



Charrette #1 Summary

Thames River Clear Water Revival

Museum London

Friday, May 14, 2010



Charrette #1 Summary

Thames River Clear Water Revival

Museum London
Friday, May 14th, 2010

Table of Contents

A. Agenda.....	3
B. The ‘Surroundings Sounding’.....	4
C. Developing a Vision: The Thames River and Watershed ‘North-Star’.....	5
D. The Current State - Identifying Strategic “Itches” and 9 Actions in Support of Realizing the Vision	
1. Collaboration.....	7
2. Communication.....	9
3. Public Attitudes and Awareness.....	10
4. Growth and Development.....	12
5. Research and Data.....	14
6. Value of the Resource.....	15
7. Water Quality.....	16
8. Objectives/Directions and Strategy.....	17
9. Funding and Dollars.....	18
E. Making it Work – Keep It Alive.....	19
F. Feedback.....	21
G. Participant’s List.....	25

A. AGENDA

*Thames River Clear Water Revival
In search of improved health for the Thames River*

Time: Item:

9:30	Coffee and Registration	
10:00	Opening Remarks	Glenn Pothier, President, GLPi Consulting Pat McNally, City Engineer, City of London
10:15	Overview Presentation <i>Purpose and Intent of the Thames River Clear Water Revival</i>	Patrick Donnelly, Watershed Program Manager, City of London Jack Gorrie, Vice-President, Environmental Management, Stantec Consulting
	The ‘Surroundings Sounding’	All
	Discussion	
11:00	Developing a Vision <i>Establishing a mutually shared ‘North Star’: A Beacon to Guide Planning</i>	All
	Discussion	
11:30	The Current State <i>Identifying the Strategic Issues and Problems</i>	All
	Discussion	
12:30	Lunch Break	
1:00	Actions in Support of Realizing the Vision	All
	Interactive Discussion	
2:30	Making It Work – Keep It Alive	All
2:45	A Look Ahead and Open Forum	Glenn Pothier
2:55	Closing Remarks and Adjournment	Glenn Pothier Ron Standish, Director, Wastewater & Treatment, City of London

B. The ‘Surroundings Sounding’ (summarized by GLPi)

The following were identified as key developments, trends and contextual considerations that need to inform the Thames River Clear Water Revival Strategy — essential things that must be taken into account. (Please note that the items listed below are in no particular order, though they generally reflect the sequence in which the points were offered at the session.)

We need to consider...

- The values, interests and expectations of the diverse multiple users of the Thames River resource — and the need to achieve some modicum of balance among them. Resource users need to ‘buy-in’ to the Clear Water Revival Strategy.
- The current funding climate — in particular, reduced federal and provincial funding to municipalities and Conservation Authorities, and increased competition for scarce resources.
- The need for ongoing consultation with various parties regarding the current state and long-term future of the Thames River and surrounding watershed.
- The importance of establishing value-guided principles to direct strategy development and related actions.
- How ecosystem-related priorities may be in conflict with other societal priorities and related pressures.
- The ongoing volatility in politics and related public policy directions.
- The natural proclivity to resist change — and to respect that there may be inherent value in some past ways of doing things.
- That the available data regarding the River and surrounding watershed may not be as comprehensive, accurate or current as we might believe or require it to be — there are data gaps and questions about data accuracy / integrity / timeliness.
- The importance of appropriately valuing the River — and treating it as ‘green capital’ with all of the attendant implications of doing so.
- That the Lower Thames acts as somewhat of a boundary, barrier and divide — creating issues of access and connectivity.
- The broader issues of climate change and the related implications for the Thames River and surrounding area.
- A larger world-wide perspective, including the need to be conversant with and to link to international trends/policies and the best practices of those in other jurisdictions — we cannot afford to be too insular.
- The changing face of agriculture — the changing cost/price ratios; the move toward larger, ‘corporate’ holdings/practices and ‘factory farms’; and land ownership issues generally.

