

Final Consolidated City Council Meeting

Date: Monday, June 12, 2023

Time: 4:00 o'clock p.m.

Location: Council Chambers, 1st Floor, Windsor City Hall

All members will have the option of participating in person in Council Chambers or electronically and will be counted towards quorum in accordance with Procedure By-law 98-2011 as amended, which allows for electronic meetings. The minutes will reflect this accordingly. Any delegations have the option to participate in person or electronically.

MEMBERS:

Mayor Drew Dilkens

Ward 1 – Councillor Fred Francis

Ward 2 – Councillor Fabio Costante

Ward 3 – Councillor Renaldo Agostino

Ward 4 – Councillor Mark McKenzie

Ward 5 – Councillor Ed Sleiman

Ward 6 – Councillor Jo-Anne Gignac

Ward 7 – Councillor Angelo Marignani

Ward 8 – Councillor Gary Kaschak

Ward 9 – Councillor Kieran McKenzie

Ward 10 - Councillor Jim Morrison

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Item #	Item Description
---------------	-------------------------

1.	ORDER OF BUSINESS
----	--------------------------

2.	CALL TO ORDER - Playing of the National Anthem
----	---

READING OF LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We [I] would like to begin by acknowledging that the land on which we gather is the traditional territory of the Three Fires Confederacy of First Nations, which includes the Ojibwa, the Odawa, and the Potawatomi. The City of Windsor honours all First Nations, Inuit and Métis peoples and their valuable past and present contributions to this land.

3.	DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF
----	--

4.	ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES
----	--------------------------------

4.1	Adoption of the Windsor City Council meeting minutes held May 29, 2023 (SCM 168/2023) (previously distributed)
-----	--

5.	NOTICE OF PROCLAMATIONS
----	--------------------------------

Proclamations

“World Sickle Cell Day 2023” – June 19, 2023

“World Refugee Day” – June 20, 2023

Flag Raising Ceremony

“Muslims’ EID” – July 7, 2023

Illumination

“National Blood Donor Week” – June 12, 2023 – June 16, 2023

“World Sickle Cell Day” – June 19, 2023

“Muslims’ EID” – July 7, 2023

“World Refugee Day” – June 20, 2023

6. **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

7. **COMMUNICATIONS INFORMATION PACKAGE** (This includes both Correspondence and Communication Reports)

7.1 Correspondence 7.1.1 through 7.1.8 **(CMC 8/2023)** *(previously distributed)*

8. **CONSENT AGENDA**

8.3. Response to CR133/2023 - Private Culvert Rehabilitation Program - City Wide **(C 96/2023)**

8.4. 2024 Proposed Budget Process & Timeline - City Wide **(C 92/2023)**

8.6. Amendment to CR415/2022 for Closure of the north/south alley between Guy Street and the east/west alley between Bernard Road and Francois Road, Ward 5, SAA-5809 **(C 90/2023)**

CONSENT COMMITTEE REPORTS

8.8. Essex-Windsor Solid Waste Authority (EWSWA) Minutes of the Regular Board Meeting held March 7, 2023 **(SCM 156/2023) & (SCM 149/2023)**

8.9. Policy and Funding Program Review for Updating Narrow Streets - City Wide **(SCM 157/2023) & (C 66/2023)**

8.10. Traffic Noise along the E.C. Row Corridor Close to Sensitive Land Uses without Sound Mitigation Measures - City Wide - CQ17-2022 **(SCM 158/2023) & (C 67/2023)**

9. **REQUEST FOR DEFERRALS, REFERRALS AND/OR WITHDRAWALS**

8.11. Dandurand Avenue Pedestrian Generator Sidewalk (from Northwood Street to existing sidewalk (approximately 210m north)) - Ward 10 **(SCM 159/2023) & (S 58/2023)**

Clerk's Note: Councillor Morrison requests a deferral of this matter to allow for further consultation between Administration and the residents to occur.

11.1. Update Regarding Council Decision B14/2019 and Proposed Shoreline Structures Local Improvement Policy Amendment - City-Wide **(C 77/2023)**

Clerk's Note: Theresa Wunder, area resident submitting the *attached* request for deferral to allow for more information and consultation with the residents.

