



CITY OF WINDSOR

# Appendix B - Consultation Report

Sewer and Coastal Flood Protection Master Plan

Page is intentionally blank

# Table of Contents

|            |  |           |
|------------|--|-----------|
|            | <b>Stakeholder Engagement</b>                                | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>1.0</b> | <b>Communication and Engagement Overview</b>                 | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2.0</b> | <b>How We Engaged</b>  | <b>3</b>  |
| 2.1        | Project Contact List .....                                   | 3         |
| 2.2        | Mandatory Notices and Other Notifications.....               | 3         |
| 2.3        | Website and Contact Information.....                         | 5         |
| 2.4        | Newsletters.....   | 6         |
| 2.5        | Educational Videos .....                                     | 6         |
| 2.6        | Stakeholder Advisory Committee.....                          | 8         |
| 2.7        | Public Information Centres (PICs) .....                      | 10        |
| 2.8        | Partners for Action Survey.....                              | 11        |
| 2.9        | Pop-ups.....   | 11        |
| 2.10       | Property Owner Meetings .....                                | 11        |
| 2.11       | What We Heard.....   | 13        |
| <b>3.0</b> | <b>Indigenous Communities Consultation</b>                   | <b>29</b> |
| 3.1        | Potentially Interested Indigenous Communities.....           | 29        |
| 3.2        | Correspondence with Indigenous Communities.....              | 29        |
| <b>4.0</b> | <b>Agency Coordination</b>                                   | <b>30</b> |
| 4.1        | Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP) ..... | 30        |
| 4.2        | Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA) .....             | 31        |
| 4.3        | Consultation with Emergency Services.....                    | 31        |
| <b>5.0</b> | <b>Neighbouring Municipalities</b>                           | <b>33</b> |
| 5.1        | Town of Tecumseh .....                                       | 33        |
| 5.2        | Town of LaSalle .....  | 33        |

|            |                                     |           |
|------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>6.0</b> | <b>Technical Steering Committee</b> | <b>35</b> |
| <b>7.0</b> | <b>Closing</b>                      | <b>36</b> |

### Figures

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Figure 1: Screen capture of the Windsor Sewer Master Plan website .....               | 7 |
| Figure 2: Screenshot of one of the Windsor Sewer Master Plan Educational Videos ..... | 7 |

### Tables

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Summary of Public Engagement Objectives.....              | 1  |
| Table 2: Summary of Consultation Program.....                      | 2  |
| Table 3: Project Notification Points .....                         | 4  |
| Table 4: Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meetings.....        | 8  |
| Table 5: List of Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Members..... | 9  |
| Table 6: Summary of Public Information Centres.....                | 10 |
| Table 7: Summary of Pop-up Events .....                            | 11 |
| Table 8: Summary of Property Owner Meetings .....                  | 15 |
| Table 9: Summary of Public Input .....                             | 19 |
| Table 10: Summary of Emergency Services Consultation .....         | 32 |

### Consultation Appendices

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| B-1 | Stakeholder Committee Meetings                |
| B-2 | Public Information Centres (PICs) #1 and #2   |
| B-3 | Partners for Action Survey                    |
| B-4 | Pop-Ups Community Events                      |
| B-5 | Newsletters                                   |
| B-6 | Property Owner Meetings                       |
| B-7 | Indigenous Communities and Organizations      |
| B-8 | Correspondence (Agencies, Stakeholders, Other |
| B-9 | Quarterly Council Updates                     |

# Stakeholder Engagement

## 1.0

## Communication and Engagement Overview

The overall objective of communicating and engaging with specific stakeholders and the broader public was to create a Sewer and Coastal Flood Protection Master Plan (MP) that takes various perspective into account, is understood and supported by the community and can be endorsed by City staff and Council. The following represents the overarching objectives of the MP communication and engagement program and reflections on whether the project was successful at achieving each objective:

**Table 1: Summary of Public Engagement Objectives**

| Engagement and Communication Objectives   | Reflections on What Was Achieved   |
|---|--|
| <u>Increase awareness</u> of flood management activities and how the public can assist in managing flooding | Increasing awareness around the project has been a central objective to the engagement and consultation program. The team took a multi-pronged approach to advertisements, notifications and providing updates that included emailing a project list, regular website updates, publishing newsletters, developing educational videos, and promoting events where members of the public could speak with project team members.  |
| <u>Obtain input on MP development</u>   | Members of the public had several opportunities to provide input based on their experiences, preferences and expertise through the project website, at Public Information Centres and at Pop-Ups, emailing directly to the project team, and other online opportunities including an interactive map as well as a survey. A number of community members also actively participated in a project Stakeholder Advisory Committee to provide in-depth insights on public communications, key decisions and evaluation criteria. |
| <u>Be transparent and timely</u> and show how the input received was used.                                  | While much of this project involved highly-technical information, the Stakeholder Advisory Committee provided an excellent sounding board assisting in making the information clear and easy to understand for the public and providing advice on community priorities.  |

Table 2 summarizes the overall consultation program tactics and timing in relation to the key technical work steps noting that website updates were maintained throughout the project.

**Table 2: Summary of Consultation Program**

| Technical Phases and Timing  | Communication and Consultation Tactics   |
|--|--|
| Phase 1: Existing Conditions/Define Problem & Opportunity (January 2018 to June 2018)                          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newsletters #1 and #2</li> <li>Notice of Commencement</li> <li>Advertisement in the City’s Activity Guide</li> <li>Partners for Action Survey</li> <li>Climate Change Brochure</li> <li>Pop up event #1- Windsor Earth Day</li> <li>Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meetings (1)</li> <li>Public Information Centre #1</li> <li>Mayor Dilkens – City of Windsor MP Introduction Video</li> <li>Social media promotion around web site launch and events</li> </ul>   |
| Phase 2: Develop Long Term Alternative Solutions & Implement Short Term Solutions (July 2018 to December 2018) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pop up event #2</li> <li>Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meetings (1)</li> </ul>   |
| Phase 3: Evaluate Long Term Solutions (January 2019 to February 2020)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newsletter #3</li> <li>First Nations Communication Via Update Letter</li> <li>Pop up event # 3- Windsor Home and Garden Show</li> <li>Pop up event # 4- Windsor Earth Day Event</li> <li>Pop up event # 5- Little River Pollution Control Plant Public Tour</li> <li>Pop up event # 6- Windsor Open Streets</li> <li>Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meetings (4)</li> <li>Property Owner Consultation Sessions and one-on-one meetings</li> <li>Newspaper article “Homeowners encouraged to provide feedback as city moves to finalize sewer master plan” published in the Windsor Star on February 4, 2020 inviting people to PIC #2</li> <li>Ads in the City of Windsor Activity Guide (Summer and Fall 2018, Fall 2019)</li> <li>Public Information Centre #2</li> <li>Educational Videos (3)</li> <li>City Engineer MP Update Video</li> <li>Attendance at the Ward 6 Town Hall Meeting – November 7, 2019</li> <li>Social media promotion around events</li> </ul> |
| Phase 4: Confirm preferred Long Term Strategy/ Document MP (February 2020 to November 2020)                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meetings (1)</li> <li>Property Owner Meetings</li> <li>Meetings with Neighbouring Municipalities</li> <li>Final MP Presented to Council – November 23, 2020</li> <li>Notice of Completion - December 2<sup>nd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup>, 2020</li> </ul>  |

Throughout the project duration, communication also included continued update to the project website ([weatheringthestorm.ca](http://weatheringthestorm.ca)), continued individual engagement through the project email ([info@weatheringthestorm.ca](mailto:info@weatheringthestorm.ca)).

## 2.0 How We Engaged

This Section of the Consultation Summary Report provides information on the communication and engagement activities that took place (Sections 2.1 to 2.10) and provides an overview of the key themes that were heard from participants (Section 2.11).

### Project Contact List

It is important to ensure that those who might be interested or affected by the MP are provided the opportunity to participate in its development. As such, a comprehensive project contact list was developed including stakeholders from the community. In a dedicated effort to keep everyone informed, contacts from various City divisions and agencies were also included. It is noted that the project contact list was discussed with representatives of the City of Windsor to ensure that the list reflected their knowledge of community members and interested groups. Throughout the project, people were able to sign up to join the contact list online, at events, on the website and through email. The following lists the categories of stakeholders that are included on the contact list. These stakeholders were consulted throughout the project:

- Stakeholder Advisory Committee;
- City of Windsor elected officials;
- Provincial and federal elected officials;
- City of Windsor municipal staff;
- Neighbouring Municipalities and the County of Essex;
- Affected property owners;
- Provincial and federal regulatory agencies;
- Indigenous Communities; and,
- Other local stakeholders (e.g., environmental organizations, local conservation authority, businesses and business organizations, utilities, school boards).

