

**ONTARIO MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES
ONTARIO PARKS**

**PRESQU'ILE PROVINCIAL PARK - MANAGEMENT PLANNING
PRELIMINARY MANAGEMENT PLAN
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC RESPONSE**

October 2000

HOW INPUT WAS SOLICITED

About 1,000 copies of the February 1999 Preliminary Management Plan were distributed through:

- a mailing to the 556 individuals and groups then on the mailing list,
- an open house and public meeting in Brighton on March 25, 1999, attended by about 500 people,
- mailing, and over the counter distribution at Presqu'ile, in response to individual inquiries.

Preliminary plan recipients were invited to submit comments to Ontario Parks by April 23, 1999, later extended to August 31, 1999.

Section 2, Public Consultation and Significant Issues, of the October 2000 approved Management Plan describes all aspects of public involvement in the management planning process.

This summary divides public response into three categories:

- individual and interest group submissions and presentations,
- public meeting comment sheets,
- form letters.

INDIVIDUAL AND INTEREST GROUP SUBMISSIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Respondents

This category consists of the following types of responses from individuals and interest groups:

- Written submissions (briefs, letters, faxes, etc.), e-mails, and telephone calls for which there is a written record, to Ontario Parks, other MNR staff, the Minister, the Premier, or other MPPs, that were not comment sheets or form letters.
- Presentations to the March 25, 1999 public meeting (see *Preliminary Management Plan: Summary of Public Meeting - Brighton, March 25, 1999*, June 1999).
- Texts of or notes for remarks at the public meeting, handed in at the meeting.

Total number of respondents:

- 147 total
- 116 individuals (a family group is counted as one individual) (79%)
- 31 interest groups (21%).

Total number of responses:

- 32 public meeting presentations
- 16 texts of and notes for public meeting presentations
- 169 written submissions, e-mails, and telephone call records (some respondents wrote similar letters to more than one person, and some respondents made two or more different submissions).

Individual respondents by residence:

- 33 with local addresses (see definition below) (28%)
- 16 from elsewhere in Northumberland, Hastings, and Prince Edward counties (14%)
- 62 from elsewhere in Ontario (53%)
- 4 from outside Ontario (3%)
- 1 address unknown (1%).

For the purposes of this summary, local addresses are the mailing addresses listed below. Substantial portions of these mailing addresses lie within the Town of Brighton and/or Township of Brighton. As well, each of these mailing addresses has a unique postal code, making it easy to determine whether a given mailing address is local or not. In other words, "local" as defined in this summary is approximately equivalent to "living in the Town of Brighton or Township of Brighton". The local mailing addresses are:

- Brighton K0K 1H0
- Carrying Place K0K 1L0
- Codrington K0K 1R0
- Warkworth K0K 3K0
- Wooler K0K 3M0
- R.R. 1, Trenton K8V 5P4
- R.R. 2, Trenton K8V 5P5
- R.R. 4, Trenton K8V 5P7
- R.R. 5, Trenton K8V 5P8

Responses on Major Issues

In interpreting these results, readers should keep in mind that these respondents were composing their responses entirely on their own. They were not completing questionnaires as respondents to the Background Information/Issues and Alternatives document were, or comment sheets as the public meeting comment sheet category of respondents to the Preliminary Plan were. Those generally opposed to, or with major concerns about, a proposed plan are more likely to identify the specific proposals they are opposed to. Those generally in support of a proposed plan are less likely to identify the specific proposals they support.

The issues are listed in order of how many respondents commented on them.

General position on Preliminary Plan

Total commenting: 94 (64%) of respondents, of whom:

- 62 (66%) generally support the Preliminary Plan
- 32 (34%) generally oppose the Preliminary Plan.

Waterfowl hunting

Total commenting: 76 (52%) of respondents, of whom:

- 7 (9%) support immediate ending of waterfowl hunting in the park
- 6 (8%) support phasing out waterfowl hunting in the park whether or not alternative waterfowl hunting opportunities are developed
- 37 (49%) support implementing the Ontario Parks Board of Directors recommendation to phase out waterfowl hunting in the park provided alternative waterfowl hunting opportunities are developed, or otherwise generally support ending waterfowl hunting in the park
- 26 (34%) support permitting waterfowl hunting to continue.

