That land based stewardship and changed behavior /actions MUST be at the heart of efforts of the PLWMP if we are to see a SUSTAINABLE positive impact upon the problem of the unattractive frequency and intensity of BG algal blooms

In- lake options require applications and approvals and will not move forward without suitable scientific supports

That any options presently being considered as “potentials”, are not viewed as “permanent” solutions or capable of negating the need to change our behaviors on the watershed (they may be beneficial in accomplishing an improvement in conditions over a shorter span of time – in other words, do not diminish the need to continue working upon the root causes of the problem)

Options would likely require ongoing or a repeat of application.

If any are approved they would also involve a need to seek a resourcing budget or model. Economic evaluations of a healthy vs. unhealthy lake are underway and it is expected that we will see a considerable economic and social rationale for investing in the health and condition of Pigeon Lake. Frankly, a need for resources (financial and otherwise) will arise to varying degrees under almost all components and initiatives under the PLWMP, whether land based or in-lake management.

The watershed efforts are REQUIRED for long term sustainable improvement; in-lake options may be helpful to see more immediate improvement (with varying length of durable improvement) while the underlying condition improves through the execution of the land based changes.

As the TOR are coordinated with AEP and vetted through APLM the structure will be shared with the various stakeholders.

The problem we face is significant and complex – an open minded -all of the above consideration of actions (land based and in-lake) is prudent