

Chapter 16 The Process of Part 2 of the Inquiry

Contents

16.1	Introduction	500
16.2	Principles	500
16.2.1	Thoroughness	500
16.2.2	Expedition	501
16.2.3	Openness	501
16.2.4	Fairness	502
16.2.5	Proximity to the Issue of Drinking Water Safety	502
16.3	The Internet.....	502
16.4	The Research Advisory Panel.....	503
16.5	Key Rulings.....	505
16.5.1	Standing	505
16.5.2	Funding for Parties with Standing.....	506
16.5.3	Parties Granted Standing in Part 2	507
16.6	Research	509
16.6.1	The Commissioned Papers.....	509
16.6.2	Other Staff Research	510
16.6.3	The Expert Tour	510
16.7	Submissions from the Parties with Standing	511
16.8	Public Submissions.....	511
16.9	Consultations.....	512
16.9.1	Town Hall Meetings	512
16.9.2	Expert Meetings	513
16.9.3	Public Hearings	513
16.10	Expert Advice	514
16.11	Budget	514
16.12	Appreciation.....	514

Chapter 16 The Process of Part 2 of the Inquiry

16.1 Introduction

In Chapter 14 of the Part 1 report of this Inquiry, I described the process by which I addressed the broad mandate and the dual roles of the Inquiry: to report on what happened in Walkerton and why, and to make recommendations to ensure the safety of drinking water across the Province in the future. It is not unusual for public inquiries to have both an adjudicative-type role, to determine why a particular tragedy occurred, and a forward-looking policy function, to make recommendations so that a similar tragedy will not occur again. What is somewhat unusual about the mandate of this Inquiry is that the second part of the exercise goes far beyond making recommendations arising solely from the events of Walkerton. Indeed, many of the issues that arise in the course of looking into what is necessary to ensure the safety of Ontario's water system have little to do with what occurred in Walkerton.

Given the dual roles of the Inquiry, one of the first decisions was to divide the Inquiry into two parts, Part 1 and Part 2, which allowed the development of a separate process for each part. I proceeded with both parts simultaneously.

16.2 Principles

In the Part 1 report, I set out four principles that guided the process: thoroughness, expedition, openness to the public, and fairness. These four principles also guided the process in Part 2, although in the context of a broader set of questions they called for a different process. In Part 2, I also considered the proximity of the issues to the safety of drinking water.

16.2.1 Thoroughness

In the aftermath of Walkerton, there was a widespread concern in Ontario about the safety of drinking water. One objective of Part 2 is to restore the public's faith in their drinking water systems. In order to do that, and to ensure that the Inquiry was fair and complete, it was important to examine all the issues that may have an impact on the safety of drinking water. I considered every suggestion made concerning issues that might even remotely be connected to the mandate. In the end, some issues that were examined were not sufficiently

connected to the mandate to warrant recommendations. Other issues, such as the standards applicable to specific water contaminants, were too broad to address comprehensively and in detail; instead, the relevant standard-setting processes were reviewed. In several places in this report, I point out where I conclude that certain matters on which I heard submissions were beyond my mandate.

16.2.2 Expedition

To remain relevant, a public inquiry should be expeditious. Expedition in the conduct of an inquiry makes it more likely that members of the public will be engaged by the process and that they will feel confident that the issues are being appropriately addressed. When the mandate involves issues concerning public health and safety, it is especially important to proceed as quickly as possible. With this in mind, I established two processes, largely with separate teams of staff, for Parts 1 and 2. The two parts were carried on simultaneously. Although the evidence heard in the Part 1 hearings was useful to my consideration of some of the Part 2 issues, I found that the two processes were by and large able to proceed apace and somewhat independently of each other. This resulted in a considerable saving in time and likely also in expense. Although this approach entailed the expense of two separate teams of staff, even more expense would probably have been incurred if the processes had been run consecutively rather than concurrently.

16.2.3 Openness

In Part 1, I sought to ensure that the public had full access to the Inquiry. There was a similar need for openness in Part 2. In Part 2, it was important to ensure that there was not only ample opportunity for the public to see and scrutinize the process, but also to participate meaningfully. The expert meetings and the public hearings were open to the public. The town hall meetings across the province were widely advertised and, with one exception, were televised. In addition, the Inquiry's Web site was kept current and the various papers and records of proceedings were made available to the public.