### 2.1 Mandatory Notices and Other Notifications

There were many points during this project where notice was provided to the public of the opportunity to learn about and participate in the MP. There are two (2) mandatory notification points for this MP process in order to meet the Municipal Class EA requirements for Schedule B projects. This includes providing the public notice to the public of the opportunity to provide comment and input on the problems identified and solutions being considered, and the Notice of Completion which explains the opportunity to review the MP and the specific projects for which approval is being sought under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process (MCEA). Other notices included newsletters, postcards provided at City events, notices in the activity guide, notices of Public Information Centres, newspaper articles, and social media postings. Table 3 summarizes all the notification points for the project.

**Table 3: Project Notification Points**

| Notification            | Distribution Details   |
|-------------------------|--|
| Notice of Commencement  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published in the Windsor Star on March 22<sup>nd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>, 2018.</li> <li>● Distributed via email and letter on March 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2018 to contact list.</li> <li>● Posted to the project website.</li> </ul>  |
| Notice of PIC #1        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published in the Windsor Star on June 2<sup>nd</sup> and June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2018.</li> <li>● Distributed via email and letter on June 6<sup>th</sup>, 2018 to the contact list.</li> <li>● Posted to the project website.</li> <li>● Social media promotion through Twitter and Facebook (total of 20 Tweets and 3 Facebook events for the whole project).</li> </ul> |
| Newsletter #1           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Distributed via email to the contact list on September 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018.</li> <li>● Provided to the public during pop-up events.</li> <li>● Posted to the project website.</li> </ul>  |
| Activity Guide          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published in the summer and fall 2018 activity guide that is available in hard-copy at municipal buildings or for download via city website.</li> </ul>   |
| Newsletter #2           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Distributed via email to the contact list on April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019.</li> <li>● Provided to the public during pop-up events.</li> <li>● Posted to the project website.</li> </ul>  |
| Activity Guide          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Published in the fall 2019 activity guide that is available in hard-copy at municipal buildings or for download via city website.</li> </ul>  |
| Newsletter #3           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Distributed via email to the contact list on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2019.</li> <li>● Provided to the public during pop-up events.</li> <li>● Posted to the project website.</li> </ul>   |
| Letter to First Nations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sent to First Nations contacts on August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019.</li> </ul>  |



| Notification                 | Distribution Details   |
|------------------------------|--|
| Notice of PIC #2             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newspaper Article “Homeowners encouraged to provide feedback as city moves to finalize sewer master plan” published in the Windsor Star on February 4, 2020 inviting people to PIC #2.</li> <li>● Distributed via email and/or letter to the project contact list on January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2020.</li> <li>● Hard copy notifications were distributed to all property owners on Riverside Drive general between Ford Blvd. and St. Rose Ave and all properties that will be directly impacted by the MPs’ recommended solutions.</li> <li>● Posted to the project website.</li> <li>● Social media promotion through Twitter and Facebook (total of 20 Tweets and 3 Facebook events for the whole project). Distribution of flyers and postcards at other related City events.</li> <li>● Media Release including local radio announcements. (Feb. 3, 2020).</li> <li>● Project update video by the City Engineer.</li> </ul> |
| Climate Change Brochure      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Distributed at all pop-up events and public information centres. (April 2018).</li> </ul>   |
| Property Owner Notifications | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Mail out letters were distributed to property owners impacted by recommended solutions to attend consultation sessions or meetings with project staff.</li> </ul>   |
| Notice of Completion         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newspaper article “‘This is huge.’ Windsor approves multi-generational \$4.9B sewer plan” published in the Windsor Star on July 27, 2020 to report on council endorsement of the MP conclusions.</li> <li>● Mail outs will be distributed to all properties that will be directly impacted by the Recommendations of this MP.</li> <li>● Notice of Completion is scheduled for advertisement in the Windsor Star newspaper on Dec. 2 and Dec. 5, 2020.</li> </ul>   |

## 2.2 Website and Contact Information

An interactive website ([www.WeatheringTheStorm.ca](http://www.WeatheringTheStorm.ca)) was launched on March 19, 2018. The website integrates the City’s existing social media tools, provides a streamlined channel for communicating project updates with the public, and offers a variety of opportunities to engage site visitors in interesting activities. At each phase of the project we have uploaded new project materials and used different types of engagement tools that are appropriate based on the information to be shared and collected.

The online tools that were used include discussion forums, surveys, quick polls, stories, Q&A and idea sharing. The most popular tool was the places tool which allows users to geolocate their unique experiences with flooding in Windsor. In August, 2018, 207 people visited or interacted with the places

map and 44 people documented their flooding stories on the map (see Appendix B-3 for the input received from this web based activity).

This website also includes valuable information for home owners and property owners on measures they can take to protect their properties from flooding and reduce the strain on the City's municipal system. It is recommended, that as part of the City's Enhanced Education Program that the City continue to maintain an active website as a central hub for the public to obtain valuable information on flooding risks, safety measures, City projects and as a tool to contact the public to City staff to address questions in real time.

Between March 19, 2018 and May 12, 2020 there were a total of 7,115 site visits. Using the website analytics tool it can be demonstrated that website visits increased as a result of other mail out and pop-up events therefore the City should continue to promote and inform the public about this site.

### 2.3 Newsletters

A total of three (3) newsletters were distributed to individuals who signed up to receive project updates. These newsletters were dropped off at community and recreation centres, as well as libraries, to reach a broader audience. The newsletters were also posted on the website and distributed to all government agencies, elected officials and organizations identified on the project contact list. In addition to informing the public of the most recent project works, decisions, and consultation opportunities, the newsletter highlighted the City's commitment to keeping the community informed about the project and what had been heard through consultation to date. A copy of the newsletters can be found in sub-Appendix B-5.

### 2.4 Educational Videos

The project was launched with a Weathering the Storm video where Mayor Dilkens outlined the importance of this project and how it fit within his 8-point plan to address flooding in Windsor.

Three (3) additional educational videos were made in collaboration with the City's communications department to reach an audience beyond those who attended the project public events or signed up to be on the project contact list. The videos were designed to promote three key messages:



Figure 1: Screen capture of the Windsor Sewer Master Plan website

- [Video #1](#): Stormwater solutions rely on a partnering approach which includes a combination of private (homeowner) and public (municipal) improvement measures.
- [Video #2](#): Solutions will not eliminate the risk of basement or surface flooding. Implementing protection is key.
- [Video #3](#): The master plan will require significant investment and take decades to complete.



Figure 2: Screenshot of one of the Windsor Sewer Master Plan Educational Videos

A fourth video was made in collaboration with Mark Winterton, Windsor's City Engineer, to provide an overview of the entire project including work done to date, the three key messages that were

communicated in the other videos, opportunities for participation, and other resources available for the public to learn more. The fourth video can be accessed here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yoN3gBcX4uA>.

All of the videos were posted to YouTube and shared via the City of Windsor Twitter page (@CityWindsorON) which has approximately 17,000 followers.

## 2.5 Stakeholder Advisory Committee

The purpose of the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) was struck to provide advice and feedback to the MP project team at key milestone points over the course of the project. The SAC was a non-political advisory body.

The objectives of the SAC included:

- Provide insight and feedback on the project at various points in the process;
- Provide insight into key issues related to the MP from the perspective of the members and the organizations/interests represented;
- Explore opportunities and solutions to resolve these concerns;
- Engage in collaborative discussion to increase project understanding;
- Review materials and provide feedback on matters brought to the SAC for comment;
- Communicate project information back to their organization/community; and
- Participate in consultation events for the project.