10. **PRESENTATIONS AND DELEGATIONS**

DELEGATIONS (5-minute maximum)

- 8.7. Report No. 156 of the Windsor Licensing Commission - Taxicab meter rate and tariffs
(SCM 155/2023) & (SCM 107/2023)
a) Jay Abdoulrahman, Checker Cab Co., available for questions (in person)
b) Walt Bezzina, Vets Cab, available for questions (in person)
- 8.2. Stormwater Financing Project Update, City Wide **(C 95/2023)**
a) Elizabeth Treadway, WSP – Sr. Vice President, Samantha Stokke, WSP – Senior Environmental Planner, Peter Simcisko, Watson & Associates Economists – Managing Partner and David Bulova with WSP, available for questions (via Zoom)
- 8.5. IESO E-LT1 and LT1 RFP Municipal Support Resolutions Update - City Wide
(C 89/2023)
a) Jonathan Cheszes, President, Compass Renewable Energy Consulting Inc., available for questions (via Zoom)
- 8.1. Advisory Committee Performance Annual Report as of December 31, 2022 - City Wide
(C 58/2023)
a) Frank Butler, President, Citizens Environmental Alliance (in person)
b) Larry Duffield, Windsor-Essex Chapter - Canadian Association of Retired Persons (CARP) (in person)
Clerk's Note: Larry Duffield, Windsor-Essex Chapter – Canadian Association of Retired Persons (CARP) submits the **attached** written submission received June 9, 2023
- 11.1. Update Regarding Council Decision B14/2019 and Proposed Shoreline Structures Local Improvement Policy Amendment - City-Wide **(C 77/2023)**
Clerk's Note: See also deferral request.
a) Carroll Flewelling & Paul Denomme, area residents, available for questions (via Zoom)
b) Nicolette Carlan, area resident (in person)
c) Anne Mullen, area resident (in person)
d) Craig Kondruk, area resident (in person)
e) Carl Montcalm, area resident (in person)
f) Theresa Wunder, area resident in person
LATE:
g) John Polakas, area resident, (in person)
h) Jane Boyd, area resident (in person)
i) Eric Lamar, area resident (in person)
j) Ken Schneider, area resident (in person)

11. **REGULAR BUSINESS ITEMS** (Non-Consent Items)
- 11.2. Howard Avenue/South Cameron Intersection Project, Pre-Commitments, Agreements and Payments Approval - Ward 9 **(C 93/2023)**

12. **CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE REPORTS**
- 12.1. (i) Report of the Special In-Camera meeting or other Committee as may be held prior to Council (if scheduled)
- 12.2. Minutes of the Committee of Management for Huron Lodge of its meeting held March 15, 2023 **(SCM 105/2023)**
- 12.3. Minutes of the meetings of the Executive Committee and Board of Directors, Willistead Manor Inc., held March 9, 2023 **(SCM 133/2023)**
- 12.4. Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors, Willistead Manor Inc. held April 13, 2023 **(SCM 150/2023)**
- 12.5. Report No. 117 of the Willistead Manor Inc. Board of Directors of its meeting held May 11, 2023 **(SCM 151/2023)**
- 12.6. Report of the Striking Committee of its meeting held May 29, 2023 **(SCM 165/2023)**
(previously distributed)

13. **BY-LAWS** (First and Second Reading) *(previously distributed)*
- 13.1. **By-law 68-2023** A BY-LAW TO ASSUME GUNDY PARK CRESCENT AND WHITESIDE DRIVE FROM GUNDY PARK CRESCENT SOUTH TO LOT 6 ON 12M-211, BEING STREETS SHOWN ON PLAN OF SUBDIVISION 12M-211 KNOWN AS GUNDY PARK CRESCENT AND WHITESIDE DRIVE, IN THE CITY OF WINDSOR, authorized by M 98-2012 dated Feb 21, 2012
- 13.2. **By-law 69-2023** A BY-LAW TO AMEND BY-LAW NUMBER 137-2007 BEING A BY-LAW RESPECTING THE LICENSING AND REGULATING OF PUBLIC VEHICLES, See Item 8.7
- 13.3. **By-law 70-2023** A BY-LAW TO FURTHER AMEND BY-LAW NUMBER 8600 CITED AS THE "CITY OF WINDSOR ZONING BY-LAW", authorized by CR177/2023 dated April 24, 2023
- 13.4. **By-law 71-2023** A BY-LAW TO FURTHER AMEND BY-LAW NUMBER 8600 CITED AS THE "CITY OF WINDSOR ZONING BY-LAW", authorized by CR178/2023 dated April 24, 2023