16.2.4 Fairness

Section 5 of the *Public Inquiries Act* provides that any party with a substantial and direct interest in an inquiry should be granted the opportunity to provide evidence and to examine or cross-examine witnesses.¹ It also provides that an inquiry cannot make any findings of misconduct against a person without giving that person notice of the substance of the alleged misconduct and the opportunity to be heard in person or through counsel. These requirements had strong implications for the Part 1 process. The nature of Part 2 was such that section 5 of the Act, particularly the second provision of the section, was not engaged. That said, in some cases parties in Part 2 had radically differing points of view about what should be done to ensure drinking water safety in Ontario. Fairness in Part 2 therefore required that I ensure that all of those who wished to participate could and that parties with differing points of view had equal opportunity to be heard.

16.2.5 Proximity to the Issue of Drinking Water Safety

It quickly became apparent as I considered the safety of drinking water in Ontario that with a little creativity, a wide array of issues could be linked to the topic. I did not make a hard and fast rule about how to determine whether an issue was closely enough related to the safety of drinking water to merit consideration, but rather relied on the advice of experts, researchers, parties in Part 2, and ultimately my own judgment. These determinations led to the different degrees of emphasis given to topics in this report and the specificity of some recommendations. Where an improvement in the existing system is considered essential, the language of this report is intended to make that clear; where change might be helpful, or be more closely related to objectives other than safety – such as conservation, efficiency, and equity – the language becomes less imperative and the discussion more brief.

16.3 The Internet

Throughout Part 2, the Inquiry made extensive use of the Internet as the principal means of communication with parties and with the public. Without

¹ R.S.O. 1990, c. P.41.

instant electronic communication, the work of Part 2 would have taken much longer.

All the issue papers commissioned by the Inquiry, nearly all of the submissions from the Part 2 parties, and many public submissions were posted on the Inquiry's Web site, as were notices and agendas concerning upcoming meetings and other public notices. Drafts of papers, comments and suggestions, references to literature, and sometimes the literature itself, circulated rapidly among the participants. This use of the Internet proved to be highly effective and provided the additional benefit of being completely transparent to the public.

16.4 The Research Advisory Panel

Early in the Part 2 process, I appointed a Research Advisory Panel consisting of leading practitioners and academics in fields relating to the issues being examined by the Inquiry. In selecting members of the panel, I attempted to ensure that they would represent a diversity of expertise and perspective to help me in fulfilling the mandate. The panel's first task was to assist in determining the subjects to be addressed in the commissioned papers and in deciding who should prepare them, a job that they performed admirably. I met with the panel regularly, and their expert assistance in many areas regarding both parts of the Inquiry was invaluable. I am deeply appreciative of the time and effort that the panel devoted to their task.

The Panel consisted of the following individuals:

Harry Swain, Ph.D. (Chair), a partner in the consulting firm Sussex Circle and a former deputy minister in the federal government. As Deputy Minister of Industry, he was responsible for science policy advice for the Government of Canada. Educated in urban and economic geography, Mr. Swain taught at the Universities of Toronto and British Columbia and was a project leader at the International Institute for Applied Analysis in Laxenburg, Austria. He holds a doctorate from the University of Minnesota and was awarded an honorary degree by the University of Victoria. From 1996 to 1998, he was a director of Hambros Bank Limited, a U.K. merchant bank, and CEO of its Canadian subsidiary.

Prof. George E. Connell, OC, FCIC, FRSC, is a biochemist who became one of Canada's leading academic administrators and, from 1991 to 1995, was

chairman of the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy. Prof. Connell also served, from 1990 to 1993, as vice-chair of the Environmental Assessment Board of Ontario. He has served on numerous boards, inquiries, and public policy bodies, including the Corporate Higher Education Forum; as chair of the Task Force on Human Resource Management and the Status of Higher Education; as senior policy adviser, Canada Foundation for Innovation; and as chair of the 1995 Ontario Task Force on Funding and Delivery of Medical Care. His administrative posts included terms as president of both the University of Western Ontario and the University of Toronto.