- That we are not starting from scratch — there are significant successes to communicate and on which to build.
- The imperative of protecting the public (appropriate water quality measures, flood control, and so forth) and protecting the watershed (from groundwater, to wetlands, from agricultural lands, to woodlots, etc.).
- The vital role of public education, including helping people understand the importance of the Thames and its impact on surrounding communities (and surrounding communities' impact on the Thames).
- The ongoing development in the area, including both employment and residential growth (and the economic development thrusts of various regions and municipalities).
- The administrative complexity involved in an initiative such as this one, particularly given the different levels of government and diverse stakeholders who must be involved.
- The need to build and strengthen relationships throughout the process — no single player/entity can address the challenges on its own.

C. Developing a Vision: The Thames River and Watershed 'North-Star' (summarized by GLPi)

The group answered the following question: *Ten years from now, if the Thames River and surrounding watershed were more the way you wish they would be, how would things be different than they are today?* Participants identified the following collective aspirations for the River and watershed — painting a picture of a compelling 'north-star' that can serve as a directional beacon and that honours the storied history of the River and the communities that nurture and are nurtured by it (listed in no particular order):

Community relationship/access to the River

I wish...if only...wouldn't it be great if...

- All communities (geographic and otherwise) feel connected to the river;
- All communities fronted on the River (rather than backed on to it);
- There was greater public ownership of the River resource;
- There was greater public access to the River along its entirety;
- There was a greater shared public reverence for water as a vital resource and the River as a specific entity; and
- All residents understood which of the River watersheds/sub-watersheds in which they reside.

The River as a recreational resource and economic contributor

I wish...if only...wouldn't it be great if...

- We could eat the fish caught in the River;
- The River was more swimmable and safe for family recreation;
- The River was a more significant tourist draw; and
- The River was an important 'attractor' and contributor to economic development strategies.

River protection/rehabilitation as a priority

I wish...if only...wouldn't it be great if...

- Farmers and agricultural interests employed enhanced management practices that served to better protect the River and lessen the amount of harmful run-off entering the system — including better treatment of wastewater from factory farms;
- The public no longer discharged untreated/dangerous material (including dumping garbage) into the River;
- Natural heritage links were re-established — for example, the re-connecting of woodlots, fields, etc.;
- More trees were planted along side the River;
- There was less erosion along the River banks;
- The River was sufficiently rehabilitated so as to be deserving of being called its original name;
- Water quality was actually *improved* after passing a water treatment plant;
- The River was no longer a source of stress to the Great Lakes; and
- We had improved data and tracking systems to better gauge progress.

Mutual respect and collaboration among River users/stakeholders

I wish...if only...wouldn't it be great if...

- The public sufficiently valued agriculture and the contributions of farmers to society;
- Various users of the River and parties concerned about its future were to engage in a visionary, constructive dialogue about the resource;
- There was improved information sharing and cooperation among various groups;
- Various agencies and organizations truly collaborated to optimize the benefit and impact of money spent toward river-related initiatives;
- There was greater private sector interest in and demonstrated action in support of the entire watershed;
- People cared more about and were proud of the River; and
- The public — including and particularly youth — were better educated about the River, the watershed and related issues.

D. The Current State - Identifying Strategic “Itches” and 9 Actions in Support of Realizing the Vision

(summarized from flip charts by City of London)

1. Collaboration
<p data-bbox="672 415 941 451" style="text-align: center;">Strategic “Itches”</p> <ul data-bbox="289 457 1321 1371" style="list-style-type: none">• Lack of connectivity, collaboration, co-operation, and coordination.• Categorizing issues such as rural versus urban.• “Who does what” governance / rules / and responsibilities?• Agency confusion and conflict.• Inconsistent land use policies for watershed.• Need multi-level buy-in (best bang for the buck).• Lack of sharing of knowledge and resources.• Lack of public awareness of their connection to Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie.• Poor access to information by whole public.• Lack of awareness and respect of different use or river resources.• Overlap in government review and responsibilities.• No shared vision.• Too many stops and starts with these types of initiatives.• No champion.• Poor municipal and public recognition of First Nations concerns.• First Nations requests/requirements push limits of municipal spheres of jurisdiction.• Mistrust with municipalities.• Large cities not taking into account communities downstream.• Lack of involving the agriculture community.• Lack of stakeholder consultation on watershed usage.• Need for farmers and rural interests to be involved as partners.• Too much of “you versus me” (or agency conflicts).• The disconnection between researchers and decision makers.• Poor attitudes about river and watershed.• Misconception that the River does not affect my life.
<p data-bbox="667 1444 946 1480" style="text-align: center;">Directions/Actions</p> <p data-bbox="245 1486 521 1522"><i>We need to start...</i></p> <ul data-bbox="289 1528 1308 1871" style="list-style-type: none">• Understanding what collaboration means.• To rebuild trust with Southern First Nations Secretariat (SFNS), rural-urban.• Thinking of “we”, not “me”.• A shared vision for the watershed.• Taking responsibility and being accountable for choices – to society.• Thinking sustainability.• To bring all users to the table.• Thinking of only pieces, i.e. only sanitary sewage, only agriculture operator.• Assuming “collaboration” means complete agreement.• Assuming we may be able to completely please every user.