**Table 4: Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Meetings**

| Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting and Date | Agenda Items  |
|---|---|
| SAC Meeting #1 – May 2, 2018                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review the purpose of the SAC, Terms of Reference, project overview and personal experiences with flooding.</li> </ul>   |
| SAC Meeting #2 – August 14, 2018                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of spring consultation, proposed project objectives, assessment of short-term solutions, communication and engagement opportunities.</li> </ul>                   |
| SAC Meeting #3 – January 24, 2018               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update, level of service discussion, review of sewer model results, introduction to long-term solutions.</li> </ul>  |
| SAC Meeting #4 – May 8, 2019                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update, long-term solutions, short-term solutions implementation plan, brainstorm tactics to improve public education and involvement of the solutions.</li> </ul> |
| SAC Meeting #5 – July 3, 2019                   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project update, draft long-term solution alternatives, evaluation criteria, planning the next round of PICs.</li> </ul>  |

| Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting and Date | Agenda Items   |
|---|--|
| SAC Meeting #6 – September 26, 2019             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long term solutions, evaluation criteria, format and notification process for the PICs.</li> </ul>  |
| SAC Meeting #7 – April 21 <sup>st</sup> , 2020  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide an overview of the recommended solutions and what we heard at the PIC (recap of the PIC information), obtain feedback on the recommendations, and get input on the Implementation Plan and on a future Enhanced Educational Program.</li> </ul> |

At each meeting, SAC members contributed thoughtful questions, raised concerns and suggested ways to improve our approach, communications and evaluation criteria. The SAC generously donated several hours of their time over the course of two years to review materials, attend meetings and promote project events within their networks. Their contributions were essential in ensuring the MP would consider and meet the various local needs.

The SAC was made up of seventeen (17) people in addition to the technical representing community interests, environmental interests, academic interests, and citizens at large. Notes of the meetings are included in sub-Appendix B-1.

**Table 5: List of Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC) Members**

| Name                        | Affiliated Organization                |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <b>SAC Members</b>          |  |
| David Hilton                | Windsor Resident                       |
| John S. Holmes              | Windsor Resident                       |
| Ron Brant                   | Windsor Resident                       |
| David Hanna                 | Windsor Resident                       |
| Tom Markham                 | Windsor Resident                       |
| Ray Bezaire                 | Windsor Resident                       |
| Frank Dattilo               | Windsor Resident                       |
| Randal Sasso                | Windsor Resident                       |
| Bridget Scheurman*          | Pillette, Riverside and Ford City BIAs |
| Greg Plante*                | Pillette Village BIA                   |
| Amandeep Hans               | Windsor-Essex County Health Unit       |
| Dave Munro                  | Detroit River Clean-up                 |
| Dr. Rajesh Seth             | University of Windsor                  |
| Tirupati Boliseti           | University of Windsor                  |
| Stephen Laforet, Fire Chief | Windsor Fire & Rescue Services         |
| Maria LeBlanc               | Local Insurance Company                |



| Name                 | Affiliated Organization                    |
|----------------------|--|
| SAC Members          |  |
| Pete Karageorgos     | Insurance Bureau of Canada (IBC)           |
| Project Team Members |  |
| Anna Godo            | City of Windsor Project Manager            |
| Flavio Forest        | Dillon Consulting Project Manager          |
| Karla Kolli          | Stakeholder Advisory Committee Facilitator |

\*These members were not active

## 2.6 Public Information Centres (PICs)

There were two (2) rounds of Public Information Centres that were held throughout the course of this project. Each round consisted of three in-person sessions on different weekday evenings in different sections of the City. Recognizing that it is a lot to ask of the public to attend consultation events, emphasis was placed on developing easy-to-read, accessible and eye-catching materials that would be displayed in high-traffic locations to expand participation of passersby.

Table 6 lists the public information centres and includes the focus of discussion and the approximate attendance.

**Table 6: Summary of Public Information Centres**

|         | Event and Date   | Focus of Discussion  | Attendees  |
|---------|--|--|------------|
| PIC # 1 | June 12 <sup>th</sup> , 2018 from 5:00 – 8:00 pm at Tecumseh Mall                          | The purpose of this round of PICs was to present information on the causes and factors being considered to address flooding; the preliminary model results identifying the problems in the sewer and overland drainage systems; short-term solution alternatives including existing City subsidy programs and alternatives; and next steps. This round also obtained input on what issues should be taken into consideration in evaluating short-term and long-term solutions. Comments received from the public can be found in sub-Appendix B-2. | 27 people  |
|         | June 13 <sup>th</sup> , 2018 from 3:00 – 5:00 pm and 6:00 – 8:00 pm at Fogolar Furlan Club |  | 11 people  |
|         | June 14 <sup>th</sup> , 2018 from 5:00 – 8:00 pm at Roseland Golf and Curling Club         |  | 15 people  |
| PIC # 2 | February 4 <sup>th</sup> , 2020 from 5:00 – 8:00pm at Roseland Golf and Curling Club       | The second round of PICs took place in February 2020. The focus was on receiving input on the evaluation of alternative solutions, the preliminary preferred solutions and proposed implementation plan. The PIC event included interactive display panels, feedback forms and opportunities for members of the public to ask questions to members of the project team. Comments received from the public can be found in sub-Appendix B-2.  | 42 people  |
|         | February 5 <sup>th</sup> , 2020 from 3:00 – 8:00pm at WFCU Centre                          |  | 142 people |
|         | February 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2020 from 5:00 – 8:00pm at Windsor Aquatic Centre               |  | 30 people  |

## 2.7 Partners for Action Survey

In spring 2018, Partners for Action, together with the City of Windsor and the Canadian Red Cross completed a survey to obtain a better understanding of flood risk perception and flood preparedness. This online survey was available from April 5, 2018 to May 15, 2018. The survey was promoted through a variety of outlets including the City of Windsor main website and weatheringthestorm.ca, social media platforms, in print and on the radio, and at public outreach events. A total of 306 respondents with postal codes located in the City of Windsor completed the survey. Their responses were considered for this report. The full survey is included in Appendix B-3.

## 2.8 Pop-ups

The City wanted to provide a variety of ways for people to learn about and contribute to the MP project. Holding public meetings often brings out those who are already aware of the project and therefore may not reach new audiences. To reach a broad spectrum of people, the City opted to go out into the community by way of pop-ups. Pop-ups consist of setting up a booth at high traffic public, free, and accessible events. Five (5) pop-up style events were held around the City and are described in Table 7.

At these events team members talked to passerby about the project. The main purpose of these pop-up events was to raise awareness about the MP project, and opportunities for participation. Project postcards were handed out with the project website so that people could log on to learn more and subscribe to the contact list. Given that the events attended were family oriented, the team brought kid-friendly activities to each event that included a spinning wheel, trivia questions and a face painter. Pop-up event materials are included in sub-Appendix B-4.

**Table 7: Summary of Pop-up Events**

| Event Date and Location                        | Participants    |
|--|-----------------|
| Earth Day at Malden Park – April 22, 2018      | Over 100 people |
| Windsor Open Streets – September 23, 2018      | Over 140 people |
| Windsor Home & Garden Show – April 12-14, 2019 | Over 200 people |
| Earth Day at Malden Park – April 28, 2019      | Over 120 people |
| Windsor Open Streets – September 22, 2019      | Over 30 people  |

## 2.9 Property Owner Meetings

Some property owners may be affected by the location of recommended solutions, including pump stations, stormwater management ponds, underground storage facilitates and the proposed berm alongside Riverside Drive. As such, letters were sent to property owners providing an opportunity to meet with the project team so that their perspectives could be considered in the decision-making process.

Three (3) property owner pre-consultation sessions were held in fall 2019, with property owner groups that would be directly impacted by the recommended solutions. The purpose of these sessions was to

provide property owners an opportunity to review and provide comment on the solutions prior to presenting solutions to the public at the final PIC#2 (Winter 2020). Property owners were able to review detailed drawings and the evaluation of alternatives and have discussions with project team members, City administration, Councillors and Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA). The property owner pre consulting meetings are summarized below:

- Riverside Drive Landform Barrier Property Owner Meeting (Oct. 30, 2019)
  - Direct mail outs were distributed to all Riverside Dr. E. residents between Ford Blvd and the east City Limits.
  - Meeting was held at the WFCU Centre between 5:00pm and 8:00pm.
  - Display boards and conceptual design plans were available for property owners to review and provide feedback.
  - A total of 83 households attended this session.
- St. Rose Pump Station Property Owner Meetings (Nov. 5, 2019)
  - Meeting was held at the WFCU Centre between 5:00pm and 8:00pm.
  - Display boards, conceptual design plans and 3D renderings were available for property owners to review and provide feedback on the various Pump Station Alternatives.
  - A total of 10 households attended this session.
- Ford Blvd. Pump Station Property Owner Meetings (Nov. 6, 2019)
  - Meeting was held at the WFCU Centre between 5:00pm and 8:00pm.
  - Display boards, conceptual design plans and 3D renderings were available for property owners to review and provide feedback on the various Pump Station Alternatives.
  - A total of 21 households attended this session.