Prof. Steve E. Hrudehy is professor of environmental health in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Alberta and a member of the Alberta Environmental Appeal Board. A specialist in public health engineering, Prof. Hrudehy chaired the 1985 inquiry into the safety and quality of Edmonton's drinking water. Recently he has been collaborating with the Australian Health and Medical Research Council in revising the framework of the Australian drinking water guidelines. The author of numerous scientific contributions to environmental quality, health risk assessment, and management, he holds an M.Sc. and Ph.D. from Imperial College, University of London, in public health engineering. His awards include the Alberta Emerald Award from the Alberta Foundation for Environmental Excellence.

Prof. William Leiss, president of the Royal Society of Canada, has a wide-ranging background in the social sciences, public policy, and environmental risk issues. He is professor in the School of Policy Studies at Queen's University and also currently holds the NSERC/SSHRC Industry Research Chair in Risk Communication and Public Policy at the University of Calgary's Faculty of Management. He has taught political science, environmental studies, and sociology at the University of Regina, York University, and the University of Toronto. He has served as vice-president, research, at Simon Fraser University, where he also served as department chair in the School of Communications. In 1994, he was awarded the Eco-Research Chair in Environmental Policy at the School of Policy Studies at Queen's University. He has written extensively. He co-authored *Mad Cows and Mother's Milk*, which contains seven case studies of failure in risk communication. For the past 15 years, Dr. Leiss has worked as a consultant, mostly with the federal government, on health and environmental risk issues.

Douglas Macdonald, Ph.D., is a lecturer in the Environmental Studies Program, Innis College, University of Toronto. His area of specialty is Canadian

environmental politics and policy. He has been active in a number of environmental non-governmental organizations and from 1982 to 1988 served as executive director of the Canadian Institute of Environmental Law and Policy. Scholarly and professional publications include *The Politics of Pollution* (1991), an examination of the environmental regulatory system, and a number of articles and applied research studies on various aspects of environmental policy. He is currently writing a book on the role of business in environmental policy.

Dr. Allison J. McGeer is a specialist in infectious diseases, public health, and internal medicine. She is a staff microbiologist and director of infection control at Mount Sinai Hospital in Toronto and is associate professor in the Departments of Pathobiology and Laboratory Medicine and Public Health Sciences at the University of Toronto. She has published extensively in the scientific literature on disease prevention and public health. Her many honours include the Louis Weinstein Award for best paper on clinical infectious diseases and the Family and Community Medicine Research Award.

Prof. Michèle Prévost is an internationally recognized expert in environmental engineering whose career spans academic research and executive assignments in the private sector. She is a professor in the Department of Civil Engineering at the Ecole Polytechnique de Montréal, where she holds the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada Industrial Chair on Drinking Water. Prof. Prévost also advises Vivendi Water, North America on its research and development program. Her past projects include directing a study on the internal corrosion of drinking water distribution systems, a collaborative effort with the Université Libre de Bruxelles, funded by the Québec and federal governments as well as the City of Laval. She has also served on numerous advisory committees, including the technical advisory committee for the Greater Vancouver Regional District drinking water program.

16.5 Key Rulings

16.5.1 Standing

In Part 2, I granted standing to parties who I felt either had a direct interest in the outcome of Part 2 (i.e., those who might be directly affected by the recommendations) or represented a distinct viewpoint that needed to be separately represented in Part 2. I wanted to hear as broad a cross-section of opinion as possible, so I erred on the side of inclusion, granting standing to all

parties that I believed would assist me in my mandate. This included parties from a broad political spectrum and from diverse backgrounds. A list of the 36 parties granted standing in Part 2 is provided as section 16.5.3. A review of the list shows that all relevant interests and areas of expertise were represented.

Standing in Part 2 included the following:

1. access to documents collected by the Commission that related to Part 2, subject to the Rules of Procedure and Practice;
2. the opportunity to make submissions on any matter relevant to the Commission's mandate in Part 2, including submitting papers to respond to the commissioned papers;
3. the opportunity to participate directly in one or more public meetings, where such participation would make a contribution to the subject matter of the meeting; and
4. the opportunity to apply for funding to participate in Part 2.

Parties with standing also received most correspondence from the Commission by direct e-mail, rather than by having to visit our Web site.