Motorboating in park waters in Presqu'ile Bay

Total commenting: 51 (35%) of respondents, of whom:

- 19 (37%) support the Preliminary Plan proposal to prohibit motorboating in most park waters in Presqu'ile Bay, assuming the water boundary is extended as proposed
- 6 (12%) support permitting motorboating to continue in park waters in Presqu'ile Bay, but under greater restrictions than at present (such as speed control, wake control, noise control, boat size restrictions, etc.)
- 5 (10%) support permitting motorboating to continue in the less sensitive open park waters in Presqu'ile Bay, while prohibiting it, either seasonally or year round, in the more sensitive inlets
- 5 (10%) support permitting motorboating to continue but with some combination of the two preceding types of restrictions
- 16 (31%) oppose the proposal to prohibit motorboating in most park waters in Presqu'ile Bay, and support not having any Boating Restriction Regulation specific to this area.

Deer population reduction

Total commenting: 39 (27%) of respondents, of whom:

- 24 (62%) support reducing the deer population as proposed in the Preliminary Plan
- 1 (3%) support reducing the deer population as proposed, but by a compassionate cull by wildlife managers
- 10 (26%) support reducing the deer population as proposed, but by a controlled public hunt
- 1 (3%) support reducing the deer population by reintroducing native predators
- 3 (8%) oppose reducing the deer population.

Calf Pasture Point boat launch

Total commenting: 35 (24%) of respondents, of whom:

- 12 (34%) support the Preliminary Plan proposal to close the Calf Pasture Point boat launch
- 1 (3%) support relocating the boat launch to the north side of Calf Pasture Point
- 22 (63%) oppose closing the Calf Pasture Point boat launch.

Beach management

Total commenting: 35 (24%) of respondents, of whom:

- 2 (6%) support managing the sand beach more for bird migration and less for beach recreation than proposed in the Preliminary Plan
- 14 (40%) support managing the sand beach for both bird migration and beach recreation as proposed in the Preliminary Plan
- 19 (54%) oppose managing the sand beach as proposed in the Preliminary Plan and support managing it more for recreation and less for bird migration.

Water boundary in Presqu'ile Bay

Total commenting: 31 (21%) of respondents, of whom:

- 3 (10%) support the Preliminary Plan proposal to extend the water boundary in Presqu'ile Bay
- 3 (10%) support a water boundary in Presqu'ile Bay somewhere between the present and Preliminary Plan boundaries
- 25 (81%) oppose the proposal to extend the water boundary in Presqu'ile Bay, and support the present boundary.

Cormorant management

Total commenting: 28 (19%) of respondents, of whom:

- 1 (4%) oppose any control of cormorants
- 1 (4%) support the Preliminary Plan not proposing any specific cormorant control policy beyond the general animal control policies in the Preliminary Plan
- 26 (93%) support including a specific cormorant control policy in the Preliminary Plan.

Salt Point

Total commenting: 24 (16%) of respondents, of whom:

- 2 (8%) support the Preliminary Plan proposal to add Salt Point to the park
- 22 (92%) oppose adding Salt Point to the park.

Picnic shelter north of park store

Total commenting: 15 (10%) of respondents, of whom:

- 7 (47%) support the Preliminary Plan proposal to remove the picnic shelter north of the park store
- 8 (53%) oppose the proposal to remove the picnic shelter north of the park store.

Changing municipal official plans

Total commenting: 9 (6%) of respondents, of whom:

- 4 (44%) support the Preliminary Plan proposal to recommend changing municipal official plans to better protect park values
- 5 (56%) oppose the proposal to recommend changing municipal official plans to better protect park values.

Other specific, major changes to the Preliminary Plan

Total advocating one or more specific, major changes: 42 (29%) of respondents.

