

Questions received from residents pertaining to Special Council Meeting, February 4th, 2021

No.	Resident	Questions
1	Johanna McPherson, 832 MacPherson Drive	Why is a portion of the Mattawa River Provincial Park still being considered for disposition and development when the consultation and planning for the Lands for Life / Living Legacy process clearly designated this as a protected area for important ecological and social reasons and the sensitivity of this protected park is even more significant now than when the decision to protect it was finalized?
2	Zachary Holmes, 970 MacPherson Drive	<p>1. Under what authority does your government department have to come along a few short years later, rewrite a law then take away this ecologically sensitive public park land from all future generations without any consideration for the people who live here?</p> <p>2. Under what authority does your government department have to give away this ecologically sensitive public park land to a small group of people that want to claim it as their own, want to destroy the natural environment, want to bulldoze the landscape, want to build a bunch of roads and houses and want to sell them off for a huge pile of profit ?</p> <p>3. Since this land is owned by the PUBLIC, what authority does your government department have to give it away without the consent of the PUBLIC who owns it ? This is PUBLIC land that does not belong to your department, any consultant or any lawyer in some far away office to dispose of as you please.</p>
3	Todd Wilcox	<p>1. As there is no support for development of parkland and public spaces will 302b, 83F1 and 83F2 remain in their current state to the benefit of all Ontarians?</p> <p>2. In 1999 the provincial government implemented Ontario’s Living Legacy Land Use Strategy which resulted in the extension of the Mattawa River Provincial Park to include the parcels designated as 83-F1 and 83-F2. The rationale was “to protect the historical, ecological, environmental and recreational value of this area for future generations.” Why is this strategy no longer applicable? Why is it acceptable to take away parkland used extensively for recreational purposes without acknowledgement and compensation?</p> <p>3. Why has there been such little consultation and communications with taxpayers over the past 10 years?</p> <p>4. Is giving away parkland and public lands for development the only and best solution to addressing historical issues? Why not give away Algonquin Park for example? Will development of parkland provide a long term and lasting solution that is the best possible for all taxpayers?</p>

No.	Resident	Questions
	Todd Wilcox	<p>5. It is obvious from the materials provided by the proponents they are planning intensive development of very fragile lands without regard to 300 meter setback provision, protecting species at risk, protecting water quality and unfettered use of infrastructure paid for by taxpayers. What conditions is the province attaching to this transfer that would ensure proper and sustainable development? Is it the province's intent to ignore the 300 meter setback provision?</p> <p>6. What is the body of evidence, scientific and environmental to support the conclusion "there is no anticipated net effect associated with the transfer of proposed settlement lands into AOO ownership"? As a professional Forester my extensive survey of the lands involved finds this statement to be untrue.</p> <p>7. Municipal infrastructure cannot support this development as the municipality is very rural. Macpherson Drive and Centennial Crescent are not capable of safely handling any more traffic. Is the province paying for new roads and infrastructure or downloading their responsibility to local taxpayers?</p>
4	Chris Holmes, 970 MacPherson Drive	<p>1. Will the MNRF Land Claims and Treaties Division formally implement an online portal or other formal mechanism to Receive, Record and Respond to all public submissions and to create a permanent "PUBLIC RECORD" accessible to all citizens for review and comment?</p> <p>2. Will the MNRF Land Claims and Treaties Division formally implement a Citizens Committee to facilitate a collaborative working relationship to discuss local concerns and create solutions that are mutually acceptable to the municipality and its thousands of residents, including the members of the AOO?</p>
5	Shirley Ferron	<p>1. How does the MNRF and the AOO justify IGNORING the Environmental Requirements and Legislation that preserve the Mattawa River Provincial Park (83F1 and 83F2)....these are Our "LANDS FOR LIFE"!!? These lands are unsuitable for subdivision property development.</p> <p>2. Why is the East End Waterway of Trout Lake (from the East Ferris Boat Launch to the blasted out area in the channel with the Memorial Plaque ...the Narrows...) why is it designated on YOUR map as TURTLE LAKE when in fact it is labelled as TROUT LAKE on all other existing maps?? It appears this mislabelling supports your own purposes to circumvent the environmental requirements as per the TROUT Lake Development Capacity Model. Would you please correct this deviant error?</p> <p>3. Why is there NO Transparency or FAIR DEMOCRATIC PROCESS when adding large increments of Land to the ALC in East Ferris and Nipissing District!?</p>