- 13.5. **By-law 72-2023** A BY-LAW TO ADOPT AMENDMENT NO. 157 TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF WINDSOR, authorized by CR179/2023 dated April 24, 2023
- 13.6. **By-law 73-2023** A BY-LAW TO FURTHER AMEND BY-LAW NUMBER 8600 CITED AS THE "CITY OF WINDSOR ZONING BY-LAW" authorized by CR179/2023 dated April 24, 2023
- 13.7. **By-law 74-2023** A BY-LAW TO AMEND BY-LAW 2466, BEING A BY-LAW TO STOP UP THE ALLEY LYING SOUTH OF TECUMSEH ROAD BETWEEN NORMAN ROAD AND PRINCESS AVENUE SOUTHERLY TO THE NORTHERLY LIMITS OF GRAND BOULEVARD, IN THE TOWNSHIP OF SANDWICH EAST, ACCORDING TO REGISTERED PLAN NUMBER 1107, authorized by CAO 138/2023, dated May 24, 2023
- 13.8. **By-law 75-2023** A BY-LAW TO ESTABLISH LANDS AS A PUBLIC HIGHWAY KNOWN AS PROVINCIAL ROAD IN THE CITY OF WINDSOR, authorized by CR 76/2011, dated February 28, 2011
- 13.9. **By-law 76-2023** A BY-LAW TO CONFIRM PROCEEDINGS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF WINDSOR AT ITS MEETING HELD ON THE 12th DAY OF JUNE, 2023

14. **MOVE BACK INTO FORMAL SESSION**

15. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

16. **THIRD AND FINAL READING OF THE BY-LAWS**
By-laws 68-2023 through 76-2023 (inclusive)

17. **PETITIONS**

18. **QUESTION PERIOD**
 - 18.1 Summary of Outstanding Council Questions as of June 7, 2023 (**SCM 163/2023**)
(previously distributed)
 - 18.2 Summary of Outstanding Council Directives as of June 7, 2023 (**SCM 164/2023**)
(previously distributed)

19. **STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS**

20. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

Environment, Transportation & Public Safety Standing Committee
Wednesday, June 28, 2023
4:00 p.m., Council Chambers

Development & Heritage Standing Committee
Tuesday, July 4, 2023
4:30 p.m., Council Chambers

Community Services Standing Committee
Wednesday, July 5, 2023
9:00 a.m., Council Chambers

21. **ADJOURNMENT**

June 11, 2023

Mr. S. Vlachodimos, City Clerk & Licence Commissioner
Mr. I. Quakenbush, Engineer
Councillor F. Francis, Ward 1
Councillor F. Constante, Ward 2
Councillor R. Agostino, Ward 3
Councillor M. McKenzie, Ward 4
Councillor E. Sleiman, Ward 5
Councillor J. Gignac, Ward 6
Councillor A. Marignani, Ward 7
Councillor G. Kaschak, Ward 8
Councillor K. McKenzie, Ward 9
Councillor J. Morrison, Ward 10
City of Windsor Legal Department

svlachodimos@citywindsor.ca
iquakenbush@citywindsor.ca
ffrancis@citywindsor.ca
fconstante@citywindsor.ca
ragostino@citywindsor.ca
mmckenzie@citywindsor.ca
esleiman@citywindsor.ca
joagignac@citywindsor.ca
amarignani@citywindsor.ca
gkaschak@citywindsor.ca
kmckenzie@citywindsor.ca
jmorrison@citywindsor.ca
Fax: (519) 255-6933

RE: June 12/23 Council Meeting Proposed Shoreline Structures Local Improvement Policy Amendment

Dear City of Windsor Representatives:

On Thurs. June 8, 2023 I received the City's mailed Notice of Council Meeting for Mon. June 12, 2023 with a Fri. June 9, 2023 noon deadline. The City envelope was post-marked Fri. June 2, 2023 and included the Jan. 16, 2020 Landmark "Final" Report that mentioned an unproduced Watech report with video-graphic material.