For each change, the number of respondents advocating it is shown:

- 15 Classify park as a recreation park and/or zone the park mainly for recreation and/or manage the park mainly for recreation
- 10 Include in plan a specific gull control policy
- 8 Do not expand park store or relocate it or remove it from park
- 4 Do not extend water boundary on Lake Ontario side of park
- 3 Do not include in plan support for international conservation designations
- 3 Reopen and dredge channel that used to exist between Owen Point and High Bluff campground
- 3 Do not permit food vending carts on beach
- 2 Establish permanent citizens' committee with greater scope than park-community liaison and Presqu'île Heritage Forum as proposed in Preliminary Plan
- 2 Keep existing food concession building on beach
- 2 Close Lighthouse Interpretive Centre and relocate activities to one of Lighthouse Lane heritage cottages
- 2 Acquire where possible additional lands adjacent to park as they come on the market
- 2 Do not remove planted conifers
- 2 Include in plan a statement of legal right of Presqu'île Peninsula landowners to access across the park
- 2 Dedicate 20% of all capital expenditures to management and restoration of natural environments

- 2 Set deadline for completion of all zone management plans
- 1 Thin trees, do not leave to rot
- 1 Develop roofed accommodation (cabins etc.)
- 1 Do not permit Aboriginal people to hunt in the park except as sport hunters
- 1 Remove all planted conifers in Zone NR4
- 1 Close Paxton Drive-Lighthouse Lane loop to most private motor vehicles and provide transit service
- 1 Make Paxton Drive-Lighthouse Lane loop one way to motor vehicles during peak traffic periods only
- 1 Do not develop day use facilities in Zone D2 south and east of Zone D1; restore natural environment
- 1 Provide transit from Brighton to park during peak periods
- 1 Increase emphasis on recreation in park goal and objectives
- 1 Permit motorboating in Zone NR2
- 1 Prohibit motorboating in Zone NE1
- 1 Eliminate all existing water boundaries and remove all waters from park
- 1 Do not expand parking at amphitheatre
- 1 Establish entry station in Zone D4 for Bayshore Road traffic westbound into park
- 1 Do not build new hiking trail in panne
- 1 Include in plan a specific raccoon control policy
- 1 Do not undertake further archaeological study.

PUBLIC MEETING COMMENT SHEETS

Respondents

This category consists of comment sheets (see Appendix 1) distributed at the March 25, 1999 public meeting and:

- completed and handed in at the public meeting, or
- taken from the public meeting, completed, and mailed or faxed to Ontario Parks by April 23, 1999.

234 comment sheets were returned, 215 with names and addresses and four with names only. Duplicates were eliminated from those with names. There is no evidence that the 15 comment sheets without names or addresses represent any attempt to manipulate the response, so they have been included.

Respondents were asked to indicate "interest group or agency you represent, if any". It appears that many respondents who were not officially representing groups put down the names of groups they belonged to. Therefore, all responses were treated as individual responses. Where more than one family member submitted a comment sheet, each was counted separately.

Respondents by residence:

- 138 with local addresses (see definition of local in Individual and Interest Group Submissions and Presentations section) (59%)
- 38 from elsewhere in Northumberland, Hastings, and Prince Edward counties (16%)
- 17 from Durham Region (7%)
- 13 from City of Toronto (6%)
- 9 from elsewhere in Ontario (4%)
- 19 address unknown (8%).

Responses on Major Issues Identified on Comment Sheet

All quoted text is taken from the comment sheet (see Appendix 1). In some cases, respondents wrote

in other preferences that were not given on the sheet; these are shown without quotation marks.

"No response" tallies include respondents not checking any choices, or checking more than one choice or otherwise leaving their preference unclear.

"Who is Presqu'ile Park for?"

- 2% - "local residents and property owners"
- 88% - "all Ontarians"
- 9% - no response.

"Are the proposed policies:"

- 64% - "too protectionist"
- 3% - "too recreation/development oriented"
- 27% - "a reasonable balance"
- 7% - no response.