It should be noted that the public were also free to provide submissions in writing and to participate in any of the Inquiry's public processes. The principal difference between parties with standing and the public was access to some of the documents collected by the Commission and the ability to apply for funding.

16.5.2 Funding for Parties with Standing

I recommended that the Attorney General grant funding to parties with standing in Part 2 for one of two purposes: the preparation of papers presenting the party's position on issues in Part 2, and participation in the Part 2 meetings and hearings. In order to be eligible for funding in Part 2, parties had to demonstrate that their participation would be of assistance in making my recommendations and that without funding, this participation would not have been possible. Since many of the parties in Part 2 were advocacy groups whose mandates include participation in exercises like this Inquiry, I set the bar quite high in determining when participation would not have been possible without

funding. That said, many of the parties did receive funding for both of these types of participation.

To apply for funding, a party made a written request setting out the nature of the proposed submission or participation and explaining how it would help the work of the Inquiry and why the work could not be done without funding. If I considered that the proposal would be helpful and agreed that the party could not participate without assistance, I wrote to the Attorney General recommending that the party receive funding. I am pleased to say that the Attorney General accepted all of these recommendations and provided funding in the form of grants. This process was, in general, smooth and successful in ensuring the participation of the parties.

The assistance I received from the parties with standing was, almost without exception, of a very high quality and was extremely helpful to me in making my recommendations. In my view, this funding was money well spent.

16.5.3 Parties Granted Standing in Part 2

- 1 ALERT/Sierra Club Coalition
- 2 Association of Local Public Health Agencies
- 3 Association of Municipalities of Ontario
- 4 Azurix North America (Canada) Corp.
- 5 Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound Health Unit
- 6 Canadian Environmental Defence Fund and Pollution Probe Coalition
- 7 Canadian Union of Public Employees
- 8 Christian Farmers Federation of Ontario
- 9 Concerned Walkerton Citizens/Canadian Environmental Law Association
- 10 Conservation Ontario and the Saugeen Valley Conservation Authority

- 11 Dairy Farmers of Ontario
- 12 Ducks Unlimited Canada
- 13 Energy Probe Research Foundation
- 14 Government of Ontario
- 15 Grand River Conservation Authority
- 16 Indian Associations Coordinating Committee of Ontario Inc. (Chiefs of Ontario)
- 17 Dr. Murray McQuigge
- 18 Office of the Chief Coroner of the Province of Ontario
- 19 Ontario Cattle Feeders Association
- 20 Ontario Cattlemen's Association
- 21 Ontario Farm Animal Council
- 22 Ontario Farm Environmental Coalition
- 23 Ontario Federation of Agriculture
- 24 Ontario Medical Association
- 25 Ontario Métis Aboriginal Association
- 26 Ontario Municipal Water Association
- 27 Ontario Pork Producers' Board
- 28 Ontario Public Service Employees Union
- 29 Ontario Society of Professional Engineers
- 30 Ontario Water Works Association

- 31 Professional Engineers and Architects of the Ontario Public Service
- 32 Professional Engineers of Ontario
- 33 Sierra Legal Defence Fund Coalition
- 34 Uxbridge Conservation Association
- 35 Walkerton and District Chamber of Commerce
- 36 Walkerton Community Foundation

16.6 Research

16.6.1 The Commissioned Papers

Under the guidance of the Research Advisory Panel, I commissioned 25 research papers addressing what were initially 15 topics.² These papers were written by outside experts, not Commission staff, and were intended to provide a sound understanding of the basic issues involved in providing safe drinking water.

Authors were instructed to provide a descriptive overview of their topics, to describe the state of the art, and to compare approaches in various jurisdictions. They were specifically instructed not to reach normative conclusions. It was my intention to create a baseline level of understanding within the Commission and among the parties with standing and the public, on which debate about the future of drinking water safety in Ontario could take place.

As a quality control measure, the commissioned papers (also known as “issue papers”) were peer reviewed, and I owe a debt of thanks to the reviewers, many of whom undertook highly detailed reviews of lengthy and dense materials. I also wish to thank the capable team of editors who edited the papers. These papers now stand as a substantial and up-to-date library of information about the state of the art of protecting drinking water safety.