Displays, comment sheets, sign-in sheets are included in Appendix B-6.

Meetings were also held with individual property owners/groups to obtain additional information on flooding experiences or to discuss solution that may have direct impact on their property. At each of the meetings, Dillon provided a summary of the project and the findings related to surface flooding. Attendees learned about the preliminary preferred solutions and next steps in the process. Meeting materials can be found in sub-Appendix B-6.

- FCA - Fiat Chrysler Automobiles - Windsor Assembly Plant (Jan. 15, 2020)
- Ford Motor Company – Windsor Engine Plant (Feb. 3, 2020)
- Greater Essex School Board (Feb. 5, 2020)
- Riverside Drive Resident #1 (Feb. 6, 2020)
- Riverside Drive Resident #2 (Feb. 24, 2020)
- Rosati Group (May 19, 2020)
- Riverside Drive Resident #3 (Site meeting Sept. 28, 2020)



## 2.10

**What We Heard**

Through engagement, we learned that residents of Windsor have experienced a range of impacts from recent flooding events. These impacts include repair costs for home and belongings; stress; damage to sentimental items; and other financial costs. The MP engagement program has tried to understand the flooding experience of Windsor residents in developing the measures that will be taken to mitigate the impacts of future flooding events.

While the impacts of flooding vary among Windsor residents, so do the actions residents are taking. Some residents are proactively installing mechanisms to mitigate the potential for flooding damage in the future; other residents do not believe it is their responsibility to prevent flooding; and some residents are growing frustrated with the City suggesting they are not doing enough to address flooding which is believed to be caused by aging or inadequate infrastructure.

Windsorites use different methods for obtaining flooding information, sharing their experiences and addressing their damage. Through this project we tested some methods of distributing flood related information and obtained an understanding of the type of information that would be valuable to residents moving forward.

Numerous comment forms and other correspondence pieces (i.e., letter, email, web form), were received during the project, considered during the pre-design phase, and are included in Appendix B-8.

The following summarizes the key input received from participant groups:

**Stakeholder Advisory Committee**

The committee has provided great value in the identification of problems, development of solutions and providing guidance on how best to engage and presenting findings to the public. Below is a short list of some key feedback point they have provided. For more information, the SAC meeting minutes can be found in sub-Appendix B-1.

- Public education is important (provide public examples of private property measures);
- Need plan for emergency access to mitigate risks and damage;
- Rely first on LIDs and Best Management Practices;
- Tailor solutions to specific problem;
- City needs to be transparent and gain public's trust;
- Share success stories; and
- Input has been integral in the development of the level of service, solution development, communication strategy and private property recommendations.

**Pre-Consultation Sessions**

Below is a short summary of the key comments that were received during these sessions:

#### Riverside Drive Landform Barrier Property Owner Meeting (Oct. 30, 2019)

- Property owners who live north of Riverside Drive have concerns related to:
- The condition of the existing shoreline (wall or land).
- The need for coastal flood protection barriers to be placed north of their properties along the shoreline.
- There is concern over the need to construct the landform barrier on front yards including impacts to tree plantings, decorative walls, driveways, structures.

Subsequent to this meeting, it was determined that where existing property grades are above flood protection elevations (176.50) that a landform barrier along the Riverside Dr. ROW is not required. This applies to areas where existing properties grades are consistently higher than 176.50 from the east property limit to the west. Based on available topographic information, there is an area along Riverside Dr. E. where this criteria is satisfied. Upon detailed design and implementation of coastal flood protection in this area (Area 2), the existing lot grades will be confirmed. The City will coordinate with these property owners to include property grades as part of the property's title to give the lot's elevation legal status. Applicable properties are detailed in the Tec. Volume 3 report.

The functional design for the berm has been refined through this study and is included in Tec. Volume 3 Report. During detailed design, the design will be completed using detail site topographic survey information and the design team will engage property owners on a site by site basis to develop a design that mitigates as much impact as possible while meeting the City's flood protection objectives and allocated budget.

#### St. Rose Pump Station Property Owner Meetings (Nov. 5, 2019)

- The following summarizes the concerns presented by property owners;
- The pump station will eliminate the park lands which are a community amenity for the area;
- Pump station will impact scenic views of the Detroit River;
- Pump station will have noise and vibration impacts; and
- The Pump station building will impact the architecture and aesthetic of the area.
- Property owners were in support of solutions to mitigate flooding however alternative locations for this pumps station should be considered. It was requested that the project team review options to place the pump station at Wyandotte St. E. and St. Rose Ave. (NW corner) or to place an underground storage facility below St. Rose Park.

In response to these comments the project team proceeded as follows:

- The feasibility associated with the implementation of an underground storage facility (Example Product: Storm Trap) in the vicinity of St. Rose beach was reviewed. A pump station outlet that is placed sufficiently high enough to mitigate impacts of high river levels is preferred as it acts to remove rainwater volume from the sewers system. During major rain events, an underground facility would limit the resilience of the storm sewer system as it would require additional drawdown time leaving the system vulnerable to back to back storms. Also the size of an

underground storage facility would have to be significant to hold the necessary volume (60,000-80,000 cubic meters).

- The option of placing the pump station further south, at the Wyandotte St. E./St. Rose Ave. Intersection was reviewed. This alternative pump station location has been added to the pump station location alternatives as “Alternative 4 (PS-E1-ROSE-4)” and the associated comparative evaluation and review of feasibility was completed. Details evaluation and finding related to this can be found in the MP Report (Section 6).

Also, subsequent to this meeting the project team refined the solution developed for Regional Area 1&2, which allowed the capacity of the pump station to be decreased, allowing for the pump station wet well footprint to be reduced.

**Ford Blvd. Pump Station Property Owner Meetings (Nov. 6, 2019)**

Property owners had similar concerns as those of the St. Rose Pump Station area.

Subsequent to the meeting, it was determined based on further refinement of the Regional Area 1&2 solution that the need for a large pump station could be eliminated. The revised solution includes the upsize of storm pumps within the existing pump station located in City’s Reaume Park. It is recommended that the City evaluate whether the need for emergency back-up power should be added to this pump station through another analysis.

**Property Owner Meetings - Summary**

Table 8 below summarizes key points from the meetings held with individual property owner groups:

**Table 8: Summary of Property Owner Meetings**

| Property Owner Meeting   | Summary of Discussions   |
|--|--|
| FCA - Fiat Chrysler Automobiles - Windsor Assembly Plant (Jan. 15, 2020) | The automotive industry representatives noted they have experienced flooding issues and are not opposed to the City’s recommended improvements (storm sewer on Chrysler Centre and storage facility under the asphalt parking lot). Coordination is required during the planning process to ensure that construction work does not negatively impact production or employee access.<br><br>Having a city owned and operated underground. |
| Ford Motor Company – Windsor Engine Plant (Feb. 3, 2020)                 | Ford representatives were not oppose to works proposed to upsize the existing sewer. They pointed out challenges related to existing site conditions as this site was previously a building that has since been demolished.  |

| Property Owner Meeting                               | Summary of Discussions  |
|--|---|
| <p>Greater Essex School Board<br/>(Feb. 5, 2020)</p> | <p>The school board is not oppose to construction an underground stormwater facility under the park area within the school lands at the Roseville School site.</p> <p>Some concern was raised over implementing any storm sewer improvements within the David Suzuki School site as there are already LID measures onsite. Since this meeting the need to use the school site was determined be not necessary.</p>  |
| <p>Riverside Dr. Resident #1<br/>(Feb. 6, 2020)</p>  | <p>The project team identified the potential need to acquire the property along Riverside Drive, to allow for construction of the Berm and implementation of a permanent solution to provide a barrier crossing Riverside Drive during emergency events.</p> <p>A follow up email was sent on August 12, 2020 noting that the proposed berm construction is not included in the City's 10-Year Capital Work Plan therefore unless the City acquires funding from external sources or if future water levels warrant expediting the implementation of the berm, the project will not go to construction in the next 10 years.</p>  |
| <p>Riverside Dr. Resident #2 (Feb. 24, 2020)</p>     | <p>The project team identified the potential need to acquire the property to permit the construction of a Berm and implementation of a permanent solution to provide a barrier crossing Riverside Drive during emergency events. The individual property owners want more communications and transparency in terms of clarity, timelines and decision-making process.</p> <p>A member of the Dillon Consulting project team had a follow up phone conversation with the resident. The resident was informed that the proposed berm construction is not included in the City's 10-Year Capital Work Plan therefore unless the City acquires funding from external sources or if future water levels warrant expediting the implementation of the berm, the project will not go to construction in the next 10 years. The resident noted concern regarding the City's ability to purchase the property in advance of this proposed berm construction. The Dillon consulting representative provided the property owner with the City's property department who could provide more formation and also sent a separate email to the City informing them of the Residents' concerns.</p> |
| <p>Rosati Group (May 19, 2020)</p>                   | <p>The developer had concerns related to property acquisition and associated compensation. Dillon will work with the Developer and the City to develop a pond configuration that mitigates impact to private property and existing vegetation and provides sufficient area to implement waterfowl habitat mitigation measures.</p>  |