"Should the beach be managed:"

- 57% - "mainly for beach recreation"
- 3% - "mainly for migrating birds"
- 31% - "for both, as the plan proposes"
- 4% - checked "for both, as the plan proposes" but crossed out "as the plan proposes"; these respondents obviously support managing the beach for both recreation and birds, but not the way proposed in the Preliminary Plan
- 5% - no response.

"Should the Park's water boundary:"

- 20% - "be extended, with no motorboating in the marsh and around the islands, as the plan proposes"
- 9% - "be extended as the plan proposes, but with motorboating still allowed"
- 58% - "be left unchanged, with motorboating still allowed"
- 3% - be extended as the Preliminary Plan proposed, but with motorboating still allowed in Presqu'ile Bay under greater restrictions than at present (such as speed control, wake control, noise control, boat size restrictions, etc.), or with motorboating allowed in the less sensitive open park waters in Presqu'ile Bay, while prohibiting it, either seasonally or year round, in the more sensitive inlets
- 3% - be left unchanged, with motorboating still allowed in Presqu'ile Bay under greater restrictions than at present (such as speed control, wake control, noise control, boat size restrictions, etc.), or with motorboating allowed in the less sensitive open park waters in Presqu'ile Bay, while prohibiting it, either seasonally or year round, in the more sensitive inlets
- <0.5% - be left unchanged, with no motorboating in park waters
- <0.5% - be eliminated, removing all waters from the park
- 6% - no response.

"Should Salt Point be added to the Park as the plan proposes?"

- 16% - "yes"
- 74% - "no"
- <0.5% - land area yes, surrounding waters no
- 9% - no response.

"Should 'problem' wildlife populations (deer, cormorants, mute swans, etc.) be reduced if they affect park natural heritage values?"

- 82% - "yes"

- 8% - "no"
- 5% - yes, except for mute swan populations
- <0.5% - no, except for deer populations
- 5% - no response.

"Should the Ontario Parks Board's recommendation to phase out waterfowl hunting be implemented?"

- 38% - "yes"
- 57% - "no"
- 1% - waterfowl hunting should be ended as quickly as possible
- 4% - no response.

"Has management planning for Presqu'ile been conducted fairly and openly?"

- 22% - "yes"
- 67% - "no"
- 11% - no response.

Other Specific, Major Changes to the Preliminary Plan

Total advocating one or more specific, major changes: 23 (10%) of respondents.

For each change, the number of respondents advocating it is shown:

- 8 Reduce the deer population by a controlled public hunt
- 4 Reduce the cormorant population by a controlled public hunt
- 3 Reopen and dredge channel that used to exist between Owen Point and High Bluff campground
- 2 Do not remove, or only thin, planted conifers
- 2 Do not close Calf Pasture Point boat launch
- 2 Do not reduce the deer population by a cull by Aboriginal people
- 1 Do not reduce the deer population by a cull by wildlife managers
- 1 Reestablish pioneer cemetery as a cultural heritage feature
- 1 Remove park store
- 1 Undertake water pollution studies
- 1 Require birders wishing to use Bayshore Road east of park to leave motor vehicles within park
- 1 Do not include in plan support for international conservation designations
- 1 Do not make Paxton Drive-Lighthouse Lane loop one way to motor vehicles
- 1 Do not give Aboriginal people any preferred rights in the park
- 1 Make Paxton Drive-Lighthouse Lane loop one way to motor vehicles during peak traffic periods only
- 1 Develop more car campsites
- 1 Develop walk-in campsites
- 1 Review plan after five years.

FORM LETTERS

Respondents

This category consists of various preprinted form letters submitted to MNR.

The form letters, and the number received of each, are as follows.