² The Commission’s issue papers are available on the Walkerton Inquiry CD-ROM or on the Inquiry’s Web site at <www.walkertoninquiry.com>.

16.6.2 Other Staff Research

In addition to the research done by commissioned paper authors, there was a need for substantial research capacity within the Commission itself. This need was identified early and grew as the Inquiry proceeded, particularly through the drafting phase as I identified areas where additional information was needed. There is a wealth of academic research and government resources concerning all facets of drinking water management. Staff researchers have now assembled an extensive library of information about drinking water source protection, treatment, distribution, monitoring, pathogens, and a variety of other related topics.

16.6.3 The Expert Tour

In addition to the issue papers and submissions from parties with standing, I felt it was important to obtain expert opinions from drinking water veterans who had no stake in the Ontario system. Dr. Edwin E. Geldreich and Dr. J. Edward Singley are two of the leading American experts in water treatment systems.

Dr. J. Edward Singley

Dr. J. Edward Singley has had 42 years' experience in the drinking water industry as a process and operations consultant. He served as president of AWWA in 1991–92 and as the director of the operator-training centre in Florida for water and wastewater operators. He has consulted on water treatment problems for many utilities and has published over 100 peer-reviewed technical papers, hundreds of other papers, and chapters in several books.

Dr. Edwin E. Geldreich

Dr. Geldreich's 46 years of experience as a research microbiologist includes the pioneering development of the membrane filter technique for use in sanitary microbiology, the origination of the fecal coliform concept, and the writing of over 125 publications in peer-reviewed publications as well as three books. He has carried out numerous assignments, including reviews of standards

development and laboratory certification, and he has been involved in a number of outbreak investigations around the world.

Dr. Geldreich and Dr. Singley, accompanied by one member of the Commission staff, toured 27 water facilities around Ontario. They met plant managers and workers and discussed issues relating to the safety of drinking water on an informal, collegial basis. This process was very useful in developing a picture of the current state of water treatment at the plant level in Ontario. The report of what became known as the “Two Eds Tour” is included in the commissioned papers.

16.7 Submissions from the Parties with Standing

The parties in Part 2 were invited to make submissions about what should be done to protect the safety of drinking water in Ontario. Many of the parties made substantial written submissions in this regard. These submissions generally took two forms. One type of submission was much like an issue paper, providing a substantial amount of background information about topics the parties considered relevant; the difference, however, was that these submissions reached conclusions about what should be done. The second type of submission was provided prior to the public hearings. In these submissions, the parties were encouraged to provide suggestions regarding specific recommendations that they felt I should make regarding the topic of the particular public hearing.

The parties helped to augment the background information provided in the issue papers. But more importantly, they brought their informed and considered opinions about what should be done. Their submissions helped to develop many of the recommendations I have presented in this report.

16.8 Public Submissions

Members of the public also provided numerous submissions. Many of these contributions reflected much careful consideration and hard work, and they were a useful addition to the work of the Inquiry.

Some of the public submissions came from groups who could or arguably should have had standing in Part 2, but who did not apply. These groups were generally treated as parties, although they were not eligible for funding.

Taken together, I think that the commissioned papers, the submissions from parties with standing, the submissions from the public, and the discussions held have created a complete and in-depth picture of the water systems of Ontario and have outlined the full range of alternatives regarding what should be done to ensure drinking water safety.

16.9 Consultations

I considered it important to provide opportunities for active debate among those concerned with the various issues. I also wanted to ensure that I had the opportunity to engage directly with the parties in Part 2 and the public to discuss their views, research, and recommendations. I therefore established three types of meetings in Part 2: town hall meetings, expert meetings, and public hearings. In all cases, a complete schedule of the meetings was available on the Inquiry's Web site. All meetings were open to the public, and although participation from the general public was encouraged to occur through the town hall meetings and written submissions, anyone who wished to participate in any of the expert meetings or public hearings was permitted to do so.

16.9.1 Town Hall Meetings

The town hall meetings were a series of public meetings held in locations across Ontario. They were advertised in local media several weeks in advance, and submissions from the public were solicited. People who wished to make a presentation were asked to provide a written submission describing what they wanted to discuss, although some time was allocated for last-minute presenters.