| Property Owner Meeting                                     | Summary of Discussions  |
|--|---|
| Riverside Dr. Resident #3<br>(Site meeting Sept. 28, 2020) | <p>This resident provided a letter to the Riverside Vista Phase 2A Design team and provided comments in the Winter 2020 PIC regarding flooding issues.</p> <p>Dillon reviewed the existing conditions of this property and determined that additional site grading is required to mitigate risk of overland flooding of the property from ponding within the roadway during major rain events. A representative from Dillon met with the property owner and discuss what interim measure the property owner could take in advance of the reconstruction of Riverside Dr. and the installation of the large trunk storm sewer.</p> |

The detailed Property Owner Meeting comments can be found in tabular format in sub-Appendix B-6.

#### Public – Key Comments

- Residents are prepared to install short-term solutions to their properties, however, they are also keen to learn what the City will be doing for long-term solutions;
- More transparency around the costing of long-term solutions;
- Interest in the City taking a holistic approach that considers the implications of climate change (intensity and frequency of storms);
- General support for low-impact development and more green infrastructure as a solution to prevent flooding;
- Some residents want the City to have ‘tough conversations’ in terms of mandatory requirements of some short term solutions (e.g. disconnected downspout) or that some properties are included/excluded from additional considerations (e.g. in reference to the berm and/or break wall); and
- Solutions related to coastal flooding should be implemented immediate as the river and lake levels area rising.

**Table 9** provides an overview of the comments received at public meetings, pop-ups, on the interactive website and the survey. Not all comments received are documented in the summary but were reviewed and considered by the project team. Also included in the table is the project team response to these comments indicating how they will be considered in the MP where appropriate. Written comments received throughout the project are included in Sub-**Appendix B-8**.

Page is intentionally blank



**Table 9: Summary of Public Input**

| Comment #               | Comments and Concerns Received   | Consideration of Comments and Concerns   |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| PIC # 1 – June 2018     |  |  |
| 1                       | If the sewer system is not improved it won't matter what improvements individuals make to their properties. Residents should wait until the results of the MP are released before implementing more changes.             | Through further refinement of the model, completion of several solution iterations that used a wide range of private/public infrastructure improvements it was found that to meet the established level of service, that both private property source control measures and public infrastructure is required. Implementing private property protection is necessary as improvements will require time/capital budget to implement. |
| 2                       | The bottleneck areas should be prioritized.  | Areas where bottlenecks exist have been identified. Prioritization is based on a number of criteria.   |
| 3                       | The costs of implementing flooding solutions and the effectiveness of the proposed solution are concerning.  | This project is expected to be implemented over 50+ years and sewer improvements are anticipated to be constructed in conjunction with other City initiatives. The City will continually and actively apply for funding from external sources such as government.  |
| 4                       | There needs to be more information available that explains the different methods to prevent basement flooding e.g. an ejector pump before.   | Information to be part of Enhanced Education Program. Recommended devices is included in the City's existing Basement Flood Protection Program. Each home/building is difference and it residents are encouraged to contact professional contractors and to complete research to implement measures that work best with their particular needs.  |
| 5                       | It is good to know that the city is taking steps to address flooding and find a solution.  | N/A  |
| PIC # 2 – February 2020 |  |  |
| 6                       | Pumping station should be located at St. Rose and Wyandotte. This would not eliminate the park, destroy the aesthetics of the neighbours, and it would be placed in a commercial area rather than in a residential area. | There are a number of limitations on locating the Pump Station at the Corner of Wyandotte Street East and St. Rose Ave. Refer to Technical Volume 2 Volume 2 Report for more information.  |



| Comment # | Comments and Concerns Received   | Consideration of Comments and Concerns  |
|-----------|--|---|
| 7         | Water levels along Riverside are very concerning. City should expand project to protect other homes along Riverside Drive East.                | Flood protection is proposed to be placed between Villaire Ave. to the east City limits. These areas were chosen because they are most at risk based on regulatory and projected high water elevations and existing topography.   |
| 8         | It seems like the best solution is a mandatory downspout disconnection program. This is what Toronto and Detroit have required for properties. | City Wide mandatory policy to downspout disconnection is being recommended through this study.  |
| 9         | Ward 7 is at risk for flooding and needs to be notified.   | Ward 7 (East Riverside and Forest Glade Areas) is currently protected by the existing landform barrier (Ganatchio Trail). Infill and improvement to the barrier is proposed to fill gaps to meet the established flood protection elevation. Property owners have been notified through various studies as well as other emergency coastal flood programs (studies include the East Riverside Flood Risk Assessment Study completed by Landmark and this MP). |
| 10        | What are the parameters of areas draining into Blue Heron Lake?  | General details are included in Technical Volume 2 Report.  |
| 11        | It seems like the proposed lower berm height alternative will probably be inadequate by comparison to the higher berm height.                  | The use of a higher protection elevation was evaluated. Based on the immediate impact to property owners on Riverside Drive and the level of risk associated with the 176.8 high water levels, the preliminary preferred recommendation is to construct the berm at 176.50 at this time. The City will continually evaluate the Lake St. Clair/Detroit River and revisit the flood protection elevation of the landform barrier infrastructure.               |
| 12        | The City needs to address the break wall that is falling apart.  | Existing infrastructure along the existing shoreline are not part of the scope of this study. The City will address items as required through other project programs.   |



| Comment # | Comments and Concerns Received  | Consideration of Comments and Concerns   |
|-----------|---|--|
| 13        | Riverside Drive residents on the north side should be involved in a discussion. The berm could be as useless as the one at the Ganatchio Trail. How does this impact Vista? | Properties or existing infrastructure, north of the proposed/existing Riverside Drive landform barrier are not part of the scope of this study. The rationale for placing the landform barrier along Riverside Drive is further described in the MP report. The proposed berm within the Proposed Vista Phase 2A area will be integrated into the design and construction of this section of Riverside Drive.                                  |
| 14        | Suggest that the City builds a higher land form elevation. This is in residents' long-term interest.  | The use of a higher protection elevation was evaluated. Based on the immediate impact to property owners on Riverside Drive and the level of risk associated with the 176.8 high water levels, the preliminary preferred recommendation is to construct the berm at 176.50 at this time. The City will continually evaluate the Lake St. Clair/Detroit River and revisit the flood protection elevation of the landform barrier infrastructure |
| 15        | Please keep residents informed of the break wall condition, repairs and council report when made public.  | Properties or existing infrastructure, north of the proposed/existing Riverside Drive landform barrier are not part of the scope of this study. The City is addressing this separately.  |
| 16        | There is no solution provided for residents on waterfront properties. Please elevate the break wall for all residents in the area.  | Properties or existing infrastructure, north of the proposed/existing Riverside Drive landform barrier are not part of the scope of this study. The City is addressing this separately.  |
| 17        | Landform barrier needs to be elevated.  | The use of a higher protection elevation was evaluated. Based on the immediate impact to property owners on Riverside Drive and the level of risk associated with the 176.8 high water levels, the preliminary preferred recommendation is to construct the berm at 176.50 at this time. The City will continually evaluate the Lake St. Clair/Detroit River and revisit the flood protection elevation of the landform barrier infrastructure |
| 18        | Please prioritize sewer separation in the central Windsor area in a way that minimizes polluted water entering the Detroit River.   | Benefits related to water quality will be considered in the development of the Project's implementation plan.  |

