

4.0 PUBLIC AND AGENCY CONSULTATION

Significant public consultation has been undertaken as part of the provincial EA process for the TFD project. The following is a brief summary of the consultation activities that were undertaken.

4.1 Agency and Public Stakeholder Contact

Communication with stakeholder groups, including government agencies and the local community, was initiated in mid-1990s as detailed below. Communication activities included a series of public open houses, direct mailings, and public advertisements during that period. Staff workshops and public open houses were also held in 2009. Further consultation is also scheduled for the end of 2009.

The TFD project has had several periods of stakeholder consultation since being initiated in mid-1990. Two public open houses (**February 25, 1998** and **June 16, 1999**) as a component of a Municipal Class EA and a Criteria Workshop (**May 7, 1998**) were held to obtain input on the approach to evaluating alternatives. Direct mailings and public advertisements were distributed at that time. This work also included the filing of a Notice of Completion and 30-day stakeholder Environmental Study Report (ESR) review period.

In 2004, an addendum to the Environmental Assessment was initiated to update the design and improve the traffic planning based on new information. On January 14, 2005, a 30-day notice was posted as a notification of the completion of the project (**Appendix E**). A bump-up to a full review of the environmental assessment was requested by a Mr Don Baylis, who owned the property now known as the Richcraft Lands. Mr Baylis wanted an intersection so that he could develop the lands west of Terry Fox, outside of the urban boundary. This request was subsequently rescinded by Mr Baylis in Sept., 2007 (**Appendix E**) as his concerns had been addressed with the sale of his lands to Richcraft. Following the MOE guidelines on conducting an environmental assessment, the EA Approval was therefore back-dated to February 14, 2005, at the completion of the 30 day review period. As the 2004 EA Addendum proceeded, a number of public consultation open houses, meetings and presentations were held as follows:

- 3rd December 2002, EA Addendum Public Open House, 7-9pm, Kanata United Church, 33 Leacock Dr, Kanata;
- 17th Dec 2002, 22nd Jan 2003, 11th Feb 2003 - Meetings with Landowners;
- 29th July 2003, Special Study Area Workshop #1;
- 27th Aug 2003, Special Study Area Workshop #2;
- 6th Sept 2003, Field visit with residents in study area;
- 10 Sept 2003, Special Study Area Workshop #3;
- 29 Oct 2003 15 Dec 2003, Landowner meeting; and,
- 6th Oct 2004 EA Addendum Report Presented to Transportation Committee.

<http://ottawa.ca/calendar/ottawa/citycouncil/trc/2004/10-06/ACS2004-DEV-POL-0021.htm>

<http://ottawa.ca/calendar/ottawa/citycouncil/trc/2004/10-06/disposition14.htm>

In 2007, a Preliminary Design Report and an EA Addendum were issued to confirm technical details. This also included the filing of a Notice of Completion and 30-day stakeholder review period. More recently, the following has been completed:

- A Design Criteria Workshop was held with staff from the City of Ottawa on May 28, 2009 to make final technical decisions on road lane widths, the need for bike lanes, stormwater management requirements, and other pertinent information;
- A Public Open House and a meeting with the Ward Councillor were held on June 24, 2009 as advertised in local newspapers to present the detailed pre-design, just prior to beginning the work on the detailed design;
- An Agency/stakeholder meeting was held November 23, 2009, so agency staff (MNR / MVCA / DFO) could provide input to the concept restoration and roadway designs, help the team expedite the plan review process and to address all remaining issues at one time;
- A second Public Open House was held later the same day on November 23, 2009 with the public and Ward Councillor to discuss the working design drawings, effects on species at risk, impact mitigation details, Statewood Avenue turning lanes and solicit any final comments from the public before proceeding to final drawings and construction; and,
- Draft copies of the December 12, 2010 Part B CEAA report (this document) were circulated to the following federal and provincial agencies for review and comment; Infrastructure Canada, Canadian Transportation Agency, Environment Canada, Fisheries and Oceans, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Mississippi Valley Conservation. A Second draft was circulated for comments on March 8, 2010 with the final round-table review occurring on March 30, 2010.

As a further component of the consultation program, meetings were held with representatives of the major land owners of development lands and review agencies.

The meetings with the major land owners were intended to coordinate technical details of stormwater drainage, finalize traffic modeling, determine intersection improvements and discuss the joint protection of environmental features. Predictive scheduling between Terry Fox Drive extension and the adjacent site servicing in the adjacent lands was discussed, to better understand the expected time frames when each development would come on line, and when Terry Fox Drive would need to be ready to accept the required traffic volume.

Table 4-1 provides a summary of the external meetings held since the completion of the Provincial Class EA.

