



**CONCEPT DE DÉVELOPPEMENT RÉCRÉOTOURISQUE DE
COMPLEXES TOURISTIQUES INTÉGRÉS WENTWORTH INC.**

**WENTWORTH INTEGRATED TOURISTIC RESORTS INC.
RECREOTOURISTIC DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT**

**SUIVI DES AUDIENCES PUBLIQUES
DU 8 JUIN 2019
(À TITRE D'INFORMATION SEULEMENT)**

**FOLLOW-UP TO THE JUNE 8th, 2019
PUBLIC HEARING
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY)**

17 septembre 2019 / September 17th, 2019

Mise en contexte

Ce document constitue un suivi au rapport synthèse déposé le 23 juin 2019 regroupant les commentaires et préoccupations recueillis lors des audiences publiques tenues le 8 juin 2019 sur le concept de développement présenté par Complexes touristiques intégrés Wentworth inc.

Le présent document de suivi renferme les commentaires reçus des citoyens et de certains organismes du milieu à la suite du dépôt du rapport synthèse. Les communications reçues sont jointes intégralement au présent document. Certains commentaires ont fait l'objet de réponses d'employés de la ville, qui sont aussi reproduites dans ce document. À l'exception des organismes et de leurs dirigeants, l'identité des personnes ayant communiqué avec la municipalité a été maintenue confidentielle.

Context

This document is a follow-up to the summary report tabled on June 23rd, 2019, which brings together the comments and concerns gathered during the public hearings held on June 8th, 2019 on the development concept presented by Wentworth Integrated Touristic Resorts Inc.

This follow-up document contains the comments received from citizens and certain community organizations following the tabling of the summary report. The communications received are attached in full. Some comments have been the subject of responses from city employees, which are also included in this document. With the exception of organizations and their leaders, the identity of those who contacted the municipality has been kept confidential.

Natalie Black
Director General
Wentworth Township

While the Lake Louisa Property Owners Association (LLPOA/APLL) has noted on more than one occasion that it is highly irregular for a Municipality to provide a prospective developer/proponent a summary of comments before a project plan is deposited, and to present feedback "collected as part of the public hearing process", we have non-the-less reviewed the report.

Respectfully, the LLPOA/APLL asks that the Counsellors of Wentworth decline to publish, distribute or make available this report in the June 23, 2019 format for the following reasons:

1. The Summary Report fails to fulfill its mandated purpose as noted clearly on the cover page and the introduction. Specifically the Summary Report does not make any reference to the community organizations that contributed feedback in person and in writing outlining the concerns and comments of Wentworth community members and stakeholders. The two obvious omissions refer to the LLPOA/APLL and the Dunany Community Association (DCA), and these community organizations represent the views of the largest Wentworth community groups, as well as the views of the majority of Wentworth community. These organizations have conservatively held over 100 meetings in 2019, and consistently communicated opposition to golf and the large scale development envisioned by WITRD for zone RU6. In fact, the Summary Report also failed to communicate that these organizations represent a significant portion of the population that support and "welcome development when done thoughtfully and according to the rules and regulations in place from all levels of government that doesn't in any way compromise the environment" - as noted in the DCA and LLPOA/APLL submissions. Further, the Summary Report mentions individual names and anonymous feedback, and quantifies that 18 briefs and 11 verbal presentations were made; and in contrast the Summary Report does not mention that the President of the LLPOA held up over 270 signed petitions from community members documenting wide-spread opposition to golf and the large scale WITRD concept.

Note: In Section 1, Introduction, it is stated that the "purpose of the public hearings was to provide the municipality's citizens and community organizations with a forum to comment on WITRI's recreational tourism development concept". Reference to the petitions should have been included in the summary, and reference to anonymous feedback should not be included in the summary.

Bottom Line: The Summary Report does not meet its mandated purpose, and it is unacceptable to exclude the feedback and contributions from the two largest Wentworth community organizations, it is also unacceptable to not make mention of the 270 petitions from LLPOA/APLL, and it is unacceptable to include references from anonymous individuals in the summary. Before publishing or making the Summary Report available to the WITRD, all contributors should be offered the protection of anonymity – if anonymous content is included in the summary, appendix and verbal testimony.

2. The Summary Report fails to put into context the widespread public concern that resulted in the hiring of a consulting firm to help the council manage the unexpected volume of letters, emails, etc. As the mayor said on a number of occasions, when asked why they had not replied to the residents' letters within a reasonable delay, he indicated that it was because the staff and councilors had been overwhelmed by the sheer volume of concerns and inquiries expressed by the community.

Note: At several of the public meeting held in 2019 the Mayor promised that the early letters and phone calls received expressing concern and opposition to the WITRI concept would be included in the overall assessment of community support. Only letters and comments submitted via the FAQ portal of the Wentworth website have been included – regular mail and email directed to Wentworth and Councilors have been excluded.

Bottom Line: It is unacceptable that the context outlined above was not included in the summary. Reference to the widespread expression of concern from the Wentworth community and the unmanageable volume of calls and email inquiries, resulting in the hiring of a communications consulting firm must be noted in the summary.

3. The Summary Report also fails to make mention of the significant visual indication of community concerns represented by hundreds of red signs installed on the streets and waterfront of private residences of Lac Louisa, Wentworth and bordering communities.

Note: The Mayor was recorded at a recent meeting stating "You would have to live under a rock to not know about the Red Sign Campaign" (.... in opposition).

Bottom Line: Reference to the hundreds of red signs in opposition to golf and large scale development, as well as red signs urging increased protection of the heronry, must be included in the summary.

In summary, the LLPOA/APLL respectfully asks that the June 23, 2019 Summary Report be considered a DRAFT or preliminary report, and if it is shared with the Wentworth community that DRAFT watermarks be clearly visible on each page of a PDF format document.

Please confirm in writing or via email to the LLPOA/APLL, how Wentworth plans to proceed to address the concerns outlined above.