We need to stop...

- Excluding some users i.e. the average Jane.
- Stereotyping the user: i.e. developers are inherently bad, environmentalists are stubborn and unrealistic, and farmers don't care.

We need to change...

- By better understanding what we can do now, in the near future, and long term.
- Baby steps, incremental, reverse it.
- By having regular meetings and conversations, "Keep the initiative alive".
- To make all agencies accountable, not just "I", but "we"!
- Because no one agency has the capacity to do it all.
- By making the political systems become more proactive, i.e. responses to climate change have been nil.
- To full costing evaluation.
- To include external ties.
- To include the life-cycle.
- To legacy issues.

2. Communication

Strategic “Itches”

- Not sharing information between all interests in the watershed.
- Need open communication and understanding.
- Lack of communication between communities.
- Lack of communication amongst levels of government, agencies, Non-Government Organizations (NGO's), and public.
- Need for more public education - youth and school programs.

Directions/Actions

We need to start...

- By understanding the best means of communicating i.e.: written, visual, tactile, and choosing the correct venue.
- Letting people know how to get more involved.
- Providing different options to let people be involved.
- Listening to others.
- Respecting cultures and sectors.
- Respecting people's understanding of an issue.
- Using various means to get the message out; plain language, summaries.
- By having a Thames River website with one window for user friendliness and access.
- Preparing a state of the environment communiqué that includes people. (2nd group addition)

We need to stop...

- Having pre-conceived outcomes.
- Producing boring publications.
- Assuming that no response to an issue means all are in agreement to it.

We need to change...

- The mediums and context of academic research communicated to the public.
- The way we engage the community, i.e. social networking methods, twitter.

(2nd group addition):

- By being more open, transparent, and inclusive.
- And celebrate success.
- And be realistic and honest.
- By taking responsibility.
- By giving a purpose for communication objectives; use tool for support.
- By making it an ongoing process.
- How we communicate and know our audience.
- By adding a Thames River Clear Water Revival website.

3. Public Attitudes and Awareness

Strategic “Itches”

- “I” can’t change anything, so why bother?
- Need an army/network of river advocates, influencers, champions, and enthusiasts.
- Aesthetics – People don’t appreciate the Thames’ beauty.
- Lack of access to the lower river – out of sight/out of mind, lack of appreciation, no recreation opportunities.
- Lack of commitment to work on this altogether.
- Not a strong connection between lower and upper watershed users and agencies.
- Lower river is a jurisdictional, social, cultural, political, and geographic DIVIDE.
- Lack of real concern, caring, and knowledge – REVERANCE for water, rivers, ponds, and lakes.
- Interest groups do not support common principles.
- Heritage is unrealized.
- Lack of strategic buffer/regeneration target (example = 20%).
- Lack of definition of the agriculture component: People needs versus agriculture needs, need wider buffers, pay the farmer for Environmental Services.
- Poor attitude: balance science / bureaucratic language with the Art and Spirituality of the River (First Nations values). Water: The 21st Century Issue.
- Lack of reference to the State of the Thames River Workshop in September 2003.
- Lack of promotion of the history of the river – see Grand River and Manitoulin successes; see US National Park History Route brochures for Tourists i.e. Retrace Wagon Train Routes.

Directions/Actions

We need to start...