Table 4-1 – Meetings with the Major Land Owners and Agencies

Date	Meeting With	Representatives	Purpose of Meeting
Feb. 26, 2009	MVCA	*,**, John Price (MVCA)	Kickoff meeting, receive MVCA directions on environmental approvals.
Apr. 16, 2009	IBI Group, Regional Group	Demetrius Yannouloupoulos, Steve Cunliffe	
Apr. 23, 2009	MVCA, IBI Group	John Price, Demetrius Yannouloupoulos	Stormwater management options.
Apr. 24, 2009	Urbandale, Uniform Development	Mary Jarvis, George Georganas	Discussed intersection details, stormwater management options.
June 17, 2009	Novatech, IBI Group, DSEL, Richcraft Group, Regional Group	John Riddell, Demetrius Yannouloupoulos, Stephen Pichette, Steve Grandmont, Lisa Dalla Rosa, Steve Cunliffe	Intersections into Richcraft lands, stormwater management.
June 19, 2009	Canderel	Wayne Jennings	
June 24, 2009	Public Open House	*, **, Presented stormwater drainage,, Species at risk, Innovation Drive interconnection, intersection details, Shirley's Brook realignment.	
June 29,2009	Novatech , IBI Group, Regional Group, Richcraft, Uniform Development	Marc St. Pierre, Demetrius Yannouloupoulos, Joseph Kardish, Steve Grandmont, Lisa Dalla Rosa, George Georganas	
July 27, 2009	MVCA	John Price	Floodplain Compensation modeling.
Aug. 6, 2009	MVCA, Greenland Engineering	John Price, Don Moss	Carp River floodplain compensation hydraulics.
Sept. 3, 2009	Novatech	John Riddell, Marc St. Pierre	
Sept. 10, 2009	MOE	Jason Schaefer	
Sept. 10, 2009	IBI Group, Regional Group	Demetrius Yannouloupoulos, Steve Cunliffe	
Oct. 8, 2009	IBI Group, Regional Group	Demetrius Yannouloupoulos, Steve Cunliffe	
Oct. 16, 2009	MVC	John Price	
Oct. 29, 2009	Novatech	John Riddell, Marc St. Pierre	
Oct. 29, 2009	KNL, Richcraft	Mary Jarvis, George Georganas	
Nov. 9, 2009	MVC	John Price, *,**	Final floodplain configuration, culverts.
Nov. 23, 2009	MNR. MVCA, DFO	*,**, Georgina Williston (DFO), Kelly Wilson (MVCA), Paula Norlock (MNR- SAR), Laura Melvin (MNR-Planning)	Species at Risk - agreements Shirley's Brook realignment Carp River floodplain compensation restoration concepts.
Nov. 23, 2009	Public Open House #2	*,**, City Councillor, Kanata Community	Update on progress, species at risk.

* Steve Stoddard, City Project Manager;

** Dillon Project Team: Mike Flainek (Project Manager), Gary Holowach, Laurie McRae, Brian Huston, Shawn Taylor

Key findings from these meetings were reflected in the design changes instituted for this project.

4.2 Commitment to Stakeholder Consultation

Public and agency consultation is an important part of this project and will continue through all phases. To set the stage for achieving project consultation objectives, the consultation plan called for a series of communication and consultation activities that would be closely linked to the technical work being conducted as part of the study.

Future project updates will likely be circulated to the following agencies:

- Infrastructure Canada;
- Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO);
- Environment Canada;
- Department of Environment - Canada Wildlife Service;
- Canadian Transportation Agency;
- Transport Canada - Navigable Waters and Railways; and,
- Indian and Native Affairs Canada (INAC).

4.3 Aboriginal Consultation

Aboriginal consultation is an integral part of the environmental assessment process. The following section provides information on the consultation efforts that have been conducted to date. A complete Aboriginal Consultation Log and correspondence letters can be found in **Appendix F**.

As a first step in determining which Aboriginal communities and organizations to consult, Dillon contacted the following government agencies on July 30, 2009:

- Indian and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) – Specific Claims Branch Services;
- INAC – Comprehensive Claims Branch;
- INAC – Litigation Management and Resolution Branch;
- INAC – Assessment and Historical Research Directorate; and,
- Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) – Relationships Branch.

It should be noted that in some cases, multiple representatives from the same office were contacted for information.

The following summarizes responses from the above agencies to-date:

- **MAA** – Relationship Branch, correspondence received July 30, 2009. Inquired on whether or not the Algonquin Consultation Office had been contacted. Correspondence sent back indicating that yes the office had been contacted;
- **INAC** – Litigation Management and Resolution Branch, correspondence received July 31, 2009. No active litigation in the vicinity of the project area;
- **INAC** – Assessment and Historical Research, correspondence received August 5, 2009. No comprehensive or special claims to the project; and,
- **INAC** – Specific Claims, correspondence received August 6, 2009. No First Nations in the vicinity of the area of interest have submitted specific claims.