LLPOA/APLL

Dear Councillor Brothers, A few points:

1. You are clearly responsible for this mess. Without sharing with WITRI right from the start that their proposal was outrageous and way overreaching you created havoc in our peaceful community. You are pitting environmental integrity against job growth. Why? With reasoned leadership you can have both.
2. What initiatives to grow job opportunities are you considering that don't involve putting the environment at risk?
3. Were you elected on a platform to promote enormous growth?
4. Why do you want to do business with people whose reputation is so suspect?
5.  Surely the opinions of residents most affected will warrant greater consideration.
6. I wouldn't be happy but I would learn to accept mountain bike trails, walking trails, cross country skiing, vita parcours - even in the watershed of Lac Louisa - make them world class and environmentally responsible. Why couldn't you have started with something small rather than a mega-project?
7. Build what you want OUT OF THE WATERSHED FOR LAC LOUISA! There's even room for a golf course if it is situated in the West River watershed.
8. I didn't spend 19 years of MY recreation time working with RSVL, CRE Laurentide, LLPOA gathering significant data concerning oxygen levels, chlorophyll, dissolved carbon, transparency, invasive species, educating the community about the importance of water quality to our health and well-being only to have all that work and the work of countless others, be dismissed.
9. Of course you have residents who are in favour of creating jobs! None said they were willing to destroy the environment in order to get them.

10. With the Vary's Bay disaster we have recent first-hand knowledge that it only takes a debatable emergency for some bureaucrat to turn Lac Louisa into a mud bath. That makes the "no development" option very real.

11. In your Municipal Communication concerning the Recreational Tourism Project acknowledge the dozens of red signs and the over 400 petitions of opposition that you have received.

12. Have some good come from the mess that you have allowed to develop.

Bonjour,

En tant que [REDACTED], j'aimerais vous signifier mon opposition au projet Wentworth Integrated Tourism Resorts Inc. (WITRI).

Vous avez la responsabilité d'informer le promoteur du projet de l'opposition qui existe relativement à son projet et des nombreuses questions et préoccupations qu'il soulève.

Rappelons que vous avez l'obligation de représenter l'ensemble vos citoyens et de veiller à leurs intérêts.

Bonjour,

En tant que [REDACTED], je suis fortement en désaccord avec le projet de développement de soi-disant 2 milliards de dollars qui aurait des conséquences désastreuses pour la quiétude des gens de Wentworth et pour la pollution que cela engendrerait inévitablement.

J'ai assisté à une séance du conseil municipal ainsi qu'à une réunion d'information en juin 2019. À ces 2 séances, je n'ai vu AUCUNE personne en faveur du projet. Donc, dans votre mémoire, quand vous parlez de PERSONNES ANONYMES qui sont en faveur du projet, cela n'a absolument aucune crédibilité. Les personnes qui sont opposées au projet se sont toutes nommées au micro lors des séances. Vous dites que les gens en faveur du projet ont peur de le dire ouvertement, par crainte de représailles. Euh pardon? Nous sommes en démocratie, pas à

une réunion de motards criminalisés... !!! Personne ne va se faire battre pour être en faveur du projet!

Si pendant 50 ans, il y a 2 ou 3 citoyens qui se présentent aux séances du conseil municipal et soudainement, depuis 9 mois, il y a de 50 à 100 personnes qui se présentent à chaque séance pour s'opposer au projet, cela devrait vous sonner une cloche. Tous les gens que je rencontre sont opposés à 100% au projet WITRI.

De plus, dans votre mémoire, vous ne faites aucunement mention de l'association des propriétaires du Lac Louisa LLPOA/APLL, qui représente pourtant près de 400 propriétaires d'immeubles au Lac Louisa. Cela est un grave manque de respect et un déni de démocratie. Surtout, que 400 propriétaires et leurs familles représentent plus de monde que l'ensemble de la population de Wentworth, qui n'est même pas de 500 personnes...!!!

Nous désirons protéger le fabuleux Lac Louisa ainsi que la superbe région de Wentworth. Le moins que vous puissiez faire c'est d'écouter vos citoyens.

Vous pouvez, SANS AUCUN PROBLÈME, inscrire mon nom et mon opinion dans votre mémoire révisé. Nous vivons en démocratie et je n'ai aucune crainte à afficher ouvertement mes opinions.

To Whom It May Concern

I am writing to let you know of my concern about the WITR project on Lac Louisa.

I am a [REDACTED] and am concerned that there has not been enough detail given of the plan and as such, it is difficult to have specific questions.

I am overall concerned that there will be an irreversible environmental impact on the lake and surrounding land and animals, including the herony. I am also wondering if there needed to be a referendum prior to the zoning changes from 9/4/18.

As our officials, we expect that you are guardians of proper procedure and that you will balance the need for economic stimulus with the protection of natural resources.

Thank You Sincerely,

Hello,



We have been presented with concerning information regarding the new development that is being discussed to launch in the near future.

We are genuinely worried that this very large development will greatly impact the neighboring areas quite negatively and cause much damage to our cherished environment surrounding our lake, wildlife (including the Heron protection sectors) and the lake water quality itself. A golf course would clearly have terrible environmental impacts on surrounding areas, and undoubtedly affect the quality of the lakes nearby, we are also concerned of the added light pollution and its domino effects on the surrounding environment/wildlife.

Please consider the environment as an equal factor to the financial township gain when making these very important decisions going ahead.

I'm sure this may seem like an expendable small number of of lake homeowners causing a bothersome ruckus today, but truly we are just genuinely concerned that the impact will destroy the land as we know it today first, and our dream of quality country living second. We are right to be protective of it.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration,

Bonjour Martine,

Suite aux informations fournis à la réunion du conseil de juillet 2019 et la réunion annuelle de l'association des résidents du Lac Louisa, j'aimerais vous proposer des modifications aux règlements de zonage pour l'établissement et opération de terrain de golf sur le territoire de Wentworth. Tel que je l'ai déjà mentionné dans ma soumission de commentaires lors de la consultation publique sur le WITRI, d'autres municipalités régionales comme Muskoka en Ontario ont une restriction de 30 mètres pour l'établissement et l'opération de golf autours de tout plan d'eau. D'autres experts ont commenté qu'une zone tampon de 150 mètres pourraient être requise tout dépendamment des caractéristiques physiques des lieux (géologies, type de sol, topographie, hydrologie, etc.).