Respectfully, not enough time or notice was given to consider, absorb or process such important matters or newly produced material, let alone the selection of "one person" to speak for 5 minutes "on behalf" of an unidentified group of 69 property owners per the City's instructions. There was *one* March 31, 2023 Public Info Meeting at the Sportsmen Club with limited information. And, the City is proposing the process of divesting City ownership of its shoreline section to the property owners. The letter length should not dissuade your consideration and 5 minutes is not enough time to identify the various issues.

Respectfully, Landmark's proposals should be deferred. This is an expensive project (\$3.5 to 4.5 million and financial contribution by owners) with many implications that impact the owners and other City residents, as submitted herein. There is outstanding information that we (City, residents including owners) require to make a reasonable, cost-efficient decision. We should not "learn as we go" towards an expensive proposal until we have this.

The objective is to work with the City, not against it, with *all* information to consider the efficacy of Landmark's "functional design" options especially in light of **other options admissions** by the City and Landmark and the City's Item No. 11.1 statement that "the **affected residents ...have 30 days to submit**

a sufficiently signed petition against the works.” (p3) Respectfully, there are more “affected residents” beyond the shoreline owners.

IMPACT to OTHERS: It is *not* just the owners that are impacted. The City’s Item No. 11.1 document stated *“Since these structures solely benefit the adjacent properties, the full cost for the work would be assessed to the abutting property owners...”* (p3) and *“If not approved, the City would have to fund the repairs through the general tax levy for works that solely benefit private individuals.”* (p5) That is an over-simplification because as submitted herein:

- the proposals do not benefit the owners for several reasons *and*
- conversely there are safety issues and risks with expensive consequences relative to the proposed Rip-Rap sloped stone ramp adjacent to the shoreline wall per Landmark’s Option 1/Fig.5 and Option 2/Fig 6, that impact others residents beyond the owners:

1. **Tourism/Recreation:** The City promotes and advertises its water to attract visitors, tourists and residents. The proposed “Rip Rap” sloped stone ramp will be a safety issue and hazard for *others* who also use and enjoy the water. The frequent shoreline users are paddle-boarders; canoers; swimmers as well as some slower jet-skiers, fishing-persons and small craft boaters. Their access/egress will be impeded during ordinary use and emergencies by the Rip Rap application. Eventually, the Rip-Rap stones will also shift under water or their presence will fluctuate per known water level changes with potential devastating consequences. Common sense dictates that the City should strongly consider its potential liability risks and exposure for injuries and property damage, having recommended Landmark’s proposal while promoting water recreational use and its knowledge of the presence of shoreline users.
2. **Emergency Personnel:** It will be difficult and potentially dangerous for rescue operations involving police, firefighters, ambulance, coast guard, etc. to access/egress situations close to the shore in a timely, effective manner, without injury risks to them or the person/s involved in the situation.
3. **Workers/Tradespeople:** There will be safety/injury issues for workers/tradespeople needed for in evitable repairs/renos (i.e. existing or future watercraft lifts or deck issues). Inevitable repairs will be difficult and potentially dangerous because access/egress will be impeded. Due to equipment size and limited space at the sides of homes, water access for some projects is the only method.
4. **Environmental Impact - Stability & Lifespan of Rip Rap – Wildlife:** The following known conditions *visa vis* the Rip Rap presence, stability and lifespan, have not been considered or disclosed:
 - a. ice build-up (that will be higher along the shoreline due to the stone ramp)
 - b. cyclical fluctuating water levels – the known highs and lows
 - c. open lake with high waves during winter/storms

There is no guarantee that the preceding conditions will not eventually shift, collapse or scatter the underwater Rip Rap with detrimental effects i.e. additional or reduced or absent pressure ratio on the concrete wall/timber supports. Even with Gambion Steel containment of the stone, the underwater environment will impact its stability and longevity and create problems in the near future. Gambion Steel also has limited longevity. Online research refers to Rip Rap proper grade, size, com

paction; the attendant fabric should be free of seams and reference to avoiding new “critters” (which may impact existing waterlife creatures) – not mentioned by the Landmark report.