- ▶ Type 1 - 2,307 received. To Jim Peets, re "Presqu'ile Provincial Park Preliminary Management

Plan E.B.R. Posting PB5E4003", opposing the Preliminary Plan for five reasons:

- extending the boundary is unnecessary, and will result in "major but needless reduction of public recreational uses",
- closing the boat launches will affect recreational use,
- "setting aside . . . public beach areas for the use of shore birds only is unacceptable"; "beach areas must also remain zoned for public recreational uses and be properly maintained for the enjoyment of future generations",
- the Preliminary Plan does not address cormorant overpopulation and damage to vegetation on Gull and High Bluff islands,
- "the overall thrust of the preliminary plan is an ecotourism park for strict preservation", whereas recreational use and natural heritage protection have successfully coexisted up to now.

Most of these form letters were delivered to Ontario Parks by two Brighton area residents who organized their circulation and signature. 544 respondents made additional comments on the form letter, and these are analyzed below.

- ▶ Type 2 - 6 received. To Jim Peets, re "Presqu'île Provincial Park Preliminary Management Plan E.B.R. Posting PB5E4003", opposing the Preliminary Plan for four reasons, being the five reasons in the Type 1 form letter minus the concern about beach management. Type 2 also includes copies of the Type 1 form letter on which respondents crossed out the beach management concern. Two respondents made additional comments on the form letter, and these are analyzed below.
- ▶ Type 3 - 32 received. To Dr. Doug Galt, MPP and Jim Peets, re "Presqu'île Park Preliminary Management Plan", supporting the Presqu'île Point Property Owners' Association's April 21, 1999 *Response to Presqu'île Provincial Park Preliminary Management Plan*. The form letter specifies concerns with three Preliminary Plan proposals:
 - extending Presqu'île Bay water boundaries,
 - including Salt Point in the park; the point should instead be "designated as Brighton Township Property",
 - designating nature reserve and natural environment zones; "our particular concerns are 'Buffer Zones'".The letter leaves three blank concerns for respondents to complete. Three respondents made additional comments in the blank space, and these are analyzed below.
- ▶ Type 4 - 23 received. To Jim Peets, from "a concerned Presqu'île boater" (these are believed to be members of the Presqu'île Yacht Club), opposing proposed water boundary and motorboating policies.
- ▶ Type 5 - 6 received. To the Hon. John Snobelen, from "a member of the Kingston Field Naturalists", supporting the Preliminary Plan.
- ▶ Type 6 - 17 received. To Minister Snobelen, with a copy to Dr. Galt, from "a member of the Presqu'île Brighton Naturalists", supporting the Preliminary Plan.
- ▶ Type 7 - 8 received. To Minister Snobelen, from "a member of the Quinte Field Naturalists", supporting the Preliminary Plan.
- ▶ Type 8 - 10 received. To Minister Snobelen, re "Presqu'île Provincial Park Management Plan" (believed to be from members of the Durham Region Field Naturalists), supporting the Preliminary Plan.

Additional Comments on Types 1 and 2 Form Letters

As indicated above, 546 Type 1 and 2 form letters included additional comments. Many of these comments simply amplified the reasons for opposing the Preliminary Plan listed in the form letter. Others raised the following additional points; the number of respondents making each comment is shown.

- 277 Concerns about public access to the park, such as fear that the park would be closed or need to ensure that the park would continue to be available for everyone to use
- 53 Control problem wildlife populations including deer, cormorants, gulls
- 42 Do not limit park use to special interest groups
- 40 Tourism is important to the local economy
- 29 Continue sport fishing and/or waterfowl hunting in the park
- 28 Comments advocating continuation of various recreational activities
- 21 Taxes pay for park facilities; park fees are too high
- 9 Do not permit Aboriginal people to hunt in the park except as sport hunters; do not reduce the deer population by a cull by Aboriginal people
- 8 Do not close boat launches
- 6 Do not extend any park boundary
- 4 End waterfowl hunting in the park
- 2 Do not control mute swan population
- 1 End commercial fishing adjacent to residential properties
- 1 Concern about adverse impact on commercial fishing.

Additional Comments on Type 3 Form Letter

As indicated above, three Type 3 form letters included additional comments. These are as follows; the number of respondents making each comment is shown.