Selon ma compréhension, présentement il existe une restriction de 10 à 15 mètre des plans d'eau (lac, cours d'eau et terre humide) tout dépendamment de la pente pour l'établissement et opération d'un terrain de golf. Une zone de protection de 10 à 15 mètres n'est aucunement suffisante pour ce type d'activité étant donné l'usage intensif de pesticides, herbicides, insecticides et fongicides.

J'aimerais vous proposer que vous considériez une modification aux règlements de zonage pour avoir une zone de protection plus large autour des cours d'eau, terres humides et lacs sur le territoire de Wentworth. Afin de bien définir le minimum requis pour la dimension de la zone tampon, des études de caractérisations seraient requises. En attendant que des études soient complétées, il serait prudent de modifier la réglementation municipale pour qu'elle soit plus sévère que pas assez donc je propose alors qu'il y ait une zone tampon de 150 mètres autour des cours d'eau, lacs et terres humides de Wentworth. 150 mètres représente le maximum retrouver dans la littérature que j'ai consulté.

Des modifications futures de la réglementation (dérogations) pourraient être envisagées, une fois que des études auraient démontré qu'une zone tampon amoindrie serait acceptable. Il en reviendrait alors au développeur de faire les études (et en assumer les frais) pour en faire la preuve. Ces demandes devraient être évaluées par un comité de l'environnement (composé d'un panel d'experts) avant d'être approuvées par le conseil municipal.

Ici-bas est la référence dont je base ma recommandation.

Références : Section 4.1.1 Best Management Practices and Guidelines for the Development and Review of Golf Courses Proposals, Garlner Lee Limited, 2001.

The recommended size of buffer strips appears to be the subject of some debate. A minimum 15 m buffer strip is recommended for water quality protection around forests supporting aquatic life and a 3 m strip for small streams providing food and nutrients to fish-bearing streams (Fraser River Action Plan, M.A., 1996). Tracy Teasdale, Quercus, developed and adopted guidelines requiring a 30 m buffer around municipal watercourses for new golf course development (Quercus, 1995). In 1991, to protect water quality in Seven Sound of Georgian Bay, in Muskoka, RANSR, recommends buffer strips of 15 m around water courses and 50 m around cold. Other notices recommend buffer strips of 75 m (2001), 25 to 50 m around all natural water courses on a golf course (Klein, 1984). While all of these recommendations are worthy, there are appropriate with quantitative evidence of their effectiveness, or rationale for their use.

This more comprehensive reference on buffer strip effectiveness is that produced by Karetson and Naef (1997), for the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The tools and techniques (stream), Washington differ markedly from those in Muskoka, but the evidence presented by these authors suggest that a minimum 90 m buffer strip provides many beneficial uses:

- maintenance of 50 to 100% shading of the stream, > 70% at 30 m;
- maintenance of large woody debris requires 30 m to 50 m;
- 70% reduction in sediment requires 30 m to 60 m;
- removal of nutrients and sediment, debris requires 1 m to 36 m, weeds at 30 m;
- bank erosion control requires 30 m to 135 m in high, snow-washing areas; and
- organic materials, sediment, fish, and reptiles and amphibians all require a 30 m buffer strip.

Golf courses in Muskoka should therefore be designed to provide a 50 m buffer of natural vegetation around streams. Disturbances and setbacks in accordance with the summary given above. ANR recommendations for setbacks (taken up by the Seven Sound RFP process) protect the waters of Georgian Bay. Some flexibility should be provided so that developers can provide a buffer of other buffer vegetation to reflect site characteristics.

Je suis disponible pour discuter.

Re-bonjour,

Je voulais tout d'abord confirmer que vous aviez bien reçu mon message du 14 août.

D'autre part, je voulais aussi revenir sur un point. Une résidente m'a fait part que LLPOA vous avait approché afin de modifier le règlement de zonage pour avoir un zone de protection de 1 km qui ne permettrait pas notamment l'établissement de golf.

Ceci est un pas dans la bonne direction mais n'est qu'un commencement pour la protection de la qualité de l'eau du bassin versant.

Ma suggestion que je vous ai transmis le 14 août vient complétement ce que la LLPOA suggère afin de protéger non seulement les abords du Lac Louisa mais aussi ces cours d'eau et les terres humides de son bassin versant. Sans la protection des cours d'eau et terres humides qui alimente le Lac Louisa, la santé du Lac Louisa demeure vulnérable. Delà la suggestion du 150 mètres de protection autours des Lac, cours d'eau et terres humides sur le territoire de Wentworth.

Ma suggestion est en complément de la suggestion de la LLPO et non à la place de. Les deux mesures sont désirées. La mesure que je propose a l'objectif unique de protégé les cours d'eau alors que la suggestion de la LLPOA à un objectif plus global (assuré une certaine protection contre les activités du golf et à la fois préservé le caractère et l'usage du territoire de l'entourage du Lac Louisa. C'est pourquoi, les deux mesures doivent être considérées en complément.

En vous remerciant.

Bonjour,

Un gros merci d'avoir mis publiquement les documents sur le site web afin de favoriser le partage d'information et la participation du publique.

Concernant le rapport de communication du conseil, j'aimerais vous proposer quelques modifications pour réitérer que les préoccupations en lien avec le golf va au delà d'avoir un golf un peu plus loin du lac Louisa. Le golf ne doit pas être trop près des affluents du Lac Louisa donc les ruisseaux et terres humides qui de déchargent dans le lac Louisa.