LANDMARK & WATECH’S OBSERVATIONS:

5. **Unproduced Watech report/photographic inventory:** Landmark’s report indicated they retained Watech (“specialized marine engineering and inspection company”p3) who mobilized a workboat for underwater inspections using a 3 person inspection crew including 2 commercial divers on 3 occasions in Oct. and Nov. 2019. Landmark also referred to **Watech’s report** (Appendix A) and **Watech’s photographic inventory** of the shoreline condition at **each** property within the study area (Appendix B). They were not included with the City’s June 2, 2023 mailed material and do not appear to be online. The owners need those documents so they can visualize any defects to determine what is at stake and what is under their property to consider Landmark’s repair proposals and, it promotes transparency.
6. **Landmark Comments re Fair to Good, Stable, Sound, Intact of Concrete Wall & Timber Supports:** Landmark described rather positive inspection details on the settlement, alignment, concrete wall and timber support piles: “no evidence...generally in fair to good physical condition ... generally stable...intact”. However, there is no info on the effect of the Rip-Rap against the concrete wall’s connection with the timber supports. There is no info about the eventual pressure differences and/or voids on the submerged wall/timber supports when the Rip-Rap moves due to storms and other natural underwater events. Landmark describes the status as:
 - a. ***“There is no evidence of any significant settlement or misalignment (vertical or horizontal) anywhere along the length of the shoreline within the study area.”***, p3
 - a. ***“Over the course of Watech’s underwater inspection, it was noted that the concrete wall itself is generally in fair to good physical condition, with some spalling and cracking noted at isolated locations – generally at or near the waterline. This is consistent with the observations made in the filed by Landmark”*** (p3)
 - b. ***“Watech also noted that the timber support piles appear to be in fair to good conditions at the locations where they were visible.”*** (p3)
 - c. ***“As noted above and as indicated in the Watech report (see Appendix A) the existing concrete shorewall within the study area appears to be generally stable and in fair condition. Despite the structure’s age and its exposure to harsh shoreline conditions, most of the concrete below the observed water level on Lake St. Clair appears to be generally sound and the supporting timber piles (where they are exposed) appear to be generally intact. Furthermore there is no evidence of any significant settlement or misalignment (vertical or horizontal anywhere along the length of the shorewall within the study area.”*** (p4,5)
7. **Landmark re Status of Deck Slabs – 40 of 69 Properties – Underlying Backfill – Discrepancies on Who Needs What:** Landmark’s following comments indicate discrepancies about who needs what, yet Landmark wants all owners to pay for the repairs across the board including backfill, without backfill status testing of each property. Landmark stated **some** of the deck slabs are deteriorated; **some** are supported on the backfill materials; **most** of the newer ones sit on top of the concrete

shore-wall; **some** of the deteriorating older deck slabs is related to age, weathering and erosion of the underlying backfill and **40 of 69 properties** have deck slabs that warrant significant repair:

- a. **“Generally it appears that the original deck slabs were supported directly on the backfill materials while most of the newer-looking slabs rest directly on top of the concrete shorewall.”** (p4)
- b. **“The condition of the existing deck slab also varies widely from property to property along the length of the subject shoreline, with several properties having what appears to be fairly new and intact slabs...while others consist of severely broken slabs and/or rubble...”** (p4)
- c. **“While some of the deterioration of the older deck slabs can be attributed to age and weathering, it appears that most of the damage exhibited in the shoreline deck slabs results from undermining and erosion of the underlying backfill.”** (p4)
- d. **“Based on our inspection notes... we estimate that approximately 40 of the 69 properties within the study area exhibit cracking and/or settlement in the deck slab to the extent that would warrant significant repair or replacement in the short to medium term.”** (p4)
- e. **“Based on the field observations documented by Landmark and Watech, it appears that the primary cause for the structural damage and instability along the shoreline within the study area is the undermining of the concrete shorewall¹ and the resulting loss of retained backfill.² This ongoing erosion has led to the formation of significant voids below the shoreline deck slabs at several properties and has resulted in the settlement and/or failure of many of the deck slabs.”** (p5)

Notably: Within the last few years the City offered financial options to owners to repair their decks. And, ERCA and the City directed some owners to repair the decks at their own cost under Permit. Currently, Landmark and the City state that all owners pay for Landmark’s proposed repairs across the board despite discrepancies about who needs what and what was assessed. This requires more information.

