

Appendix B. Summary of Consultation

This appendix is intended to document the process of local consultation by the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee, the Cataraqui Source Protection Authority, and the Cataraqui Region Conservation Authority (CRCA) regarding the terms of reference, assessment report and source protection plan with municipalities, provincial ministries, stakeholders, and the broader community. Our process exceeded the requirements of the Ontario *Clean Water Act, 2006* and Ontario Regulation 287/07 - General, as amended.

Terms of Reference

The following is a brief summary of the consultation efforts related to the Terms of Reference for Source Protection Planning (June 2008).

Consultations on the Terms of Reference were completed in accordance with Ontario Regulation 287/07.

A discussion paper on the draft Terms of Reference was prepared in February 2008 and distributed to municipalities, agencies and organizations, and adjacent source protection regions. It was also posted on the CRCA website. Presentations were made to a variety of stakeholders including municipal, public utility and health unit staff, Loyalist Township, and the Ministry of Natural Resources.

A total of 31 people attended the three public open houses held in Kingston, Brockville and Bath in May 2008. There were 93 comments received on the draft Terms of Reference before it was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment for approval in September 2008.

Assessment Report

The following is a brief summary of the consultation efforts related to the Assessment Report (June 2011). Please refer to Appendix 'B' of the Assessment Report (in Volume III) for more details.

There was a series of eight public open houses hosted in the communities for which technical studies (i.e., wellhead protection area and intake protection zone) were completed, as a forum for dialogue with local decision makers and residents. The 'bottom-up' approach allowed for feedback early in the process, resulting in the collection of local knowledge about the realities of each vulnerable area.

A total of 105 people attended this round of public events, not including Source Protection Committee members and staff/consultants. There was some positive media coverage that helped

to raise the profile of drinking water source protection across the Cataraqui Source Protection Area.

Consultations on three versions of the Assessment Report (Draft, Proposed, and Draft Amended Proposed) were completed in accordance with Ontario Regulation 287/07. About 125 comments were received in response to the notice on the Draft Assessment Report, and 1 comment was received on the Draft Amended Proposed Assessment Report. A majority of those comments suggested how to improve the clarity of the report; the Source Protection Committee felt that most of the comments warranted revisions to the document.

Presentations about the Draft Assessment Report were made to 12 municipal councils in January, February, and March 2010. Public open houses were held at Brockville, Kingston, and Napanee in May 2010. There were a total of 31 participants not including Source Protection Committee members and staff/consultants. Response to the Draft Assessment Report was generally positive.

Additional presentations were made to numerous municipal councils in March, April and May 2011. A final municipal and public open house was held in May 2011. The municipal response to the Draft Amended Proposed Assessment Report was positive. There was no attendance at the evening public open house.

Source Protection Plan

The Source Protection Committee and CRCA staff actively consulted on the source protection plan with municipalities, provincial ministries, affected landowners, and adjacent source protection regions since January 2011.

Early Engagement: Community Roundtables

We hosted a series of 12 roundtables that had a total of more than 200 participants early in the plan development process. The purpose of the roundtables was to create an open dialogue with people, businesses and organizations in the vulnerable areas that could be affected by source protection plan policies.

The roundtables provided the opportunity to hear from and listen to ideas on draft policies and other initiatives to protect drinking water in each community. The main focus of discussion at the roundtables was on developing action ideas to respond to the drinking water threats that could affect these communities. The input was used to develop and evaluate policies, and will be useful for plan implementation.

Depending on the roundtable location and topic, members of the community were invited to participate in the roundtables through one or more of the following methods:

- door-to-door canvassing
- personal letter of invitation
- poster
- flyer
- newspaper notice
- radio advertisement.

Each of the roundtables was held in the community whose source(s) of drinking water was the topic of discussion. The roundtables took place in the evening for three hours on the dates identified in Table B-1. The events were facilitated by Sue Cumming of Cumming+Company.

Table B-1: Policy Roundtable Schedule

Vulnerable Area(s)	Date
James W. King (Gananoque) Intake Protection Zone	Monday January 31
Miller Manor Apartments Wellhead Protection Area	Tuesday February 1
Cana Wellhead Protection Area	Monday February 28
Brockville Intake Protection Zone	Tuesday March 1
Sydenham Intake Protection Zone	Monday April 4
Lansdowne Wellhead Protection Area	Tuesday April 5
A.L. Dafoe (Napanee), Bath, and Sandhurst Shores Intake Protection Zones	Monday May 16
Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas	Tuesday May 17
Kingston Central and Point Pleasant (Kingston West) Intake Protection Zones	Monday May 30
Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas	Tuesday May 31
Highly Vulnerable Aquifers and Significant Groundwater Recharge Areas	Thursday June 16
Fairfield (Amherstview) Intake Protection Zone	Monday June 20

Pre-consultation on Draft Policies

The Source Protection Committee consulted on the draft source protection policies with the parties that would be responsible for their implementation, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 287/07. The pre-consultation process was broken into three parts: June, September and October 2011.