La première modification proposée est à la deuxième page, avant dernier paragraphe en rouge ici-bas:

que plusieurs citoyens et citoyennes sont défavorables à la présence d'un terrain de golf au Canton de Wentworth, particulièrement si celui-ci se trouve trop près du Lac Louisa et de ses affluents (cours d'eau et terres humides qui alimente le lac Louisa).

Similairement, j'aimerais aussi proposé la modification suivante à la page 3, premier point de la résolution de conseil:

qu'un éventuel projet de développement récréotouristique devra respecter en tous points les règlements municipaux du Canton de Wentworth (ce qui inclut la protection du Lac Louisa et ses affluents ainsi que la héronnière);

et au quatrième point de la résolution de conseil:

que si le promoteur souhaite tout de même aller de l'avant avec un terrain de golf, il devra veiller à ce qu'il se situe dans la zone autorisée (RU6) et localisé le plus loin possible du Lac Louisa et ses affluents, au-delà de la zone Y22, qui interdit déjà les terrains de golf ainsi que de la héronnière, protégée par notre réglementation municipale;

En vous remerciant de votre considération sur les modifications proposées.

Bonjour,

WITRI - Rapport sommaire

Je voulais simplement vous faire part que je suis d'accord avec la position de l'association des propriétaires du Lac Louisa dans le sens que le rapport sommaire et réponse du conseil devrait non seulement donner une indication de la nature des commentaires reçus mais aussi devrait faire référence aux nombre de signatures recueillies et devrait quantifié les positions contre le projet sans quoi le rapport parle seulement des enjeux entendus mais ne donne pas une idée claire de l'ampleur de l'opposition. En ce sens, le rapport pourrait donné un portrait biaisé. Plusieurs personnes s'y opposent (tel que démontré par la campagne de pancartes rouges) et la pétition et il devrait être quantifié dans le rapport.

En espérant que des modifications soient faites au rapport pour apporter ces corrections dans la version finale. Merci

As one of the 404 residents that signed a petition against the WITRI's project in Wentworth, I am appalled by the Municipality of Wentworth's total disregard for the strong opposition of its

citizens to the development of a golf course -widely documented as unsustainable and of doubtful economic soundness- infringing on protected wetland areas and rural zones. In writing to you, I trust that you will look into this matter and, as any informed citizen in the Anthropocene, come to the conclusion that such development is not to the advantage of Wentworth's residents. Thank you for your time, regards,

Dear Ms Black and Ms Renaud,

Please find below a letter which asks questions and provides my concerns and hopes after Monday's council meeting. Following instructions given at the meeting, I have emailed my comments to you both as well as the FAQ email address. I would appreciate if you would forward the letter directly to the councillors and the mayor for their consideration.

Thank you for your help in this important matter.

Yours sincerely

Dear Mayor, Councillors and Administrators of the Municipality of Wentworth,

RE: Recreational Tourism Project

I write today, August 7th, 2019, to express both disappointment and hope following the Council Meeting on August 5th, 2019.

First, disappointment:

I wrote to the municipality in the winter, outlining my concerns about the recreational tourism project and offering suggestions of how the municipality could prepare itself for the demands of such a massive scheme. I suggested that the municipality would need help and should engage professionals. However instead of reaching out, the municipality seems to have closed in on itself, and appears to have made it difficult for the residents to understand the process or view documents.

It seems at times as if you feel that we, your constituents, are a problem to be sidelined as much as is possible. For example the August 5th 2019 Council Meeting Agenda seemed to have been designed to prohibit discussion before the members' vote on the Ryan report and accompanying letter to be sent to the developer. Whether the Mayor's stipulation that residents would not be permitted to discuss the recreational tourism project until the second question period (item 11) was a deliberate tactic or an unintended oversight, the effect would

have been the same. The vote on the report and letter (item 5.1) would have been undertaken without public consultation. I find this situation to be deeply disappointing and thank my fellow Wentworth resident who spotted the problem.

When I suggested that we would need outside help, I meant that we should get help to better equip the municipality for the long and arduous process to which the municipality has committed us, not to provide the developer with a free report on the municipality's views. Why have we spent money on a report to tell the developer what we think? What sort of negotiation benefits from showing your hand first?

The council could argue that it needs this information to better understand and represent its constituents' views. However it could have achieved this end through a referendum. In addition there are serious questions concerning the inaccessibility and the quality of the report. The report, buried on the website, poorly executed and unrepresentative in its summary, is not helping us. Is it fit for purpose? I don't know, mostly because I don't know what the purpose of the report was supposed to be. It certainly will help the developer.

The proposed letter to the developer is also of concern, mainly due to its length and lack of focus. Most of the important issues appear to be mentioned at some point in the letter but the conclusion is weak and the loose wording is unrepresentative of the views of Wentworth's citizens.

Delaying a submission of a development proposal until after eliciting regulatory changes and forcing a community to show its hand is a tried and tested strategy for developers. It appears to be working well for the developer in this case. Although in response to a direct question, the council members insisted that they are under no obligation to communicate with the developers, they act as if they feel pressure to do so, even if by doing so they would significantly harm the municipality's negotiating position.

It was evident that some councillors are tired of this issue and do not want to spend any more time on it. The anger and frustration of at least one councillor was clear. However what the council members chose to allow to proceed will not disappear just because the councillors now would like to get on with their lives. We are well beyond the quick and simple no which I suspect the majority of your constituents would have voted if openly consulted originally. We are in for a long hard process ahead if the council continues to try to handle this epic task alone. The developer already has people on the ground. Where are our experts? Those residents and community associations trying to help must be given access to information and given a voice in this process. We all need to work together to save our forests and lakes.

To date Wentworth has done much valuable work to protect the municipality's environment. It is hard to establish and enforce rules which force residents to look after this fragile ecosystem. It would be a great shame if Wentworth's ultimate legacy were to be one of destruction.

Hope:

Notwithstanding the above and most particularly the agenda incident, it was encouraging to hear three points on Monday evening.