8. **Contradiction:** As stated, Landmark confirmed that the concrete wall is generally stable and in fair condition, however, the City stated the wall was undermined along a significant portion. This contradiction exemplifies the need for the full Watech report and their videographics so owners have all the info on which to base important decisions and again, promotes transparency.
 - a. The Landmark report specified **“As noted above and as indicated in the Watech report (see Appendix A), the existing concrete shorewall within the study area appears to be generally stable and in fair condition.”** ...**“with some spalling and cracking noted at isolated locations – generally at or near the waterline.”** (p3,4) However....
 - b. The City’s Item 11.1 document specified **“...the wall has been undermined along a significant portion of the length allowing the retained fill materials to be eroded and undermine the concrete splash decks.”** (p3)

¹ The Landmark report indicated that the concrete wall was “generally stable and in fair condition...some spalling and cracking noted at isolated locations...at or near the waterline (p3,4)

² The landmark report indicated that “some” of the older slab decks deteriorated due to age, weathering and undermining and erosion of the underlying backfill (p4)

IMPACT to OWNERS re Storm Sewer Laterals – Flooding Risks, etc.

9. The City's Item 11.1 stated *"The shorewall does not protect against flooding"* (p4). However Land marks' proposed repairs and their consequences **must not increase or contribute to flooding**. Apart from the preceding issues for non owners, the following are owner concerns also with liability concerns that the City should consider.
10. Landmark's Option 2/Fig. 6 involves drilling holes into the existing concrete slab deck through which the "unshrinkable fill" will fill the underlying space (without mentioning the drill hole size or repair material to plug the hole or post repair appearance). However, on a practical level:
- a. **Storm Sewer Laterals & Flooding:** The City has extensive documentation about the importance of storm sewer laterals visa vis flooding prevention/reduction. Windsor has a history of home flooding due to known heavy rainstorms, etc.³ Insurers provide either no or minimal flood coverage with restrictions for shoreline (and other) homes due to this history. The drilling/filling process could damage the existing imbedded storm sewer laterals (located from the home extending to and within the concrete deck that transfers the flow of storm discharge to prevent home flooding). The pre-drilling precaution of cameras to identify their location is **not** a guarantee because **mishaps occur** with immediate or delayed consequences. The storm sewer laterals could be accidentally damaged, dislodged or cracked by the drill equipment and/or by the applications and/or pressure of unshrinkable fill or granular fill. Any storm sewer lateral damage caused by these processes will create portal cracks for the "fill", its residue or roots. Initially there may be leaking, but over time the discharge transfer within the damaged storm sewer laterals will reduce, become plugged and **cause water back up and flooding into the homes**.
 - b. **Existing Electrical:** The drilling/filling process could damage existing electrical mechanisms despite pre-drilling efforts to locate. Damage could create "arcing" and fire potential.
 - c. **Damage to Concrete Deck:** Drilling holes into the newer concrete deck will create drill "fissures" that "grow" into eventual cracks and eventual shift damage, due to the constant presence of water (from waves, storms, snow) and the known freeze/thaw seasonal processes. Based on Landmark's report, about 29 intact decks will be subjected to this consequence.
 - d. **Damage to Trees/Landscaping/Sprinkler Systems:** This has **not** been identified by Landmark.
11. **Option 1/Fig. 5** shows a *new* reinforced concrete deck slab, a *new* imbedded concrete grade beam and granular fill. It was **not** explained why Option 1 has granular fill vs Option 2 unshrinkable fill, **nor** how or by what access method the granular fill will be applied. It was **not** explained why Option 1 gets an imbedded concrete grade beam and Option 2 does **not**.
12. **Option 1/Fig 5 and Option 2/Fig 6 Deck Slab Comment Differences:**
*"Option 1 **should be** implemented wherever the existing deck slab **is** deteriorated."*
*"Option 2 **may be** implemented wherever the existing deck slab **appears to be** deteriorated."*

³ 11520 Riverside has not had any flooding due to precautions i.e. 2 storm sewer laterals.

This is confusing because Landmark confirmed that about 40 of 69 deck slabs were deteriorated, hence 29 are not, implying that 29 owners do not need either Option and/or the 29 owners do not have info about their backfill status.