| Comment # | Comments and Concerns Received  | Consideration of Comments and Concerns   |
|-----------|---|--|
| 19        | Prioritize separation of combined sewers over separation of dual manhole sewers.  | Separation will be prioritized on various factors related to flood relief, constructability and safety.  |
| 20        | Prioritize construction/use of open drains as opposed to pipes where feasible   | Where possible surface storage has been considered for surcharges storage of stormwater.   |
| 21        | Preference for alternative 2 for Ypres Avenue   | Based on the evaluation and natural environmental screening of the alternative 2 site, the natural heritage designation and density of mature trees would limit the amount of stormwater storage that could be accommodated.   |
| 22        | Preference for alternative 1 for basement flooding risk reduction. Low impact development design elements to encourage infiltration of stormwater into the soil.  | Recommendations for property owners to reduce their contribution to the sewer systems are included in this study.  |
| 23        | The Parks Department and others should be providing examples for the residents to mimic. The more trees and larger plants the more water will be naturally absorbed.  | This can be integrated into the Enhanced Education program for City residents.   |
| 24        | The preferred method makes sense. It would also be good if all municipalities in Essex County and the City of Windsor could coordinate their coastal flood protection MP in terms of investment infrastructure in areas of current shared use and future development. | The City has regular communications with adjacent municipalities and recommendations of this study have been communicated to those municipalities.   |
| 25        | There are properties that have removed their waterfront berm. Are there any plans to reinstall the berms or can the City of Windsor force the home owners to replace their berms?   | There are areas where the berm has been compromised. The City will be acquiring an easement for all areas where the landform barrier is proposed to allow the City to repair damages as required.  |
| 26        | The time frame of the changes and improvements seems to be too long considering the current levels of Lake St Claire and the Detroit River. Are the projects shown funded by all levels of government or only by City of Windsor?                                     | Funding of projects has not been determined at this time, the City has applied for funding for the Vista 2A (Area 1) section (DMAF funding). The implementation plan will provide more information regarding the timing of the proposed landform barrier. The City will continue to monitor lake/river levels and if required the City will expedite flood protection measures. The City will continuously look for funding opportunities for these types of improvements. |

| Comment #           | Comments and Concerns Received   | Consideration of Comments and Concerns   |
|---------------------|--|--|
| 27                  | Please consider putting the pumping station at St. Rose and Wyandotte. The park is an important part of our neighbourhood.   | There are a number of limitations on locating the Pump Station at the Corner of Wyandotte Street East and St. Rose Ave. Refer to Technical Volume 2 Volume 2 Report for more information. Property owners in the vicinity of this location will be informed and included in the detailed design of the pump station and associated park improvements during detailed design. |
| 28                  | Who did the study for the City?  | Dillon Consulting Limited and Aquafor Beech Limited.   |
| 29                  | Improve drainage to stop creation of Lake Jefferson during heavy rain.   | Riverside Drive storm sewer will be replaced with a larger sewer that will provide stormwater storage during major rain events. Refer to solutions for STM-E1.   |
| 30                  | Anything that can be done to lower the ground water level in the area as we have concerns about water coming in from underneath the fountain.  | Groundwater levels cannot be lowered. Private property protection measures are required.   |
| 31                  | Concerns about flow under Parkway.   | Parkway is a Provincial Road and not part of the scope of this study.  |
| 32                  | Reduce Riverside Drive width.  | This is not being addressed as part of the MP.   |
| 33                  | Council/City should let residents know what is being done this year, especially given high water levels.   | The City will be providing this information to the public, independent of this study.  |
| 34                  | Should have more consultation with homeowners on north side of Riverside Drive.  | The City is addressing this separately.  |
| 35                  | The City should review and update polices related to the Basement Flood Protection subsidy programs (BFP). Inspection after implementation of protection measures to ensure contractor follow manufacturer specifications. | This study recommends the City to implement an Approved Contractor list for completion of works under the BFP.   |
| Interactive Website |  |  |
| 36                  | The problem is surface water coming down St. Louis & Riverside Drive and flowing directly onto our property. The lack of curbs and insufficient sewer capacity is the problem.   | Riverside Drive storm sewer will be replaced with a larger sewer that will provide stormwater storage during major rain events. Refer to solutions for STM-E1. The Riverside Vista Phase 2A project is proposing an urban road cross section with curbs and gutters.   |

| Comment # | Comments and Concerns Received  | Consideration of Comments and Concerns  |
|-----------|---|---|
| 37        | Some homeowners have installed every mitigation measure available: sump pump and backwater installed, floor drain disconnected, disconnected downspouts; rain barrels to place around property. They are looking for the City's help now. | The purpose of this study is to identify what the City can do to mitigate flooding in addition to private property measures.  |
| 38        | Unsure of whether new home construction in the area or the new Herb Gray Parkway are factors. Within the last 3 years or so, it appears that heavier rains caused small ponds of water in local backyards.                                | This high level MP did not look at local road flooding issue. Residents are encouraged to contact the City directly for maintenance issues.   |
| 39        | Parkview Ave was fully inundated from Edgar to Tranby.  | Regional Solution 1&2 and storm sewer infrastructure proposed on Jefferson Ave. and Raymond Ave. will mitigate surface flooding issues within this area.  |
| 40        | The catch basin that is here is usually blocked. Because the area is very flat and because of the absence of curbs, the water goes where ever it wants.   | This high level MP did not look at local road flooding issue. Residents are encouraged to contact the City directly for maintenance issues.   |
| 41        | The state of Garden Court and Sumach Crescent are not meant to withstand any significant rainfall before massive pooling of water takes place.  | Regional Solution 1&2 and storm sewer infrastructure proposed on Jefferson Ave. and Raymond Ave. will mitigate surface flooding issues within this area.  |
| 42        | At the foot of Reedmere and Riverside Dr., significant pooling of overland water from the entire area, flooding residences house and basements. Property damage has been extensive.   | Regional Solution 1&2 and storm sewer infrastructure proposed on Riverside Drive will mitigate surface flooding issues within this area. This area is vulnerable to flooding under current conditions, a higher Climate Change level of service was applied to the design of the Riverside Dr. storm sewer which also include upgrade to the sewer outlet by constructing a Pump Station at St. Rose Ave. and Riverside Dr. |
| 43        | Flood-water came down St. Louis and Riverside Drive onto our property on Riverside Drive E flooding about 2 feet.   | See comment above.  |

| Comment #                         | Comments and Concerns Received   | Consideration of Comments and Concerns   |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| 44                                | The problem is surface water coming down St. Louis & Riverside Drive and flowing directly onto our property. The lack of curbs and insufficient sewer capacity is the problem.   | Riverside Drive storm sewer will be replaced with a larger sewer that will provide stormwater storage during major rain events. Refer to solutions for STM-E1. The Riverside Vista Phase 2A project is proposing an urban road cross section with curbs and gutters. |
| <b>Partners for Action Survey</b> |  |  |
| 45                                | It is widely believed that flooding in the City of Windsor is caused by aging and inadequate infrastructure, and many want the City to improve and expand its flood management infrastructure.   |  |
| 46                                | Many respondents tried to prepare for flooding in their home (by installing sump pumps and backwater valves, purchasing sewer backup insurance, or raising valuables off the floor) but still had some damage.   |  |
| 47                                | Respondents felt that certain preparations, like making flood and evacuation plans, or sharing plans with neighbours, were ineffective or unimportant. Other actions, such as purchasing flood insurance, installing sump pumps, using water-resistant building materials, or grading property, were seen to be too expensive, too difficult, or too time-consuming. Respondents felt they were not responsible for certain actions, while others simply did not know how. |  |
| 48                                | Many respondents did nothing to prepare for the most recent flooding to affect their home, mostly because they felt they were safe from flooding.  |  |
| 49                                | Twenty-five percent of respondents do not have an emergency kit, mostly because they feel it is unnecessary because they will never have to evacuate their homes or they have enough supplies on hand.   |  |
| 50                                | People use different sources for information about floods and daily weather. The Weather Network and local radio and television stations were key for information before a flood; local radio and television and social media for information during a flood; and the City of Windsor’s website and local radio and television stations for information after a flood.   |  |
| 51                                | Friends, family and neighbours are the most important source of support before, during and after a flood, followed by municipal representatives before and after a flood, and Emergency Services during a flood event. Community volunteers and non-profit organizations are also valued during and after floods.  |  |
| 52                                | Sixty-nine percent of respondents currently have sewer backup insurance for their homes.   |  |
|                                   | As a result of the most recent flood, many respondents have decided to prepare, including purchasing a sump pump or backwater valve; raising expensive appliances off the floor; and disconnecting their downspouts.   |  |