- To look at ways to go beyond jurisdictional boundaries, sub-watersheds, and political issues.
- To “brand the River” (Askunesippi) i.e. soft-shell turtle – links water, land, and air.
- To establish a marketing approach – Community Based Social Marketing (CBSM), watershed identity.
- To develop values and principles, have interconnectedness and an acknowledged Charter.
- To incorporate the 200th commemoration of the War of 1812 – 1814 to link history of Thames, role of the River, Longwoods Road, Tecumseh (2012 – 2014) (note – London is involved).
- Agricultural Land Use Services (ALUS) – see program under development.
- Bringing people to the River and have access to it.
- To fund, sponsor and support themed events – i.e. fishing events, Thames River cleanup.
- Turning communities, buildings etc. toward the River.
- The establishment of a website and linkage for Thames River events.
- Finding champions for the River.

- Engaging land owners in monitoring their own land.
- Balancing access needs with agricultural needs.
- Marketing “quantifiable targets” i.e. percentages of forest cover.

(2nd group addition):

- Having educational materials for schools.
- Promoting the River’s recreational and natural value.
- The promotion and education of pollution protection i.e. yellow fish program.
- Identifying with the sub-watersheds.
- Making water quality data available on the internet.
- Coordinating community based sub-watershed groups.

We need to stop...

- Trying to influence curriculum changes; create experiences that attract teachers and students and link to current curriculum.

(2nd group addition):

- The introduction of personal care products and pharmaceuticals that go down the drain.
- Complacency and attitude (e.g. “Nature will take care of itself”).

We need to change...

- To one Conservation Authority.
- ALUS Program to pay land owners for ecological services.

We need to keep on...

- Meeting, consulting, tabulating and celebrating.

4. Growth and Development

Strategic “Itches”

- Cannot engineer a solution for everything.
- Councils allow developers to move river/tributaries because they are in the wrong location.
- Stress of real estate development on watersheds.
- Population growth outstripping societal capacity to mitigate.
- Always having to fight for environmental uses.
- Lack of access to the River in all communities that back onto it.
- Lack of public access to the River.
- Assumption that “growth” is good and necessary.
- Non-sustainable development in the watershed.
- Better balance growth and heritage/environment.
- More emphasis on making the river a public greenbelt.
- The misnomer that the river must be tamed / fixed / contained.
- Businesses have different rules.
- Economy driving development in a way that excludes ecosystem needs.
- Not enough buffering from a landscape perspective.
- No promotion of Thames River recreational uses.
- Economic health not linked to the river’s health.
- Outdated wastewater treatment methods.
- Local food advocates do not talk much about local fish.
- Cheap food policy that has created:
 - obesity, poor health
 - farmers as commodity (factory farms)
 - low margins of profit
 - poor practices, cropping
- Lack of public ownership of river banks.
- Imbalance between ecological interest and social economic concerns.
- A poor understanding of the balance between economy, development, and its impact on our natural heritage features.

Directions/Actions

We need to start...

- Planning land use that increases access to the River.
 - Having policies in place to create and/or buffers adjacent to the River.
 - Funding sources to purchase buffer areas.
 - Development intensification to reduce sprawl.
 - Balancing ecosystem versus infrastructure needs and policies.
 - Consulting prior to growth.
- (2nd group addition)
- Improving livestock intensive uses and waste handling Sewage Treatment Plants (STP’s).
 - Redeveloping brown fields.
 - Considering natural channel design (soft engineering).

- Enforcing fencing to keep livestock out of the river.
- Considering conservation easements.
- Ecological/Goods and Services/ALUS.
- Financial incentives for green development i.e. Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design (LEED), permeable pavement, and green roofs.

We need to stop...

- Granting land use approvals without park land dedications and/or access.
- Cutting wood lots/linkages.

(2nd group addition)

- Draining wetlands for both urban and rural development.
- Paving paradise – we need greener options.

We need to change...

- To have more public and private focus on the River.
- To have no dumping in the River.
- To reduce Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO).
- To expand rural stewardship programs.

5. Research and Data

Strategic “Itches”

- Lack of sharing of information/data.
- Fragmented monitoring programs that lack funding.
- Poor monitoring dollars.
- On again, off again programs.
- Lack of knowledge.
- Ineffective monitoring strategies.
- Too much data “collection” – not enough data “analysis”.
- Lack of adaptive management.
- We are lucky to maintain status quo re: watershed health.
- No single repository for data/information.
- Do not know enough about the journey of the Thames once it hits Lake St. Clair (research data needed).
- Lack of agricultural run-off monitoring.
- Lack of river base flow information.

Directions/Actions

We need to start...