13. **Option 1/Fig 5 & Option 2/Fig 6 - "Rip-Rap" Ramp & Wave Effect & Flooding:** The Rip Rap stone within the water will be ramped or sloped adjacent to the shoreline break-wall. That stone ramp will affect the velocity and height of the known high, strong northern surface waves during frequent storms and winter. Those surface waves will forcefully impact the stone Rip-Rap ramp, elevate and then "crash splash" onto the property, **eventually eroding and/or flooding the property, then homes**. There is a science about surface waves impacting objects. Stating that Rip Rap stone has been used on *other* waterfront shoreline property, without supporting evidence or specifics, is **not** fair or proper information to base important decisions. Notably:
- Peche Island's stone application is *away* from its shoreline; there are no residents on that island and recreationists have many sections and entry points of safe access/egress.
 - Erieau Road outside of Erieau has a section with adjacent rocks, yet the surface wave height increases when it hits the rocks during storms/winter, flooding the road and properties.
- Landmark did not provide video presentation, photos or expert opinion to demonstrate and assure owners that the Rip Rap ramp/slope will "break" or "dissipate" those high, strong Northern waves before it hits the owners' property.
14. The environmental effects, success and effectiveness of Rip-Rap have not been disclosed, nor whether the recommendations involve any damage to the existing property landscape, trees, etc.
15. The Rip Rap presence impacts the ability of owners re: recreational family fishing from their docks; access/egress to paddle-board, swim, boating, etc.

OTHER OPTIONS & FUNCTIONAL DESIGN: The City's Item No. 11.1 document confirmed "*The Landmark report presented the most cost effective shorewall functional design and recognizes that **there are other design options that could be explored.***" (p5) Those **other design options** should be identified and explored, especially when Landmark confirmed the fair to good, intact, sound status of the concrete wall and timber supports and that *some* of the concrete decks needed repair due to age, weathering and landfill erosion. More information should be provided to *each* property owner about their shoreline status to consider the cost and implications of the "shorewall functional design".

These are thoughts from a lay-person's review of these complicated, incomplete documents presented by Engineers and City officials. Common sense warrants full production of all info and that the matter be deferred due to the proposed significant costs; the intended assessment for homeowners and the outstanding important issues of flooding, safety, recreational aspects and liability, so *everyone* understands *before* Council considers and/or approves this. This is not just an issue for the owners: other residents and the City are involved. It is not fair to request payment of considerable funds when all the information has not been produced.

And, it would be more efficient and timely if the City/Landmark *emailed* and mailed hard copies of all important information, with more notice and more than one Public Meeting.

Theresa Wunder

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Theresa Wunder

Emails: [REDACTED]

PS: I am co owner of 11520 Riverside Drive East with my brother Brian Ducharme who resides there. We are not Engineers or Lawyers – we are concerned tax paying residents.

June 12, 2023
City Council Meeting
Item 8.1 – Written Submission

From: Larry Duffield-cogeco

Sent: June 9, 2023 2:00 PM

To: mayoro <mayoro@citywindsor.ca>

Cc: Sleiman, Ed <esleiman@citywindsor.ca>; Morrison, Jim <jmorrison@citywindsor.ca>; Thomas Wilson <twilson@lifeafterfifty.ca>; Bennett Olczak, Sally <sbennett@aswecare.com>; Lloyd Brown-John <lbj@uwindsor.ca>; Anthony Quinn <anthony@carp.ca>; danielhebert63 <Chauvin, Christine <CChauvin@citywindsor.ca>; clerks <clerks@citywindsor.ca>; Jeanine Appleton-Bott <j.appleton@carp.ca>; Windsor - Essex Carp Chapter <windsorsex@carp.ca>

Subject: Re: Windsor Seniors Advisory Committee Status Request

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor Dilkens,

I was pleased and a trifle apprehensive to read the Windsor Star front page story today: "Council to decide fate of citizen panels".

Pleased that my several requests to you to reestablish the 'Seniors Advisory Committee' will be considered at the June 12 Council meeting - apprehensive whether Council's decision will be favourable and that delegations have not been invited to present their cases to Council. I am hopeful to attend the June 12 Council meeting and will be prepared to speak to the case for SAC's reconstitution.

