

# PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF STAGE I LAKE ONTARIO LaMP



## APPENDIX H

---

## APPENDIX H

---

One of the goals of the Public Involvement program of the Lake Ontario LaMP is to “provide opportunities for meaningful public consultation in developing and implementing Lake Ontario management plans”. As part of this commitment, the agencies conducted a number of activities to inform interested parties about the Lake Ontario Draft Stage 1: Problem Definition report and gather comments on the document.

### **Open Houses/Public Meetings**

To highlight the availability of the Draft Stage 1 for review/comment and to provide information to people interested in the LaMP, open houses and informal public meetings were held in the Lake Ontario basin in the spring of 1997. Four open houses were held in various locations in Ontario, Canada and six informal public meetings were held in various locations in New York State. Generally, open house attendees and public meeting participants were seeking more information about the Lake Ontario LaMP process, clarification of where issues of concern fit into the process, and an explanation of how people can have input to and become involved in the plans to restore and protect the Lake Ontario ecosystem.

### **Distribution of the Draft**

Copies of the Draft Stage 1 document were distributed at the open houses and informal public meetings, and mailed to people on the Lake Ontario mailing lists and to those who had requested a copy. The draft was also made available on the Lake Ontario LaMP website. Accompanying the draft document was a piece titled Topics For Your Consideration which contained questions to help gather comments, suggestions, and/or concerns about key aspects of the Draft Stage 1 document.

### **Public Comments**

The following provides a general overview of the kinds of comments the agencies received either in writing or during the open houses or informal public meetings:

Generally, public comments indicated that the document was well-written, easy to understand, covered a range of complex issues in an understandable fashion, and made good use of lists, tables, and figures. There appeared to be some need for clarification of terms and an expanded glossary that would include acronyms. Specific comments about Chapter 1 (Introduction) indicated that the chapter was sufficient and applauded the inclusion of information about various local programs and statistics. There were, however, a number of suggestions for information that, if included, would improve the chapter.

Regarding the concept of Basin Teams and Partnerships outlined in Chapter 2, comments were generally focused on the need to better explain the Basin Team/Partnership approaches. A key suggestion urged the agencies to develop a succinct blueprint of how the Basin Teams/Partnerships will be constructed. Other comments reiterated the need to clarify the connections between RAPs, LaMPs, and other watershed management initiatives. In response to a question about how the agencies could work with groups/organizations, comments emphasized the need for coordinating and communicating information using existing groups or through local channels and contacts. Creating more committees was not seen as a favorable approach.

The majority of the comments indicated agreement with the lakewide problems as defined in the Draft Stage 1 document. There were some concerns that lake levels management was not adequately addressed and that there was a lack of information about human health issues. Other lakewide issues that were seen as needing

## APPENDIX H

---

further attention included: atmospheric deposition, non-point sources of contaminants, erosion, mercury, and funding issues.

Regarding the Future Agenda as described in the Draft Stage 1, comments indicated that the Future Agenda was definitely a step in the right direction. However, most reviewers thought that the Agenda should include more details, schedules, and action items. There was also general concern about the length of time it will take to fully develop and implement the LaMP; things need to proceed quickly. Most responses indicated agreement with the overall direction that the four agencies described in the LaMP Agenda. Again, there were a variety of suggestions about ways to improve the LaMP process while moving it in the same direction.

### A Summary of Comments and Responses

There were some significant changes made to the document as a result of the public review period. Examples of these include the addition of Mercury to the list of critical pollutants, additional information on human health effects, and the revision of the Workplan to make it more detailed and action-oriented.

A detailed outline, called a Summary of Comments and Responses on the Lake Ontario LaMP, has been prepared so that those who provided comments can see how the agencies used their input as the Stage 1 was finalized. The Summary explains what changes were made to the LaMP document as a result of the comment, or if no change was made to the document, why a change was not appropriate.

While the Summary of Comments and Responses is not a part of this report, copies have been sent to those who made specific comments to the agencies. A copy may be obtained on our websites at [www.cciw.ca/glimr/lakes/ontario/](http://www.cciw.ca/glimr/lakes/ontario/) (in Canada), at [www.epa.gov/glnpo/lakeont](http://www.epa.gov/glnpo/lakeont) (in the United States) or by contacting:

In Canada:

Marlene O'Brien  
Environment Canada  
(905) 336-4552  
Fax: (905) 336-4906  
E-mail: [marlene.o'brien@ec.gc.ca](mailto:marlene.o'brien@ec.gc.ca)

In the United States:

Marna Gadoua  
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation  
(518) 485-8735  
Fax: (518) 485-7786  
E-mail: [mmarna.gadoua@gw.dec.state.ny.us](mailto:mmarna.gadoua@gw.dec.state.ny.us)