Firstly, the municipality advised that the proposed letter and report would soon be made easily accessible for public online viewing and suggestions. Names and contact details will be redacted from the online report and the final version if the council continues to follow this strategy of providing this information to the developer. Hopefully in the ensuing discussion, someone will also advise me as to why this report was undertaken and why it is proposed to be sent to the developer.

Secondly, it was encouraging to hear the mayor advise that a public referendum undertaken in Wentworth would be done by way of postal ballot.

Finally, it was heartening to witness the councillors agreeing to a strategy of greater openness with Wentworth's residents. The mayor's advice that when the developer finally deposits its proposal, the proposal will be made easily accessible for public online viewing and comments is warmly welcomed.

So far, the developer has been running rings around us but by working together, harnessing the energy and expertise of Wentworth's councillors, administrators and residents, we should be able to protect our community and reduce the stress which this massive scheme has placed on our valued public servants.

I'll sign off with a thank you to Wentworth's besieged councillors and administrators for working with Wentworth's citizens at this most difficult time.

Yours sincerely

Dear Ms. Black,

Please consider this an official document and forward this email to the councillors and the mayor for their consideration.

Please do not send the Ryan report and draft letter to the developer. I feel that these documents do not represent my views nor those of all of the other LLPOA members who assumed that LLPOA's submission would be given the weight which it deserves. How can the Ryan report say that it has included comments from the community organizations when it has not?

Furthermore, how can the municipality support a report which does not mention all of the petitions and red signs? Even the mayor said at a meeting that it is impossible to miss the signs.
Yours sincerely

Dear Ms Black,

Please consider this an official document and forward this letter to the councillors and the mayor for their consideration.

Thank you for posting the Ryan Affairs Report and draft letter to the developer on Wentworth's website as agreed in the August 5th meeting.

A. My comments on the report are as follows:

1. The report is not indicative of residents' views. With only 11 verbal presentations and 18 written briefs or messages, it does not represent the community as a whole. The sample size is too small. Why were all earlier letters received by the council not included in this report? I have found no evidence of my letter of March 22nd, 2019 even though the title page of the report says that comments were collected through the FAQ section of Wentworth's website.
2. Given the very strict limits which the municipality placed on residents seeking to speak at that one particular meeting (June 8th), it would have made sense to enable residents to give voice through letters already submitted and to include comments from other public meetings. To properly represent residents' views, a much longer timeline and open consultation process would have been needed. One of my fellow residents gave an excellent example of how an effective consultation process could be carried out.
3. The report's structure is unprofessional and biased. There are three sections; Introduction, Issues Raised and Summary of Positive Points of Views about a Potential Wentworth Recreational Tourism Project. When reading the report, I thought that a section or two might not have downloaded properly. Where is the overall summary? Why does the report end with a summary of positive views rather than a coherent synthesis of arguments? Why has Ryan Affairs been hired, to look after the municipality's public relations or to lead a public consultation? This report fails as a public consultation.
4. The purpose of the report was stated as "summary Report of Concerns and Comments received from Citizens and Organisations of the Wentworth Municipality and Region." However the body of the report does not make any reference to community associations and the number of residents which they represent. Both the Lake Louisa Property Owners Association

(LLPOA) and Dunany Community Association (DCA) submitted thoughtful letters highlighting residents' concerns. Both submissions were ignored in the body of the report. A proper analysis would have given much more weight to views of community groups rather than single residents. This report ignores them. Furthermore if residents had known that their representatives were going to be ignored then many more residents would have written. People have a right to assume that the council would hear arguments put forward on their behalf. Indeed it was assumed that the overburdened municipality would welcome not having to read the same points being made over and over again in individual letters.

5. The information available to residents was and still is inadequate. The Ryan process asked residents to submit comments on a project for which they had very little information. According to the May 6th presentation, the project was still an idea, for which more details would be provided at a later date. However according to the Ryan report, the municipality had been in discussion with the developer for almost a year by that point. We were told that any information known to the mayor and councillors could not be shared with Wentworth residents due to non disclosure agreements (NDA). It is hard to give feedback when you do not have much information. It was painful to learn on August 5th that the NDA never existed.

6. The report does not acknowledge any other sources of feedback about residents' views. Red signs, red shirts and petitions are all ignored. The mayor's remark about the ubiquity of red signs shows that the municipality is well aware of these sources of feedback. Why doesn't the report include them? 29 verbal and written comments from a strictly limited process in June do not represent the views of Wentworth's citizens who sent letters and emails to the municipality prior to June 8th, submitted 404 petitions, wore red shirts and posted hundreds of red signs around Wentworth's roads in desperate attempts to force the municipality to engage with its citizens.

In summary, the Ryan report is not fit for purpose. In addition to its unprofessional structure and analysis, it neither performs the objective of the title nor represents the views of Wentworth's residents.

Please withhold this document and start an open consultation process.

B. My comments on the draft letter

1. Asking the developer to abide by existing by-laws will not save our environment. (Resolutions 1&3). The current RU6 zoning to the north of Lake Louisa will not protect Lake Louisa, its watershed, the wetlands and the heronry. There has been much correspondence stating that this area should be re-zoned following a proper public consultation, particularly giving voice to neighbouring properties.

2. One of the conclusions in the municipality's draft letter (Resolution 5) is that it would be acceptable to locate a golf course in RU6. It is not. Furthermore this conclusion is clearly not supported by residents, as the red signs make clear. Given RU6's proximity to Lake Louisa's north shoreline, it would be impossible to mitigate adverse effects of a golf course. Furthermore as many submissions have explained, the environmental issues surrounding golf courses are much wider than the use of pesticides and fertilisers (Whereas 2 point 2). Therefore these sections of the letter are inaccurate and incomplete.

3. It would be impossible to locate a golf course in zone Y22 as to do so would place it on residents' lakeside properties. Therefore this sentence is redundant (Whereas 5 point 3). Permitting a golf course in zone RU6, which borders lakeside properties, should also be banned.