Many of the salient points are noted in my below messages to you, however, I would add in the Spring of 2018 the Ontario Government appreciating the work done by SAC acknowledged Windsor's achievements with an Award recognizing specifically its membership in the UN Global Network of Age-Friendly Communities. Councillor Sleiman accepted that Award in a Queen Park's ceremony which he conveyed to you at a following Council meeting. I am hopeful that obligations expected from an AFC member, as is Windsor, will have been considered among the reasons for Council to reconstitute SAC.

Your support to reconstitute SAC is again requested.

**Peace,
Larry Duffield,**

Windsor Essex Chapter, CARP.

On 5/23/2023 10:29 AM, windsorressex wrote:

Dear Mayor Dilkens,

My thanks for your providing a Proclamation recognizing June Seniors Month. In addition we'll be doing a flag raising on Friday June 2 on City Hall Square at 1pm and City Hall will be illuminated that week likewise honoring seniors and their singular place and role in our lives and community.

In meantime the Windsor Seniors Advisory Committee remains dormant so I appeal once again for Council's undertaking its reconstitution.

As we carefully emerge from the Covid pandemic restrictions and the devastating effects it had on seniors particularly, SAC can again provide Council with advice on issues key to seniors well-being and needs.

Seniors represent our largest demographic and still growing as we live longer.

Importantly SAC could consult with seniors organizations and advise Council on means to support their well-being and identity needs which City has jurisdiction, resources and services to address.

I understand the Clerk's Office will advise Council at its May 29th meeting on City's committees and Advisory Boards status.

We would be pleased to address Council to support and recommend the continuation of the SAC should that consultative privilege be extended?

In meantime your support for reconstituting SAC is respectfully requested.

Peace,
Larry Duffield,
Windsor Essex Chapter CARP.

On Apr 28, 2023 at 10:41 a.m., windsorressex <windsorressex@carp.ca> wrote:

Dear Mayor Dilkens,

Am following up again with regards to my requests below regarding your intention with how when or whether Council will be asked to reconstitute SAC??

June Seniors Month would be great timing for the new SAC to be announced!

Peace
Larry Duffield,
Windsor Essex Chapter, CARP.

On Apr 21, 2023 at 12:08 p.m., larry.duffield <larry.duffield@cogeco.net> wrote:

Dear Mayor Dilkens,

I am hopeful to hear from you regarding my April 12 below email regarding the status of the Seniors Advisory Committee?

Peace,

Larry Duffield,

Windsor Essex Chapter, CARP.

On Apr 12, 2023 at 1:00 p.m., larry.duffield wrote:

Dear Mayor Dilkens,

My thanks to Administration for recently accepting my applications for June Seniors Month for a Mayor's Proclamation, flag raising ceremony, and City Hall illumination.

In the past our CARP Chapter has partnered with other local seniors organizations to commemorate this event recognizing seniors role and contributions in our community.

We have in particular welcomed partnering with the Windsor Seniors Advisory Committee which since COVID-19 restrictions was not possible. More regrettably Council has not yet opted to reestablish SAC following the most recent municipal election.

Seniors will continue to have special needs as well as make contributions which SAC could advise City Council as was done over more than a decade.

In that period Windsor was recognized a leader as an Age Friendly Community and a member of the UN WHO AFC global network.

Our CARP Chapter requests your support to again appoint a SAC for the balance of the current Council's term.

Peace,

Larry Duffield,

Windsor Essex Chapter, CARP.

On Mar 17, 2023 at 12:33 p.m., Larry Duffield-cogeco <larry.duffield@cogeco.net> wrote:

Dear Mayor Dilkens,

I have written on a number of occasions advocating for the reestablishment of the Seniors Advisory Committee for this Council's term.

I note that the 'Bicycle Committee' is on this weeks Council agenda. Surely the voice of seniors through SAC as in the past could contribute to Council's consideration of seniors interests and priorities?

Your office has advised that the matter is due for consideration by Council. Time continues to pass and the role SAC can provide to Administration and Council remains in limbo. Seniors do deserve to be heard and to have an advisory voice to Council via the reconstituting of SAC.

Please give this matter your favourable consideration and action, peace,

Larry Duffield,

Founding member and former Chair SAC.