I was impressed by the level of commitment demonstrated by the presenters, including municipal officials, technicians, scientists, academics, advocacy groups, farmers, and the public at large. These people put a great deal of work into their presentations, and I thank them for their efforts. The presentations were most useful, and helped me to understand the issues that were being faced by people in cities, towns, and rural areas around Ontario.

In each city or town that we visited, Commission staff and I met local water managers and toured the water facilities. This exercise helped to develop a better understanding of water treatment and distribution systems and the challenges faced by various types of systems.

16.9.2 Expert Meetings

The expert meetings were a series of meetings held in Toronto that were chaired by Commission staff or members of the Research Advisory Panel. These meetings provided a forum for discussion among Commission staff, issue paper authors, parties with standing in Part 2, invited experts, and members of the public. The purpose of the meetings was to ensure a complete and open discussion of the issues and to canvass the diversity of opinion among the people attending.

The discussions at the expert meetings were not transcribed, but a team of graduate students was engaged to take comprehensive notes. The meetings were also recorded. At the end of each meeting, the note-takers prepared a summary of the meeting. These summaries were vetted by the participants in the meeting and Commission staff. They were then published on the Inquiry's Web site.

16.9.3 Public Hearings

The public hearings provided the opportunity for parties with standing and some other groups and members of the public to present their suggestions for recommendations in Part 2 directly to me.

These meetings were not as formal as the Part 1 hearings in Walkerton, but I considered it necessary to engage with the presenters one group at a time, rather than permitting the relatively open discussions that characterized the expert meetings. In order to ensure that presenters would have the opportunity needed to rebut points made by others, I made two stipulations. The first was that all those who wished to present at the public hearings should provide a written outline of what they wished to discuss prior to the hearing, for posting on the Web site. Second, I allowed a round of rebuttal after all of the presenters had been given their initial time for presentation.

Prior to each public hearing, a list of what I considered to be essential questions was circulated to the parties with standing and posted on the Web site. The list of questions was helpful in provoking written responses from many of the presenters and in focusing the discussions at the hearings.

16.10 Expert Advice

Throughout the process of Part 2, I often required expert advice on specific issues. In general I tried to rely on the Research Advisory Panel members for this advice, but from time to time it was necessary to seek outside advice from consultants in the relevant fields.

16.11 Budget

In August 2000, approximately six weeks after the beginning of this Inquiry, I provided a budget estimate to the Government of Ontario. The total amount of that estimate was \$6,982,200, which included \$3,928,100 for the 2000/2001 fiscal year, and \$3,054,100 for 2001/2002. The figure for 2001/2002 was little more than a guess at that time, because the scope of the mandate and the processes that would be developed to achieve it were only just being developed.

In May 2001, a second budget estimate was provided to the government based on a much-improved understanding of the amount of work involved. Our expenditures in the 2000/2001 fiscal year had been \$3,931,300, just \$3,200 more than projected in August 2000. The final budget for 2001/2002 was \$5,026,900. In October 2001, I also requested a contingency amount of \$300,000–\$500,000 for 2002/2003, in case the Commission continued past the end of the 2001/2002 fiscal year. Thus, the final budget estimate provided to the government in October 2001 was for a total of approximately \$9,458,200.

The final figure for the expenditure of this Inquiry is not yet available. However, I expect that the total amount spent by the Inquiry will be less than the final budget. It is difficult to allocate costs between Part 1 and Part 2 with complete precision, but a rough estimate is that costs were equally divided between the two parts.

16.12 Appreciation

A great number of people have provided assistance to me during Part 2 of the Inquiry. I am indebted to all of them for their conscientious and diligent work. I would like to formally thank those who were most deeply involved in the Part 2 process.

First, I would like to thank Harry Swain, who is the Chair of the Research Advisory Panel, and who, along with James Van Loon, his Executive Assistant, did an excellent job of organizing and managing the work of Part 2.

I would also like to thank the Research Advisory Panel: Professor George Connell, Professor Steve Hrudey, Professor William Leiss, Dr. Douglas Macdonald, Dr. Allison McGeer, and Professor Michèle Prévost. As I mentioned above, their assistance was invaluable throughout both parts of the Inquiry.