- 2 Control problem wildlife populations including deer, cormorants, black squirrels
- 1 Restrict use of Bayshore Road east of park to Presqu'île Peninsula landowners and their visitors
- 1 Return land not used for park to Township of Brighton.

Anthony Usher Planning Consultant
October 31, 2000

APPENDIX 1

**PRESQU'ILE PROVINCIAL PARK PRELIMINARY MANAGEMENT PLAN
Open House and Public Meeting, March 25, 1999**

I think that . . .

Please check the choice that is closest to what you think about each of these key issues. If you don't agree with any choice or have no opinion, leave the issue blank. If you want to say more, see other side! For a full description of the plan's proposals, please refer to the sections of the document indicated.

Who is Presqu'ile Park for? (Section 3, pages 7-8)

Local residents and property owners All Ontarians

Are the proposed policies: (entire document)

Too protectionist? Too recreation/development oriented? A reasonable balance?

Should the beach be managed: (Section 2.4, page 5; Section 5.4, Zone NE1, pages 15-16)

Mainly for beach recreation? Mainly for migrating birds? For both, as the plan proposes?

Should the Park's water boundary: (Sections 2.6 and 2.7, pages 5-6; Section 4.1, pages 8-10; Table 1, pages 12-13; Section 6.1, page 18; Map 2, pages 20-21)

Be extended, with no motorboating in the marsh and around the islands, as the plan proposes?
 Be extended as the plan proposes, but with motorboating still allowed?
 Be left unchanged, with motorboating still allowed?

Should Salt Point be added to the Park as the plan proposes: (Section 4.1, pages 8-10; Section 5.2, Zone NR5, page 15; Map 2, pages 20-21) Yes No

Should "problem" wildlife populations (deer, cormorants, mute swans, etc.) be reduced if they affect park natural heritage values? (Section 2.3, page 5; Section 6.5, pages 22-24) Yes No

Should the Ontario Parks Board's recommendation to phase out waterfowl hunting be implemented? (Section 2.5, page 5; Table 1, pages 12-13; Section 6.5, pages 22-24) Yes No

Has management planning for Presqu'ile been conducted fairly and openly? (Foreword, page 1; Section 2, pages 4-6; Section 11, pages 31-32; Appendix, pages 33-39) Yes No

All your comments will be carefully considered in preparing the final Management Plan for Presqu'ile Provincial Park. The approved Management Plan will be sent to everyone on our mailing list.

I want to keep in touch . . .

Your name _____ Telephone _____

Mailing address _____ Fax _____

Interest group or agency you represent, if any _____

If you are not already on our mailing list, we will add you to it.

See over . . .

I didn't get a chance to say . . .

We welcome your comments on:

- any of the issues on the other side,
- any other issues in the Preliminary Management Plan,
- any other issues about Presqu'ile Park or Ontario Parks.

Thank you!

Please hand in this comment sheet on your way out. If you would like more time to respond, please take the sheet with you and:

- mail it to Jim Peets, Park Planner, Ontario Parks, Ministry of Natural Resources, 51 Heakes Lane, Kingston, K7M 9B1, or
- fax it to Jim Peets at (613) 531-5730,

but please get your comments to us no later than **April 23, 1999**.

The Ministry of Natural Resources, Ontario Parks is collecting your comments under the authority of the *Provincial Parks Act* for the sole purpose of management planning for Presqu'ile Provincial Park. All information and comments received will become part of the public record until the end of the management planning process, and will be available for public review on demand, unless you request privacy. You have the right under the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* to request that your identity and your comments remain confidential (if you so wish, check the appropriate box below). Regardless, by submitting this comment sheet, you agree that:

- Ontario Parks may use your name, address, and phone to contact you again, about planning and management of Presqu'ile Provincial Park only;
- Ontario Parks may publish summaries of all information and comments received, provided that if you request privacy, the summaries will not include any information or comments that would allow you to be identified.

Please check if you would like us to keep confidential:

your identity your identity and your comments