- By determining what we want the data for.
- With a plan including goals and objectives.
- Collecting data.
- Doing GAP Analysis.
- With a custodian of the database.
- Sharing data among all levels of government and stakeholders.

We need to stop...

- Working in isolation.
- Discounting non-government information.
- Cutting funding for monitoring.

We need to change...

- By establishing long term stable funding.
- How we share research and data.
- Communication trends.
- What we do with research and data.
- By revisiting existing and past plans and programs.
- By developing quantitative and quality information to make more acceptable decisions.

6. Value of the Resource

Strategic “Itches”

- Public does not know about the ecological richness of the Thames, about its value and potential.
- Lack of understanding of the value of the watershed and its impact on the function of the River and lakes.
- No focus on natural features restoration.
- Lack of protection of fisheries.
- No public buy-in or appreciation of the Thames.
- No tourism based on using the River and its resources.
- Lack of public access, trail pathways, and linkages.
- Lack of respect from the users of the Thames River.
- Poor perception issues regarding the value of the Thames (i.e. David Suzuki).
- Inefficient use of resources.

Directions/Actions

We need to start...

- Improving and increasing the educational component to the schools.
- Hosting events on the River and using the events to educate the public.
- Developing school curriculum.
- Making our environment the top priority when making decisions.
- Establishing better relationships i.e. with First Nations.
- To better understand and respect the different cultures, values, and communication approaches/needs of these cultures.

We need to stop...

- Building in the flood fringe.
- The focus on single issues.

We need to change...

- Ownership along the River from private to public.
- By using conservation easements along the River’s edge.
- By restoring wildlife corridors.

7. Water Quality

Strategic “Itches”

- Poor water quality.
- Too many systems used only as a means of water conveyance.
- More “walk” and less “talk” (Implement more; study less).
- Too much rural loadings on the River.
- Need to promote that “The River is cleaner than people think”.
- Water quality guidelines are not addressing cumulative impact.
- Poor environmental linkages.
- Consumer product licensing does not include water impacts.
- Too much of the Nutrients: Nitrogen, Phosphorus getting into the River.
- Nutrient levels in Thames River out of balance (Lake Erie impact).
- Non-sustainable agriculture.
- Don’t make it pristine, life needs nutrients.
- Not able to use the River as a source of food.
- Species at risk; losing fish and wildlife species.
- Not considering downstream interests/connections to Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie.

Directions/Actions

We need to start...

- Paying for ecosystem services.
- Continuous and permanent monitoring.
- Snap shot monitoring.
- Developing a strategic plan.
- Using best available data to target nutrient reduction strategies (2nd group addition).
- Clarifying roles and responsibilities.
- Developing an integrated approach.
- Sharing information.
- Promoting the positive.
- Assessing, enforcing non - point source Best Management Practices (BMP) measures.
- Creating publicly owned buffers.

We need to stop...

- Piece-meal, fragmented data collection.
- Hoarding (maybe we don’t know who has what?) data and information.
- Removing vegetation along the banks.

We need to change...

- By creating more permanent monitoring locations (2nd group addition).
- The way we de-ice roads in winter.
- The way we manage algae growth.
- Social norms for stewardship.
- Public perception related to freshwater as a resource.

8. Objectives/Directions and Strategy

Strategic “Itches”

- Lack of clear objectives.
- Multiple ownerships of river front lands.
- Missing overall watershed study/direction.
- Complex objectives need to be simplified into understandable targets the public can grasp; i.e. Plant 2 million trees over the next 5 years.
- Lack of behaviour change.

Directions/Actions

We need to start...

- By reading the 1975 and 1952 Thames Studies and recommendations.
- Creating an updated management strategy building on past efforts.
- Identifying the top 5 objectives and “Best Value” methods of meeting objectives (i.e. reduction at source versus treatment at plant).
- Linking partners to the strategy.
- Getting \$\$ dollars to follow the clear strategy and implementation.
- Creating dedicated funding at watershed level.
- Obtaining an inventory of existing funding and programs.
- With short, medium, and long term (7 generations) targets and objectives.
- Understanding the tools available and strategizing on the watershed scale – regulation, stewardship acquisition, and land trusts.
- Improving the tools: use Community Based Social Marketing in order to change the behaviour.

