

**CHA Love Your Lake Analysis**  
**Eagle Moose Lake Property Owners' Association**

Please find attached your lakewide reports produced by the Canadian Wildlife Federation ("CWF") which are an average of all of the surveys done on your lakes.

There are some items to which I need to draw your attention:

**Property Classification Counts – Page 5**  
**(% Natural, % Regenerative, % Ornamental, % Degraded)**

The CHA has developed a different method of reporting the % of the shoreline that is Natural, Ornamental, Regenerative and Degraded (a definition of each category can be found on page 4 of the report).

The CHA determined that the lake wide %'s that are on page 5 of your lake wide reports were not calculated in a statistically sound way by Watersheds Canada (one of the 2 partners in Love Your Lake Program). This can lead to flawed conclusions.

One of the main purposes of this project is to determine where we stand on each lake vs the minimum target of 75% of the **total shoreline length** being natural (or natural plus regenerative). The CHA feels that the "Regenerative" category should be included with the Natural category in that it is shoreline that is "heading in the right direction" and does not warrant attention. The Ornamental and Degraded categories represent areas of shoreline that require attention. The numbers listed below show a total of both (Natural & Regenerative) and this number should be compared to the 75 % target. As you know we go to great lengths to determine the shoreline length of each property these are then totaled to arrive at the total shoreline length for the lake.

The correct method for determining the lake wide %'s is, in our view, the following

- Calculate the total shoreline length for the lake by adding the lengths of all the properties on the lake
- Multiply the shoreline length for each property by the 4 %'s (Natural, Regenerative, Ornamental and Degraded) for that property to arrive at the actual length in metres of each category
  - As an example for a 100 foot long property that was classed as
    - 60% natural – equals 60 feet
    - 10% regenerative – 10 feet
    - 25% ornamental - 25 feet &
    - 5% degraded = 5 feet
- Add those lengths up for all of the properties studied on the lake
- Divide the total for each category into the total lake shoreline length
- Thereby arriving at weighted average %'s

Watersheds Canada used the following approach

- Whatever the highest % was for the property - slot the whole property into that class
  - I.e. for the property example above the property would be entered into the calculation as Natural
- Add the total number of properties on the lake in each of the 4 classes
- Divide the total number of lots in each of the classes into the total number of properties on the lake

- So that if there were 500 properties on the lake and 250 of those properties were slotted as Natural because their highest % rating was natural – then the lake would be declared 50% natural

In our view there are significant problems with the Watersheds Canada approach.

1. It does not make allowance for the fact that properties on our lakes can have very different shoreline lengths
  - a. For instance on Kawagama there are properties that are approx. 100 feet long and others owned by the MNRF that are over a kilometer long.
  - b. The West shore of Kennisis has longer lots than the originally settled areas

In the Watersheds Canada system all properties are given the same weight – regardless of size.
2. It also wrongly weights at 100% a property that is less than 100% of a given classification
  - a. i.e. a property that is 50% natural, 30% regenerative, and 10% of each of ornamental and degraded would be given a weight of 100% natural.

The percentages for your lakes using the **CHA approach** are:

<b>CHA Love Your Lake Program Analysis - Shoreline Classification</b>						
Lake	CLASSIFICATION					TOTAL %
	% Natural	% Regenerative	% Natural + % Regenerative	% Ornamental	% Degraded	
Eagle Lake	25	33	58	42	0	100
Glen Lake	76	13	89	11	0	100
Moose Lake	45	28	73	26	0	100

### Ranking of Properties that Would Benefit from Naturalization – Page 6

A review of the numbers reported by priority (e.g. Priority 1) determined a calculation error had been made by CWF generating the numbers – the correct numbers are below:

<b>CHA Love Your Lake Program Analysis - Priorities</b>					
Lake	# of Properties Studied	# of Opportunities for Renaturalization			
		Priority 1	Priority 2	Priority 3	Total
Eagle Lake	201	19	57	26	102
Glen Lake	16	0	1	0	1
Moose Lake	107	3	11	14	28

**Invasive Species - Page 13**

To provide you the opportunity to assess the magnitude of the invasive species problem reported on page 13 of the CWF Lakewide report the following are counts of the numbers of properties on each lake for which invasive species were observed. The CHA extracted this data from the Love Your Lakes application database hosted by CWF.

<b>CHA Love Your Lake Program Analysis - Invasive Species</b>						
Lake	# of Properties Studied	# of Properties with Invasive Species				
		Eurasian Milfoil	Fernwort	Phragmites	Purple Looserife	Total
Eagle Lake	201	0	0	1	0	1
Glen Lake	16	0	0	0	0	0
Moose Lake	107	0	0	2	0	2