Based on previous work in the project vicinity and direction of INAC and other First Nations, the following Aboriginal communities were contacted:

- Algonquin Land Claim Communities – Greater Golden Lake (July 30, 2009);
- Algonquin Land Claim Communities – Ottawa (Urban) (July 30, 2009);
- Mohawks of Akwesasane (August 7, 2009); and,
- Algonquins of Pikwakanagan (September 22, 2009).

To date (November 18, 2009), the following responses were received:

- On August 7, 2009, Elizabeth Nanticoke on behalf of the *Mohawks of Akwesasane* emailed advising that they had reviewed the map and they advised to contact the Algonquins of Golden Lake. As noted above, a letter was sent to the Algonquins of Golden Lake on July 30, 2009; and
- On October 27, 2009, Jp2g Consultants Inc. on behalf of the *Algonquins of Pikwakanagan* requested information on any archaeological assessments to determine impacts, if any, on Algonquin interest in the future Terry Fox Drive alignment area:
 - On November 4, 2009, a project representative sent a copy of the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment Report to the Algonquins of Pikwakanagan's contact.

Please note that prior to this *CEAA* Screening, the Terry Fox Drive Temporary Construction Road – Schedule B Class EA was conducted in the same area of interest. Through this process, a Notice of Completion was submitted and INAC – Specific Claims, indicated in a response letter dated July 14, 2009, that a specific claim had been submitted by the Mohawks of Akwesasne. In addition, INAC advised that the Algonquins of Pikwakanagan (Golden Lake) may have an interest in the area. This correspondence appears to contradict INAC – Specific Claim's response noted above; therefore, INAC – Specific Claims was contacted for further clarification.

To address this and to ensure due diligence, the Mohawks of Akwesasne and Algonquins of Pikwakanagan were contacted directly. Elizabeth Nanticoke of the Mohawks of Akwesasne responded August 7, 2009, advising to contact the Algonquins of Golden Lake. As noted above, Greater Golden Lake had previously been contacted.

On October 27, 2009 J.E. Hunton of Jp2g Consultants Inc on behalf of the Algonquins of Pikwakanagan sent a letter requesting information on any on any archaeological assessments to determine impacts, if any, on Algonquin interest in the future Terry Fox Drive alignment area. A project representative emailed a copy of the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment Report to Mr. Hunton as per his request. No further communication has been recorded.

Based on correspondence received from INAC and MAA for this project, there are no specific, comprehensive, or special claims or active litigation in the project area. However, follow-up with the Algonquin Land Claim Communities (Greater Golden Lake and Ottawa Urban) is on-going to determine if they may have a potential interest.

The following chapters (**Chapters 5 to 9**) provide a description of existing baseline conditions considering the VECs of relevance to this project. See previous **Tables 3-2 and 3-3** for the list of VECs considered.

As previously noted (**Section 3.2**), the effects of Terry Fox Drive road construction on the existing baseline conditions were assessed. In assessing the potential for cumulative effects, City and OMB-approved land development activity on lands adjacent or within the project study area were considered. The lands on the inside of the TFD road alignment are in a transitional state and will change considerably in the near future over their current conditions.

In regards to the natural environment, **Chapters 5 and 6**, covers most of the Valued Environmental Components (VEC's). The assessment of effects regarding Stormwater and Floodplain Management, Fish and Fish Habitats and Species at Risk are addressed in three separate and subsequent chapters as these VEC's / issues are considered to be of critical importance to this project.

In assessing the effects on each VECs a similar format is followed including:

- **Existing conditions description:** For each VEC a description of the existing environmental conditions is provided which provides the basis for the effects assessment. The information to characterize the existing conditions was gathered using a variety of methods including background studies; field study work including topographic and geotechnical drilling surveys, literature reviews, and desktop modelling; advice from expert and regulatory provincial and federal agencies; consultation with stakeholders; aerial photographs and geographic map;
- **Assessment of effects on existing conditions:** An assessment of the potential project effects on the existing conditions of each VECs considering the construction and operation activities (interim measures, repairs and maintenance) of the TFD project. Cumulative effects that recognize the other planned/approved developments in the project area were also assessed;
- **Proposed mitigation measures:** Mitigation measures for the identified environmental effects are specified. These measures are designed to avoid, eliminate or reduce significant adverse effects on the environment. The recommended measures include:
 - Construction measures;
 - Interim measures (to cover the construction period and over the next 10 years or so until the adjacent planned urban development is in place);
 - Long-term operational measures to cover the road operations period for now and when the adjacent land development is in place; and,
- **Assessment of significance:** A qualitative statement of whether the residual, adverse environmental effects (including cumulative effects), after mitigation measures are implemented, are considered significant. The assessment of significance considered the following criteria: magnitude of effect, geographic extent of effect, duration of effect, frequency of effect, permanence of effect, and ecological context..