I was greatly helped by two senior Commission Counsel, David Stockwood and Ronald Foerster, and by my Executive Assistant, Gus Van Harten.

In addition, I am indebted to the very dedicated staff who helped with the organization, research, and drafting of the report. Here I speak of Ronda Bessner, Bay Ryley, Corinne Wallace, Robert Rishikof, Nimali Gamage, Nirupama Kumar, and Arlette Al-Shaikh.

Peter Rehak, the media consultant, provided excellent advice throughout the Inquiry and, along with Nicole Caron and Debora Harper, was critical to ensuring the success of the town hall meetings. Djordje Sredojevic and Ljiljana Vuletic, our Web masters, were extremely responsive and frequently worked under tight deadlines to ensure that materials were posted in a timely fashion.

Commission Counsel for Part 1, Paul Cavalluzzo, Brian Gover, and Freya Kristjansen were also very generous with their time and advice in assisting during the Part 2 process.

I would also like to express my appreciation to those involved with the administration of the Inquiry: David Henderson, the Chief Administrator, and Kathleen Genore, the Financial Manager. As administrative assistants, Pat Hall and Abbie Adelman contributed greatly to the smooth running of the office and the production of the report.

As she did in Part 1, Joyce Ihamaki performed her duties as the Registrar with care and efficiency.

A huge amount of research was completed by our issue paper authors, who developed excellent papers under tight deadlines and were key participants in the expert meetings. I would like to single out the following authors who not only contributed excellent papers but also made themselves available time and

time again to provide the Commission with additional advice and assistance: David Cameron, Nicholas d’Ombrain, Jim Merritt, and Jim Joe and his colleagues from Strategic Alternatives.

I am greatly appreciative of Dr. Edwin E. Geldreich and Dr. J. Edward Singley, leading American experts in water treatment systems. They toured 27 water facilities in Ontario and reported their findings. I thank Wayne Scott, formerly of the MOE, for coordinating the tour.

Carolyn Johns, another one of the issue paper authors, also led the team of graduate students who took excellent notes at the expert meetings. The students were Sarah Hartley, Rachel Melzer, Judith Muncaster, and Sarah Wolfe.

I would like to thank the parties with standing in Part 2. Without their participation, this Inquiry could not have reached its objective. Many of the parties dedicated tremendous resources of their own to assisting the Inquiry and produced work of a depth, quality, and relevance greater than I could have hoped for. For that I am deeply thankful.

Although I do not wish to single out particular parties here, there was one special subclass of the parties who deserve mention. The provincial government staff who attended and participated in our expert meetings and public hearings have my sincere thanks.

In the Part 1 report, I expressed my appreciation to the Chief Coroner for his assistance. Several of the recommendations in this report result from recommendations made by the Chief Coroner. I reiterate my thanks for the support that he has provided to the Inquiry.

Several of the experts who were helpful in Part 1 also aided the Part 2 process. These included Prof. Michael Goss of the University of Guelph, and Professors Peter Huck and Robert Gillham of the University of Waterloo.

I would like to thank all of the people who made presentations at the town hall meetings. Evident in most of those presentations was a tremendous amount of effort, for which I am very thankful. The perspectives presented to me at town hall meetings were very helpful in developing my understanding of the problems facing drinking water systems in Ontario.

I also thank all of the municipal staff and other people who helped to arrange the tours we took in each city or town we visited.

Finally, I would like to thank the editors, proofreaders, and layout designers of the commissioned papers and the report. The Part 2 report was prepared by John Eerkes-Medrano, Brian Grebow, Riça Night, Pamela Erlichman, and Maraya Raduha. Riça Night and Brian Grebow also prepared the index. The issue papers were prepared by a team of editors, proofreaders, and designers led by Sheila Protti. Her team consisted of Elizabeth d'Anjou, Frances Emery, Brian Grebow, Marie-Lynn Hammond, Anne Holloway, Bernard Kelly, Madeline Koch, Doug Linzey, Dennis A. Mills, Georgina Montgomery, Robyn Packard, Iris Hossé Phillips, Rosemary Tanner, and Kathy Vanderlinden. All of these people worked on difficult material under tight time constraints, and I thank them.