4. The letter fails to adequately explain the concerns about other environmental issues.

5. Given that the Ryan report is not fit for purpose (please see above), it should not be referenced in the draft letter without a clear statement of its many limitations. (Whereas 1, Whereas 2 and Resolution

6. The draft letter makes no mention of the municipality's other sources of information about citizens' views, such as the petitions, the red shirts and the red signs. By failing to include the views expressed by these campaigns, the municipality would knowingly be presenting an inaccurate summary of the citizens' comments and concerns if this letter were to be sent.

7. In the August 5th meeting, the mayor said that neither the municipality nor individual councillors/the mayor were under any obligation to provide a letter or report to the developer.

In summary, this draft letter is deeply flawed. It contains inaccurate statements, inadequate explanations and redundant points. It also fails to include other valid concerns raised by the residents and it ignores other sources of feedback from citizens. Most importantly, it does not represent the views of the residents.

Given the numerous and serious problems with both the report and the draft letter as well as the fact that there is no obligation for a letter or a report to be sent to the developer, please do not release these documents. Please scrap the proposed letter and report and embark on an open and honest consultation process with Wentworth's citizens on how to protect our lakes, wetlands and forests. Yours sincerely,

Dear Ms Black,

Please find below my response to your email of August 8th, 2019. Please consider this an official document and forward this letter to the councillors and mayor for their consideration.

Thank you for responding to my letter of August 7th. I welcome your attempt to answer some of my concerns this time. However, your response did not allay my fears, particularly your comment that the community's views will only be sought once a project has been deposited with the municipality and the suggestion that the communication to date has been acceptable. The difficulty in which we find ourselves now is directly the result of a lack of open and wide consultation and this situation will only get worse if the communication does not improve.

Wentworth appears to be working on the assumption that the decision of whether or not a scheme is welcomed is theirs to make, with residents' participation to be limited to tinkering after the fact of that decision. This defining moment in the health of our community demands proper examination and consultation, not just a flow chart. The May 6th 2019 presentation (point 2. Establishment of a Dialogue with the Population) is meaningless if there is no dialogue because one party refuses/ is legally prohibited to answer relevant questions. Furthermore the project is much more than an idea if the councillors have already agreed regulatory change. The residents obviously struggle with the terminology of the project being an idea in May when they have seen online plans labelled "The Lake District of Wentworth Golf Course presented by Jason Morrison February 24th, 2019." The commitment to provide regular information on the website is also an empty promise when the most important pieces of information are not available for viewing on the website, as in the case of the Ryan report and letter. Overall, the May 6th presentation comes across as a desperate attempt to reframe the situation rather than a genuine attempt to communicate.

The May 6th presentation described the goal "to surround ourselves with resource persons to reflect together on the project and the various aspects surrounding it." I implore you to keep this goal in mind and use your influence to widen the pool of resources so that Wentworth will have the top quality advice which is necessary to save our lakes and forests. The mayor commented at the August 5th, 2019 meeting that the tender for the communications support went to the only bidder because the municipality is too small to generate wider interest. If so, then we have to be more creative in finding our resources.

With that objective in mind, here is my (free) analysis and advice. Firstly, there are three main areas in which the municipality/councillors appear to require help; legal, environmental and communications.

I worry that the councillors have inadvertently got themselves in legal trouble. I don't understand the months of silence during which questions could not be answered due to nondisclosure agreements (NDA) which turned out not to exist. The Mayor's advice on Monday, August 5th, 2019, that there were no NDAs but that there were verbal undertakings with the developer was equally perplexing. Is it legal for councillors to enter into verbal undertakings with the developer? Should the council members be receiving legal advice? At the August 5th meeting, I asked the council members if they needed support and received the response that

the mayor was not colluding with the developer. I was not suggesting that he was! I was trying to determine what support the councillors might need to protect them and to ease any fear of personal legal liability.

One reason that I suspect that Wentworth might need support on environmental issues is the often quoted comment in the community that the municipality thinks that golf courses are environmentally friendly because golf courses are green. I personally did not attend the meeting in which that comment was purported to have been said and I suppose that even if the comment had been made, it might have been a bad joke. However there are other warnings signs. For example, the councillors voted for regulatory change which could lead to the death of Lake Louisa and they did so without commissioning an environmental study or consulting with local experts.

The third area of obvious concern is communications. Talks of NDAs, presentations without substance, regulatory change, councillors visibly annoyed with residents who are trying to protect their community, rules to limit resident participation in council meetings, reports not fit for purpose; these are all signs of a failure of communication.

My recommendation for dealing with these problems is simple, use the community and its networks. If we aren't big enough to attract professional help, we must be creative.

1. Existing community groups know the area and its residents.
2. Ask residents for help rather than declining the offers regularly made at meetings. Residents may have the expertise or know where it can be found, perhaps at better rates than can be negotiated by the municipality. The potential bias could be mitigated through an open appeal to residents. The result must be better than sloppy work from a firm facing no competition.
3. Approach environmental groups. The importance of Quebec's lakes is a hot topic at the moment. Lake Louisa's predicament would interest many.
4. Approach the colleges and universities. Students are well informed and professors would probably welcome a challenging project. Students of the environment, political science and law all could contribute. It would be better to seek help now rather than read case studies later about governance, communication and environmental failures.

My cry for Wentworth to communicate openly and honestly with its residents is based on my family's love of this community

The fear that quick decisions taken by overstretched and under-resourced public servants could lead to the death of Lake Louisa is

very real and very painful. Please stop shutting out the residents and resident associations, kill the empty presentations and promises, communicate openly with the residents and save our lakes and forests.

Yours sincerely,

To whom it may concern,

I am extremely disappointed to see that the summarizing report of the WITRI concept did not include any mention or views of the reports of the LLPOA and any other community members that have expressed opposition to this project.

I come from being an environmental canvasser about 10 years ago at Lac Louisa and now have a strong tie and connection to ensuring our lake remains. This project WITRI will destroy our lake and will not reserve any environmental concerns that will affect our body of water.