| Comment #            | Comments and Concerns Received   | Consideration of Comments and Concerns   |
|----------------------|--|--|
| <b>Pop-Up Events</b> |  |  |
| 54                   | Residents questioned the value of back flow valve, as they still had basement flooding with back flow valve and sump pumps installed.      | Noted.   |
| 55                   | Surface flooding was identified as a concern/source of flooding which must be considered, not just basement flooding from sewer surcharge. | Noted.   |
| 56                   | The public needs more information about project timing, completion and solutions that will be implemented.                                 | Noted.   |
| 57                   | The risks of flooding are a real/common concern for residents of Windsor.  | Noted.   |
| 58                   | With the increase in rain water over the past few years, it is great to see the City investing in the sewer system.                        | Noted.   |
| 59                   | It's good that home owners have options to protect themselves from flooding.   | Noted.   |
| 60                   | What about consideration of additional green infrastructure?   | This study recommends the implementation of Low Impact Development measures area wide. Recommendations also include the City to initiate an educational program for property owners to better understand how they can implement these measures. The City's Stormwater Financing Study is looking at ways to incentivise these types of measures within private property. |
| 61                   | The embankment needs some reinforcement as flooding occurs every year.   | Local issues shall be communicated directly to the City.   |
| 62                   | How is climate change being considered in the development of the MP?   | To provide resilient solutions for areas most vulnerable to flooding, stormwater infrastructure was sized to provide a level of service for a "Climate Change" storm which is a 1:100 year storm with an added 40% factor. Refer to Appendix E on how this criteria was included in the MP solutions.  |
| 63                   | MP to provide more emergency relief to bypass road flooding using the river and ditches and relief ponds.                                  | Many stormwater ponds, underground storage facilities were proposed to mitigate flooding within road surfaces.   |
| 64                   | Please have a stronger social media presence to spread the word.   | Noted. The weatheringthestorm.ca website will continue to be available.  |
| 65                   | This looks promising given we are no longer dealing with this once every 100 years.  | Noted.   |

| Comment # | Comments and Concerns Received                            | Consideration of Comments and Concerns |
|-----------|---|--|
| 66        | More greenspace (greenways, farmland, parkland).          | Noted.                                 |
| 67        | Basement flooding subsidy program has been well received. | Noted.                                 |

Page is intentionally blank



## 3.0 Indigenous Communities Consultation

Consultation with Indigenous Communities is an important part of conducting an EA. Engagement with First Nations and Métis provides an avenue to understand their perspectives regarding the Project. The following section summarizes the consultation related to Indigenous Communities.

### 3.1 Potentially Interested Indigenous Communities

During the project initiation, the project team worked with the Ministry of Conservation, Environment and Parks (MECP) to identify Indigenous Communities that may have a territorial interest that may relate to the MP. The MECP provided an initial list of Indigenous Community contacts. This initial contact list was confirmed with the MECP after the MCEA Companion Guide was released mid-way through the project and a final list was established. The Indigenous Communities contacted as part of the MP include:

- Aamjiwnaang First Nation;
- Bkejwanong Territory (Walpole Island First Nation);
- Chippewas of Kettle and Stone Point First Nation;
- Chippewas of the Thames First Nation;
- Caldwell First Nation; and
- Oneida Nation of the Thames (ONYOTA'A:KA).

These Indigenous Communities and organizations were engaged during the EA and the MECP was consulted during the EA for any updates to this list.

### 3.2 Correspondence with Indigenous Communities

There were five points of contact with the above noted Indigenous Communities during the course of the MP. In each instance, material was mailed to the community followed by an email with an attachment. Mail-outs and emails were sent so that the Consultation Coordinators of the Indigenous Communities were aware of the project, knew how to learn more and who to contact with inquiries or concerns. The following explains each point of contact; relevant materials are included in sub-Appendix B-7.

- March 21, 2018 – Cover Letter and Notice of Commencement was sent to each of the Indigenous Communities.
- May 14, 2019 – Project Update and Newsletter #2 was emailed to the entire project contact list which included the Indigenous Communities.
- August 28, 2019 – Project Update was mailed and emailed to each of the Indigenous Communities.
- January 24, 2020 – Project Update and Notice of Public Information Centre was emailed to the entire project contact list which included the Indigenous Communities.
- December 2020 – The Notice of Completion which includes notice of a 45 day review period for the document was mailed and emailed to each of the Indigenous Communities.

On September 3, 2019 a response was received from the Chippewas of the Thames First Nation indicating that at that stage of the project they did not have any concerns.

### 3.3 Meetings with Indigenous Communities

As the remaining groups had not responded to the above notifications. Calls were made to all Indigenous Communities in November 2020 to identify whether there were any concerns regarding the project and offering and opportunity to meet to discuss. To date, Walpole Island First Nation has indicated an interest to meet to discuss the project.

## 4.0 Agency Consultation

The following section explains how agencies have been involved in the development of the MP. Each agency was actively involved in the development of solution alternatives, especially as there have been a number of new and innovative strategies that have been considered for mitigating flooding for major rain events.

### 4.1 Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP)

It was identified early in the project that getting feedback from the MECP would be beneficial to ensure that recommendations would be in keeping with the MECP requirements.

In June 2019, the City and Project team met with the MECP Environmental Approval and Local branch representatives to review and obtain feedback on the range of alternative solutions developed to reduce flooding risks and to discuss methods to reduce the frequency of combined sewer overflows (CSOs) and manage wet weather flow at the City's two treatment plants. In conjunction with this MP, the City is completing a separate study titled "Combined Sewer Overflow Control in the Riverfront Area West of Caron Avenue, Class EA" which has recommended the implementation of a Retention Treatment Basin (RTB) facility upstream of the Lou Romano WRP. The purpose of this RTB is to provide rapid effluent treatment during wet weather events which reduces backup of sewage flows within the combined (Central Windsor Area) and separated (South Windsor Area) system and reduces the volume of CSOs to the river. A similar rapid treatment solution was considered for the Little River PCP to provide similar flood mitigation and CSO reduction benefits however MECP did not support the use of this type of facility due to the separated nature of the East Windsor sanitary sewer system. The solutions developed for the East Windsor Sanitary System have been revised based on feedback from the MECP. Refer to Technical Volume 2 report for more detailed technical information and sub-Appendix B-8 for meeting minutes and presentations related to the consultation with the MECP.

In addition to the above, a meeting was requested on November 9, 2020 by the designated EA planner. The purpose of this meeting was for the MP project team to provide MECP additional context related to concerns raised by the Town of LaSalle regarding the Turkey Creek Watershed. Refer to Section 5.2 below.

## 4.2 Essex Region Conservation Authority (ERCA)

Throughout the duration of this project ERCA has been actively involved in the establishment of level of service and development of alternatives for the reduction of flooding specifically for surface and coastal flood protection. ERCA has been integral in the technical development of this project including but not limited to the following:

- Attendance at many of the Technical Steering Committee workshops;
- Involved in the development of coastal flood protection coordination meetings including meetings to integrate the East Windsor Flood Risk Assessment Study (2019) into this MP recommendations;
- Attendance at the property owners meetings pertaining to the St. Rose Pump Station, Ford Blvd. Pump Station and Riverside Drive Landform Barrier property owner consultation meetings; and,
- Attendance at the Ward 6 Town Hall meeting to discuss the Landform Barrier recommendations and proposed improvements.

## 4.3 ERCA-Source Water Protection

On March 25, 2020, a meeting was held with the Source Protection branch of ERCA to provide an overview of the solutions developed and the potential impacts and changes to the downstream receiving water courses. Source Water protection representatives provided the project team an overview of the necessary policies and risk management guidelines that are applicable to this MP's recommendations. Minutes of this meeting can be found in Appendix B-8. A separate source water protection section was added to the MP to address this important issue.

## 4.4 Consultation with Emergency Services

The project team has consulted the City's medical, fire and police agencies to provide information on the findings of the sewer MP, confirm findings are consistent with observations of agency members and to confirm that level of service criteria for flood mitigation is sufficient to provide those services the ability to perform their duties for major storm events. Below is a summary of this consultation. It is also noted that EMS was represented on the project Stakeholder Advisory Committee.