The first part focused on draft policies for the three wellhead protection areas and three surface water intake protection zones where significant drinking water threats can occur: Cana, Lansdowne, Miller Manor, Brockville, James W. King and Sydenham.

The draft policies were posted on the Internet on June 22nd, with written comments initially requested within one month. Customized notices were sent to the bodies (i.e., province, municipalities, public health units, source protection authority) that would be responsible for implementing one or more of the policies.

The draft policies reflected the outcome of 12 community roundtable events and other early engagement discussions. Some of the draft “area-wide” policies could also apply to other vulnerable areas in the Cataraqui Source Protection Area; for this reason, all local municipalities were advised of the posting, rather than just those directly affected by the six vulnerable areas.

The second part of the pre-consultation process focused on the draft policies for the six additional intake protection zones (i.e., Sandhurst Shores, A.L. Dafoe, Bath, Fairfield, Point Pleasant, Kingston Central) and regionally vulnerable groundwater sources (i.e., highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas).

The draft policies for the six western intake protection zones (IPZ) were generally consistent with those proposed for the Brockville, James W. King and Sydenham IPZs. The comments received through the first part of pre-consultation were incorporated to the extent possible. A few new concepts were introduced in these policies, which would also be applicable to the first group of vulnerable areas.

The policies for the highly vulnerable aquifers and significant groundwater recharge areas are consistent with policies for the wellhead protection areas and intake protection zones as appropriate and focus on implementing actions to:

- promote responsible land use planning
- improve information availability
- enhance education/outreach initiatives

- conduct research to refine the sensitive groundwater area delineations and to better assess the impact of drinking water threats on these areas.

Customized notices were again sent to the bodies that would be responsible for implementing one or more of the policies. The comment window was 45 days, from mid-September to the end of October.

The third part of the pre-consultation process involved requesting comments on two new draft policies for the wellhead protection areas. Customized notices were sent to the municipalities that would be responsible for implementing the policies, as well as to the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. Comments were requested within 30 days of October 21, 2011.

There were forums held for municipal staff and councilors (September 2011) and provincial staff (October 2011) to allow policy implementers the opportunity to discuss draft policies, ask questions, and hear from other implementers. The provincial forum was hosted jointly by the Cataraqui, Mississippi-Rideau and Quinte Source Protection Areas and Regions.

Comments received were generally supportive of the intent behind the draft policies. There were concerns raised about the required level of effort and implementation costs, and the need for provincial funding.

Consultation on the Draft Source Protection Plan

The Source Protection Committee consulted on the draft Source Protection Plan with the parties that would be responsible for plan implementation and the general public, in accordance with Ontario Regulation 287/07.

Presentations about the Draft Source Protection Plan were made to all of the municipal councils in January, February, and March 2012.

The draft Plan was posted on the Internet on February 24, 2012, with written comments requested within 50 days. Customized notices were sent to the implementation bodies and to landowners that are engaged in activities that are significant drinking water threats. A two week extension was provided in response to requests from some commentators.

Public open houses were held in four locations:

March 20, 2012 – Bath

March 21, 2012 – Lansdowne

March 22, 2012 – Kingston

March 29, 2012 – Rideau Lakes

April 3, 2012 - Mallorytown

A total of 130 people attended these public events, not including Source Protection Committee members and staff. There was some positive media coverage that helped raise the profile of drinking water source protection across the CSPA.

About 40 comment letters were received on the draft Source Protection Plan. Similar to those comments received during the pre-consultation process, a majority of the comments were constructive, and resulted in a stronger source protection plan. Specific policies were identified that, in the opinion of the commentator, may not be effective, appropriate and/or affordable to implement. Again, most municipalities stressed their unwillingness to implement policies, especially non-legally binding policies, unless there is provincial funding and other resources made available to do so. Concerns were also raised by local residents that could be impacted by the Plan.

It was necessary to include additional significant drinking water threat policies in the source protection plan to address Ministry of the Environment comments on the submitted proposed Source Protection Plan. The additional policies were to fill a gap related to two waste sub-categories previously believed to be covered by prescribed instrument policies:

1. Storage of hazardous and liquid industrial wastes
2. Storage of wastes described in clause p, q, r, s, t, or u of the definition of hazardous waste as defined by Ontario Regulation 347 (General – Waste Management).

Risk management plans for both existing and future uses were selected as the preferred management option. Specific consultation on the policies was conducted from March 10 until the 25, 2014 with those directly impacted (i.e. municipalities and businesses).

Comments were received from all, but one of the bodies contacted and was generally supportive and helpful. As a result, policy language and preambles were revised to ensure that their intent and applicability is clear.