I am taking action, the signs around the lake also and the community are showing the action. Proceeding with this project is refusing to take into consideration the community concerns and environmental impact that this will cause for someone that is simply in it to make money and that doesn't reside in our community.

Should you require any further information from myself please let me know.

Regards,

I have reviewed the draft letter to the Developer, and the Summary Report by Ryan Public Affairs.

I appreciate the progress that our Municipal Council has made on this matter in the last six months. The draft letter to the Developer addresses in detail many of the concerns that I have with this development project. Six months ago, none of those concerns seems to be shared by members of the Council.

However, the supporting report by Ryan Public Affairs does a very poor job of summarizing public opposition to this development. I understand that there are individuals who see positives about WITRI. However, in the report, those positives are given almost as much weight as the negative opinions that have been expressed. The fact that 404 residents have signed a petition against the development, many of who have mounted red anti-WITRI signs on their properties, is not recognized in the report. The Report provides specific points on the negative side of this issue offered by a maximum of 16 individuals, people whose names have been blanked out for reasons of privacy. To weigh against this, the Report says that "Many citizens...highlighted

various positive aspects..." To any reader, "many" sounds like a lot more than 16. However, "many" sounds like a trivial number compared to 404.

Council represents its citizens, and this Report by Ryan Public Affairs, which Wentworth Citizens are paying for, does not accurately reflect their views. A straightforward fix would be to add a paragraph to the Report that lists the various objections cited in the petition signed by 404 residents. Further, the Report should offer an indication of just how many citizens stepped forward with positive opinions of the project, so that an objective conclusion may be reached. Thank you for listening. Sincerely,

Bonjour,

J'aimerais d'abord remercier les services municipaux d'avoir mis à la disposition des citoyens le FAQ afin que nous puissions communiquer avec la municipalité. Par la présente j'aimerais poser 6 questions, toutes dans ce mail, plutôt que de vous inonder avec plusieurs correspondances.

Je vous demanderais qu'elles soient également communiquées officiellement à Monsieur le Maire Morrison et ses conseillers, notamment ceux en charge de Relations Communautaires, Développement Régional, Comité Consultatif d'urbanisme (CCU), et Comité Consultatif Environnement (CCE).

Il s'agit dans ce mail de questions légitimes et je souhaiterais avoir des réponses, et non pas juste une mention "Le Conseil municipal s'engage à prendre en considération vos commentaires."

Question 1

Lors de la dernière séance régulière du conseil municipal, tenue le 5 août dernier, le conseil a pris l'engagement, validé par Mme Nathalie Black et spécifiquement demandé par M. Morrison, de rendre disponible sur le site web au plus tard avant la fin de la semaine, le "rapport RYAN" ainsi que le projet de lettre que le conseil voulait faire parvenir au promoteur, lettre qui avait reçu par ailleurs le vote unanime des conseillers, mais pour lequel le maire a opposé son veto.

Nous sommes 10 jours plus tard et rien n'est encore disponible. Pourquoi ? Nous attendons impatiemment la réalisation de cet engagement qui nous permettra de comparer les deux versions du "rapport Ryan", et prendre connaissance de la lettre que le conseil prévoyait envoyer.

Question 2

Sur le site web de la municipalité il est fait mention, sur la page d'accueil du site dans la section PROJET RÉCRÉOTOURISTIQUE WITRD de la note suivante : " 24 avril 2019 -Communication spéciale envoyée par la poste (ICI)". Nous sommes propriétaires, sur la plan familial de 3 propriétés, et nous certifions n'avoir reçu aucun courrier par la poste. Nous avons vérifié auprès de nos voisins immédiats et même plus éloignés et aucun d'eux n'a reçu par courrier postal cette communication spéciale.

À qui donc cette communication postale a été envoyée ? La municipalité détient une liste à jour des adresses pour les fins d'envois des comptes de taxes. Combien de lettres ont été envoyées? Quelle est la rationale utilisée pour segmenter la liste d'envoi, et quels ont été les coûts de Poste Canada engendrés par ce mailing.

Question 3

il est fait mention, sur le site web de la municipalité, que le changement de zonage, approuvé lors du conseil du 4 septembre 2018, a fait l'objet d'une consultation publique le 27 août 2018.

J'aimerais savoir quel moyen de communication ont été utilisés, autre que l'avis déposé sur le site web de la municipalité, pour communiquer avec l'ensemble de la population concernant la tenue de cette importante consultation publique, notamment, en raison de l'impact MAJEUR qui en résulte pour l'ensemble de la population tel que mentionné dans votre propre texte de l'AVIS: "QUE le projet de règlement sur le plan d'urbanisme représente la planification du territoire pour les 5 à 10 prochaines années et qu'il présente le contexte de cette planification, les enjeux d'aménagement et les choix de planification....." "QUE seuls projets de règlement de zonage et de lotissement numéros 2018-007 et 2018-008 comportent des dispositions qui sont susceptibles d'approbation référendaire" (e rajoute que c'est normal et compréhensif vu l'impact pour l'ensemble de la population)

Question 4

Toujours pour les fins de la consultation publique du 27 août 2018, quels documents ont été circulés à la population concernant le projet de changement de zonage et quel a été l'effort fait pour résumer et rendre compréhensible à la population le document de 120 pages (voir annexes).

Question 5

À quel endroit peut on consulter les questions adressées au FAQ ainsi que les réponses que vous leur avez réservées.

Question 6

Lors du conseil municipal du 8 juillet dernier, une demande spécifique a été faite, à la demande des citoyens, de tenir une réunion extraordinaire, avant le prochain conseil, afin de discuter ouvertement des enjeux du projet WITDR pour profiter de la présence et de l'attention des citoyens, le tout dans un souci de transparence. Force est de constater que cette réunion n'a pas eu lieu. Ma question est la suivante : est-ce que cette demande est notée dans les minutes, et quelle est la raison pour laquelle cette demande n'a pas été ni répondue et ni accordée.