We need to stop...

- Thinking in silos.

We need to change...

- To make tangible targets in tree planting; 20% cover in 20 years.
- And celebrate steps and achievements.

9. Funding and Dollars

Strategic “Itches”

- Lack of sustained and consistent funding.
- Huge effort/cost to deal with “rule breakers” (minority of people).
- Needs far out-weigh the funding capacity.
- Only one pocket – need to prioritize.
- Lack of a strategic master plan for the Thames.
- Lack of collective like-minded thinking.
- The necessity to lobby for funding.

Directions/Actions

We need to start...

- Sharing resources.
- Establishing dedicated funding for the sole use of river improvements.
- Having consistent, sustained, long term funding from all government sources.
- With an influx of funding from senior levels of government to identify areas of need in the River.
- Spending dollars on high priority works (biggest bang for the buck).

(2nd group addition):

- A provincial water agency.
- To lobby provincial and federal governments for increased funding.
- To promote linkage between watershed health and human health.

We need to stop...

- Working in silos (collective thinking).

We need to change...

- By making sustainable decisions.
- By integrating MOE and MNR as one agency. (2nd group addition)

E. Making It Work – Keep It Alive [summarized from flip charts by City of London]

Group 1

Capitalize?

- Identify a champion.
- Municipal election issue.
- Agency – senior management buy-in.
- Funding.

Moving Forward?

- Committee with 10 to 12 members: people representing multiple groups (municipal, agency, FN, NGO, agriculture, industry, academic, CA's).
- The committee has to be different than what already exists or invigorate and enhance what exists.

Group 2

Capitalize?

- Create Thames River Action Committee (TRAC).
- Consolidate existing information and generate Terms of Reference for future studies.

Moving Forward?

- Have 2011 Action plan developed by October 2010.
- Prepare a road show with open houses and presentations to councils in the fall.

Group 3

Capitalize?

- Need a funded secretariat and project coordinator for the initiative.
- Get buy in.
- Learn from other initiatives i.e. Grand River Water Management Plan, Toronto Waterfront Initiative.

Moving Forward?

- Prepare a collaborative agreement.

Group 4

Capitalize?

- Prepare a workshop write-up: Share with councils, staff, boards, developers (LDI), agricultural communities (source water), newspapers, twitter, facebook, and website.

Moving Forward?

- Form a technical working group to develop more defined work plan – who does what, when, costs.
- Who is doing what now?
- GAP analysis.

Group 5

Capitalize?

- Determine top 5(?) objectives.
- Define watershed initiative(s).
- Group to reconvene to review today's notes, reflect on outcomes and determine next steps.
- Volunteer base needed – Can the City of London still lead?
- Watershed science workshop involving academic, agencies, industries.
- Simple website – Wordpress.com with a blogger.
- Use a simple structure with networked working groups, such as:
 - 5 working groups (Youth, Recreation, History, Policy, and Science) reporting to the steering committee.

Moving Forward?

- Lead and steering committee to develop Terms of Reference or framework.
- Amend the 2010 brochure for the initiative where reference to funding specifies federal, provincial and municipal as shared one-third equally. This may create challenges if one group has a shortfall of funds. It is better to not suggest the proportionate allocation as funding amounts may vary.

F. Feedback – (Provided by 24 participants on feedback forms)

1. What did you like the best from today's charrette?

- It was good to force people to sit with people they didn't know; the facilitator was good.
- Having input into discussions and information produced.
- Moved well; captured details of people's ideas with the post-it notes; I just kept writing my ideas and sticking them on the sheets (it didn't matter if the scribe did not capture my name).
- The facilitator, all, great people, team work.
- It was all good; the facilitator was excellent.
- Networking with watershed partners.
- Numerous stakeholders/partners at meeting; moving agenda forward, not getting bogged down.
- Finding a group with a common initiative for the river.
- Multi-purpose discussions.
- Open dialogue; great opportunity for involvement; fast paced; well facilitated.
- Quality attendees; setting; well managed process.
- Efficient, concise, direct.
- Opportunity for diverse discussion with engaged participants; lunch.
- Interaction of participants.
- Interactive sessions were useful in forming priorities.
- Wrap up that clearly makes everyone think about what their next step is to keep the momentum.
- Round table discussions.
- Very good facilitator; very good idea to have a neutral party with knowledge to carry discussion.
- Amount of material covered in a short session.
- Great interest from participants; a beginning.
- Opportunities to hear opinions from different sectors/agencies/interest groups; great venue –food!
- Discussion on the watershed with a diverse group – many new to me.
- The fact that it happened (x2); well facilitated.