No.	Resident	Questions
5	Shirley Ferron	4. To fairly distribute land in the ALC would you please remove all acreage east and south of MacPherson Dr. (Including 83F1 and 83F2) locating more appropriate land for this massive Residential Subdivision Development!??
6	Jill Labreche	<p>1. The current proposal is to build a 137 acre subdivision on Parcel 302B, which consists entirely of granite, one of the hardest rock types on the planet! How will water be drawn for the subdivision and, in the absence of a sewer system, how will effluent be disposed of?</p> <p>2. As mentioned in my previous letter dated November 2020, a copy of which is at the East Ferris office, parcel 302B comprises the entirety of Forest Lane which six property owners must use to access their homes and cottages. They also must seek right-of-way over my property to access their homes. Are you able to put a stop to scouts, working on behalf of the Algonquins, from seeking to pressure me into selling my property?</p> <p>3. How much money are the Algonquins willing to put into rehabilitating inhospitable land into hospitable land even though there is no access to Trout Lake?</p> <p>4. What is the real reason for the Algonquins to claim Parcel 302B?</p> <p>5. Do you foresee any possible future conflict between the current lakefront property owners and the Algonquins?</p>
7	Dr. Carey Landreville	<p>1. In an era promoting environmental sensibility and responsibility why would this Algonquin/lawyer group be so irresponsible to even propose a major housing development on environmentally sensitive land along the Mattawa River?</p> <p>2. Has this Algonquin/lawyer group had an environmental impact assessment/analysis prepared regarding lakefront land (parcel 83F-1 and 83 F-2) or any of the other lands in question?</p> <p>3. Were there any consultations with the North Bay Mattawa Conservation Authority (NBMCA) regarding the impact on the proposed development site(s). If not, why not? And if so , what are the views and recommendations of the NBMCA regarding this major housing development on the lake/river?</p> <p>4. Why would this Algonquin/lawyer group not consider doing the right thing and commence developing their housing aspirations in a more appropriate location such as inside Algonquin Park?</p> <p>5. Has anyone in this Algonquin/lawyer group ever walked along this parcel (83F-1 and 83F-2) of land. If so have they not noticed how extremely rocky and hilly this area is? Have they ever contemplated the extreme cost and difficulty in developing this area into a major housing development? Quite absurd really!</p>

No.	Resident	Questions
8	Debbie McMullen, 977 MacPherson Drive	<p>1. Is it possible to schedule an ALC Update with Doug Carr and relevant stakeholders for “NORTH BAY / MATTAWA ALGONQUINS” as per the meeting held November 13, 2020 for the Township of “SOUTH ALGONQUIN”?</p> <p>2. Is a Financial payout on the table for any or all of the Algonquin Land Claim?</p>
9	The Lawrences, 414 Hemlock Island	<p>1. If even developed properties can be claimed by the Algonquins what is to stop them, either now or in the future, from claiming other developed places between here and Ottawa?</p> <p>2. Will the MNR report back to the Premier and suggest that all the negotiations in the ongoing Algonquin Land Claim be suspended and set aside until there is an opportunity for the public in these affected areas to exercise a measure of democratic control over what is going on?</p>
10	Mike Burke, 1015 MacPherson Drive	<p>1. Was Algonquin Park excluded from consideration as to lands which could be identified for transfer from the Crown. What was the rationale for excluding Algonquin Park, especially when other parks, such as the Mattawa River Park lands have been actually identified for transfer?</p> <p>2. Was there a nexus of the Algonquin peoples to the particular Mattawa River Park lands being considered for transfer?</p> <p>3. Can the Crown produce a study or report as to the nature of the nexus being relied upon for the identification of the Mattawa River Park lands ?</p> <p>4. Would any such nexus apply to similar lands in Algonquin Park for identification as to transfer from the Crown?</p>
11	Peter Bullock, Vice President of the Trout Lake Conservation Association	<p>1. What is the total acreage of lands currently on the table for transfer as a result of the negotiations over the past several years (which sparked the need for the supplemental EER)? Why was this summary not provided in the latest circulation?</p> <p>2. What are the total acreages of lands to be transferred, i.e., in the original EER and now considering the impact of the supplemental EER, for the District of Nipissing?</p> <p>3. How would these total acreages in Nipissing District compare to other parts of the land claim area, for example in Lanark or Russel Prescott Counties?</p>

	4. As parcels are added or subtracted from the Agreement-In-Principle, does this have any impact on the cash settlement also proposed in the Agreement-In-Principle?
--	--

No.	Resident	Questions
12	Mayor Rochefort, Municipality of East Ferris	<p>1. What are the goals of the Algonquins of Ontario (AOO) Land Claim as it pertains to East Ferris?</p> <p>2. How can the Land Claim in East Ferris lead to a similar positive outcome as in Ottawa?</p> <p>3. Is the Preliminary Plan just that “preliminary” and not a true reflection of the AOO’s intention?</p> <p>4. Was the Preliminary Plan accompanied by a technical evaluation of the land to ascertain which portions are developable? Are there opportunities for the Municipality’s Planning Department to collaborate with the AOO and Consultant Jp2g to identify alternative properties that may be less costly to develop?</p> <p>5. How do we achieve a win-win AOO settlement in East Ferris? Are there other lands, owned either by the Crown, the Municipality or privately that could be swapped in lieu of Parcel 302B? Could the market value of the Parcel be established via a professional appraisal and a payment in lieu of land made to the AOO?</p> <p>6. Are there opportunities for the AOO and the Crown to address the concerns of citizens regarding the Mattawa River Park development?</p> <p>Following is a summary of some potential actions that could be taken.</p>