Vous remerciant à l'avance de l'attention que vous porterez à cette lettre,

Bien à vous,

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my disillusionment with the Summary Report created by Ryan affaires publique about the WITR project.

Although my concerns were included on the first page of the report (by name, which I do not authorize you to share with the international developer for fear of reprisals), the spirit of the report does not reflect the important opposition to the major development of the vast majority of the citizens of Lake Louisa and the neighbouring communities. The report makes no mention of the 400+ petitions that were deposited with the council, nor the hundreds of hand painted signs, nor the strong and public opposition by the Lake Louisa Property Owners Assn (LLPOA), the Dunany Assn and the Wentworth North petition initiated by their mayor or any email received prior to June 8. Hundreds of voices have been silenced due to this glaring omission.

The report touches on many issues that are of concern to the citizens, however the extent to which citizens are opposed to the development is absolutely absent. The above mentioned associations represent hundreds of households who are supportive of the efforts undertaken on their behalf and have contributed in many ways (through their research, their contacts, financially and by their participation). This cannot compare with perhaps a handful of anonymous supporters.

In fact, this statement in your summary in the other considerations section "Among the citizens in favour of this project, some expressed in their written communications with the municipality as part of the public hearing process, that they had the feeling that the opponents of the potential recreational tourism project wish to occupy the public ground and silence opinions contrary to their own." is completely false. Had any council member attended even one meeting, you would know that this is never the case. Never has any voice been silenced and it

never would be. Never has there been a negative word said about anyone, including the mayor and the council. What has been shared is the findings of publicly available research and information obtained both by the associations and their knowledgeable and connected members. You underestimate the passion behind the majority of your citizens.

If you were truly listening to your citizens you would know that there is no support of a \$2B development that would absolutely put our lake at risk. You cannot control what flows downhill through the watershed. Massive infrastructure to accommodate this project, the use of explosives, the disposal of waste, both human and otherwise, the use of fertilizers and pesticides, etc, will ultimately destroy our lake. It is more inevitable than promoters developing the land. Other lakes in adjacent communities are already dealing with devastating blue-green algae blooms, Eurasian Milfoil and irreversible pollution. Lake Louisa is clean and our citizens take pride in protecting it.

We are not opposed to any development that would accommodate a reasonable amount of homes/inns, the building of rural roads, bike paths, zip lines and other truly recreotouristic activities, but the watershed and surrounding area is not a place for a \$2B development.

To the Mayor and Council of Wentworth,

I am writing in response to the Draft of the communication concerning the Recreational Tourism Project, the Summary Report from Ryan Public Affairs, and the briefs and messages sent to the municipality.

It behooves me to understand how council can possibly think that this is an accurate representation of the true sentiments felt by Wentworth residents. I have been in attendance at several of the last council meetings and the reports do not portray the views of the people I see. The most obvious, is that neither the draft of the communication nor the summary report reference two of the largest organizations in the township, the Lake Louisa Property Owners Association and the Dunany Community Association. These associations represent a very large number of residents. Neither association supports the recreational tourism project. This is not reflected in the reports. More than 400 signed petitions against the development were also submitted to council. This too, is not reflected in the reports.

It is interesting to me that all of the individuals who are supposedly in favour of the development remain anonymous. Their letters and briefs are the first ones included in the document. As human nature goes, we know these are the ones that will be read and remembered as one's stamina drops off and interest wanes. One individual stated they have been privy to the REAL information being shared by the council. Aren't we, the residents entitled to hear the REAL information? Why is it privy to certain people? From my point of view, any information I have heard has not convinced me this project is good for our community.

Perhaps if council were more forthcoming with the REAL information we would have a better understanding of the situation.

Having read the documents, it seems like the township is not describing factually all of the residents'/organizations' concerns. It saddens me to think of the environmental impact of such a development in our community.

To whom it may concern,

I am very disturbed by the proposed summary to be sent to the project developers of The proposed WITRI

1. I find it curious that the original report containing the names of the speakers at the June 8 meeting (all who expressed major concerns regarding the project) were redacted in the "final" report. There was no mention of any speaker in favor of the report but this was not reported

2. The Summary lists only the Positive benefits of the project but does not have a section listing a summary of possible Negative Consequences as expressed by citizens.

3. The petitions signed by the residents should be mentioned even if they were not available at the June 8 consultation. As well the visible opposition to the project ie signage number of people at meetings opposed the the project should be included. I ask that you take these points in consideration when you amend the report to accurately reflect the concerns of the people you represent. Sincerely ,

To whom it may concern,

I would like my email to be officially recorded with regards to any development proposals around Lake Louisa and as opposition to the conclusions drawn in the report produced by Ryan Affairs as well as to be forwarded to the Wentworth councilors.

I would like to register my disappointment with the report produced by Ryan Affairs as it fails to encompass my opinion, the opinion of the many individuals I have spoken to around Lake Louisa or the position of the LLPOA and other community organisations who are representing the views of residents.

I strongly disagree with the reports conclusions. In particular, I do not believe that "current municipal by-laws are sufficient to protect the environment, Lake Louisa and the heronry". I also do not believe that "services for citizens resulting from new property tax revenues generated by the presence of a recreational tourism site in Wentworth" will occur, nor that they will be net beneficial for residents. The short term gain to a small number of residents who

will profit from any developments made in the water shed will become redundant if this development destroys the water shed and kills the lake.

I am also disappointed that this report fails to acknowledge community organisations, in particular the LLPOA who are working hard to ensure my and my fellow community members environmental concerns are heard. It also does not include the many letters written to the council outside public hearings or make mention of the hundreds of red signs residents are displaying on their properties in protest to the zoning changes that have been made and registering their opposition to any development in the Lake's watershed.

 I can only implore council members to work in support of this heritage and continue to protect the lake so all of our children can enjoy it for years to come.

Your faithfully,