**Table 10: Summary of Emergency Services Consultation**

| Agency   | Summary of Discussion   |
|--|---|
| Windsor Police Services (WPS)<br>Meeting: August 21, 2019                              | <p>Project team members met with representatives from WPS to discuss the existing flood risk areas and to review the level of service criteria.</p> <p>WPS noted that during major rain events that emergency vehicles could travel through areas of road flooding that are 0.3m (1 ft) of ponding or less.</p> <p>The WPS facilities did not have any issues or damages to any of their facilities/buildings during the recent major rain events.</p> <p>WPS was in agreement with properties identified in the vulnerable area map.</p>   |
| Windsor-Essex Emergency<br>Medical Services (EMS)<br>Meeting: July 23, 2019            | <p>Project team members met with representatives from WPS to discuss the existing flood risk areas and to review the level of service criteria.</p> <p>WPS noted that during major rain events that emergency vehicles could travel through areas of road flooding that are 0.3m (1 ft) of ponding or less.</p> <p>The WPS facilities did not have any issues or damages to any of their facilities/buildings during the recent major rain events.</p> <p>EMS requested that the City include the 911 call centre (Rhodes Dr.) and the City's Emergency Shelters Facilities on the list of vulnerable land areas.</p> |
| Windsor Fire and Rescue<br>Services (WFRS)<br>Stakeholder Advisory<br>Committee Member | <p>Chief of Police, Stephen Laforet, is a member of the Stakeholder advisory committee and has reviewed and provided feedback for all aspects of the MP.</p>  |

## 5.0 Neighbouring Municipalities

The project team has engaged the neighbouring municipalities including: Town of Tecumseh and Town of LaSalle, during the duration of the project. The following summarizes consultation touch points and considerations for each municipality.

### 5.1 Town of Tecumseh

The Project team met with the Town of Tecumseh (Tecumseh), July 23, 2020, to review recommendations of this mater plan, specifically solutions that are adjacent or related to the shared sanitary sewer system. Dillon provide a presentation highlighting the following:

- Overview of the established level of service;
- Overview of how the City is relying on source control including private property foundation drain and downspout disconnection mandatory programs to mitigate flood risk throughout the City;
- Sanitary sewer inflow assumptions for ultimate conditions at the four Tecumseh sewage inflow points;
- Solutions related to the coastal flood protection; and
- Overview of storm sewer outlet improvements for Regional Area 5 (Blue Heron Pond drainage area) where there is an existing storm sewer easement within the Tecumseh municipal boundary.

The project team highlighted that the City of Windsor encourages Tecumseh to implement source control measures within the Municipality of Tecumseh similar to those recommended through this MP. Regular coordination between Windsor and Tecumseh on how to mitigate flood risk will be integral in achieve the goals of this study.

### 5.2 Town of LaSalle

At the early stage of this study, the Town of LaSalle requested, via letter dated April 5, 2018, that the study confirm that recommended solutions will not have negative impacts to the Cahill and Lennon watersheds within the Town of LaSalle. This request is in keeping with the assumptions and criteria mandated by ERCA that solutions must not negatively impact receiving watercourses and assessments should be completed to confirm the same.

The project team provided the Town with an Outlet Capacity Assessment report on April 22, 2020 to address the concerns raised previously by the Town (Finalized on June 2020, refer to Appendix E) followed by a project team review meeting, on May 8, 2020, with ERCA and Town's Director of Public Works. The report and discussions focused on changes to the Grand Marais drain as a result of recommendations of this MP, specifically the potential changes to the flows at the City of Windsor/Town of LaSalle boundary. In summary, this report concluded that under ultimate conditions and full implementation of all recommendations of this MP, including source control, in-line sewer improvements and downstream

improvements, that the net change in flows within the Grand Marais Drain would be marginally lower than existing conditions and therefore have no negative impacts to the downstream watercourse.

In response to the report and meeting noted above, the Town has provided two memorandums to the Dillon, dated May 22, 2020 and June 10, 2020. The Town has significant concern over the Outlet Capacity Assessment (OCA), specifically as it relates to the Grand Marais and Cahill drains and their inclusion in the MP. Specifically the Town is concerned regarding the following two items:

The existing condition water levels established in previously completed floodplain studies (completed in 1990's) are not consistent with the latest Grand Marais Drain Hydrology and Hydraulics Models (2019) study, completed by Landmark Engineering with the City of Windsor. Changes to the water levels indicate negative effects within the Town of LaSalle area. Also, there is concern regarding significant overflow from the Cahill Drain that overflows into the Canard River watershed.

The City and MP team has acknowledged that the concerns raised by the Town are valid and need to be assessed in more detail. Assessment of existing watercourses and/or addressing any historical changes that have occurred within these watercourses is not part of the scope of this study. The MP existing condition sewer model and solutions were based on the latest available information to estimate current conditions. Based on these conditions, it was demonstrated that the surface flooding mitigation measures proposed within the South Windsor area (Turkey Creek Watershed) do not pose negative impacts to the drain.

The Town of LaSalle has subsequently begun to coordinate with the City of Windsor, Town of Tecumseh and ERCA to initiate a separate regional study to address the concerns related to the Turkey Creek watershed. The purpose of this regional study is to evaluate and identify recommended solutions related to any negative impacts that have occurred within these watercourses, including the assessment of the items listed above. Based on the findings and recommendations of that study, there will be opportunities to reconfirm the functionality of the flood mitigation solutions identified in this MP based on any differences in the boundary conditions, including reconfirmation that there continue to be no negative downstream impacts.

In addition to the above drainage concerns, the Town noted that they were not sufficiently engaged throughout the Master Plan process. The Town was engaged in April 2020, as it was at this time possible for the MP team to provide the OCA report and to demonstrate to the Town and ERCA the solutions did not impact the downstream water courses. The Town was aware of this study though the Notice of Commencement and received notes for the June 2018 and February 2020 PICs.

In addition to the memo referenced above, the Town of LaSalle has provided additional comments, concerns, questions related to the completion of this MP. Dillon has prepared a detailed letter to the Town of LaSalle in response to those concerns and to clarify the scope of the MP, the methodology used



to address the Towns' concerns and the results of our Outlet Capacity assessment. This letter (Appendix B-6) also includes all comments received to date, meeting minutes, and presentations related to this issue.

The Town has engaged the MECP EA Planner on this issue. As noted in section 4.1 above the MP project team had a meeting with the MECP to provide additional background information and explain of the MP's scope of work. The MECP will continue to be engaged on this items as the City continues to liaise with the Town of LaSalle.

#### Technical Steering Committee

A Technical Steering Committee was formed to provide regular input and guidance to the project team during the duration of the project. The team consisted of representatives from ERCA and the following City departments:

- Engineering
- Pollution Control
- Recreation & Culture
- Infrastructure & Geomatics
- Public Works Operations
- Legal Services
- Fire & Rescue Services
- Planning & Building Services
- Finance

Over 17 meetings were held with representatives from departments listed above. The following summarizes the topics and items discussed in detail at these meetings:

- Update and calibration of the City's sewer computational modeling including the review of results and consultation with City to ensure that the findings of model reflect City administration's observations of the City's system;
- Development of short-term solutions that consists of source control solutions and private property measures that can be implemented in the short term to provide more immediate relief to the sewer system. This included extensive discussions related to the implementation of a foundation drain program for older homes;
- Review of problem areas that have been identified and confirm scope of solutions that will be developed to address flooding;
- Obtain information from the City regarding new development proposals and determine how the solutions will account for future Greenfield development or brownfield intensification;
- Review of various levels of private property source control measures (foundation drain disconnection and downspout disconnection) and collaboration with the City to develop a strategy for the implementation of necessary programs to enforce solutions that are being recommended;

- Detailed review of solution alternatives including results of comparative evaluations, cost comparisons, review flood risk mitigation benefits of each solution and review the benefit of private property and other source control improvements on the City's system;
- Workshop of implementation criteria and methodology for prioritizing projects for the implementation plan;
- Review of costs and associated assumptions; and
- Review of public comments from various points of engagement and reviewing how comments would be integrated into the solutions developed under this study.

## 6.0 City of Windsor Council

---

Regular updates were provided to City of Windsor Council via quarterly reports and presentations. The meeting materials can be found in sub-appendix B-9.

## 7.0 Closing

---

The overall objective of communicating and engaging with specific stakeholders and the broader public was successful in creating a City of Windsor MP that took various perspectives into account, was understood and supported by the community, and was endorsed by City of Windsor staff and City Council.