2. What did you enjoy the least from today's charrette?

- Very little time to talk with other people during the day; it would have been good to change tables during the day to get different interactions between individuals.
- At points I could not hear the discussion (x2).
- Maybe more breaks – although I understand it was a short day.
- Discussion although no action items were created; when do we meet again? (Suggest one month).
- Need a more explicit clause; "So we agree to...."
- The River water fountain at the Forks wasn't turned on!
- I think that we could have done a little more to put all the suggestions together...this will be solved by an additional meeting, however care should be taken that information has not been lost.
- Should have been an update on what has been done with TRCWR to date – highlights by handout.

- Too much fretting about details that will sort out provided a group agrees to move forward e.g. funding, governance structure, who is leading? (Why does any entity have to lead?)

3. Do you think that today's charrette was a useful first step with this initiative?

Yes – 22

Additional comments:

- This first charrette was useful for a very important initiative.
- It should be followed up very quickly with results and another meeting.
- Gets people thinking, need to follow up quickly on next steps.
- The group interaction and work; open forum along with ice breakers helped.
- Need to define what it is we want to achieve; what are we building?
- Future is still unclear.
- It brought a diverse group together and has demonstrated a need for a second meeting.
- A good mix of expertise and interests represented here.
- Very "brainstorm" oriented, which is needed at this stage.
- Let's get the ball rolling.
- Next it will be important to define what this initiative is, its scope, and one priority in the watershed to start to tackle.

4. Did the presentations assist in setting the stage for today's and future discussions?

Yes – 19

Additional comments:

- The information was good for future discussions.
- Good context.
- Very good job; well done.
- The questions outlined overhead provided very useful; also the change up in the input exercises kept the group awake and progressive.
- Hopefully, attendees will follow up with their organizations.
- Very informative.
- Terms of Reference required; objectives for 1 year, 3 year, 5 to 10 years.
- Time was limited; highlights need for information sharing.
- Sort of...the next presentation needs to focus on developing objectives to start off discussions.
- Good to see the whole watershed.
- They were brief and good.

5. Do you think that a multi-governance model to guide the initiative forward is appropriate?

Yes – 18

Additional comments:

- But need a leader.
- I think it is essential, it does appear to be herding cats at some points.
- CA's need to be involved.
- I think bringing the various stakeholders together would create a better and more collaborative picture.

- Given complexity of issues and interests in the watershed and its resources.
- No other way.
- Could be but perhaps it is premature until we clarify what our objectives actually are.
- Further discussion required.
- Not sure what this means; I suggest not trying to get higher levels of government too involved.
- A governance model is necessary to define roles.
- Not sure.
- Depends on outcome of meeting #2.
- Need everyone to sign up and show support.
- Needs to include all.
- There are “best practice” examples all over the place; defining a model is the least of your problems; focus on scope.

6. Who should be part of that model?

- Consensus on larger picture with all agencies, municipalities, and nations.
- All the usual suspects – artists, youth, TVDSB, schools, teachers.
- Funded project continuation.
- Federal, Provincial, and Municipal governments, conservation authorities.
- Agencies, municipalities, agriculture, conservation authorities, industry, First Nations.
- Of course London, municipalities, agriculture groups, First Nations.
- Everyone.
- Federal/Provincial/Municipal/First Nations/ key stakeholders.
- City of London – lead role at this time as you have resources and budget, others do not.
- Municipalities, CA’s, NGO’s, business.
- MOE, MNR, EC, CA’s, NGO.
- EC, MOE/MNR, CA’s, municipalities, academic.
- City of London and conservation authorities are most important.
- All involved today and representatives for agriculture and industry.
- CA’s, agencies, cities.
- Have everyone who attended or was invited to provide a letter of support; building a package for MP/MPP submission.
- Anyone who has the potential to exert a watershed scale influence or impact on the Thames River – steering role; others should be players in advisory, action development.

7. Would you be willing to assist in steering this initiative further either directly (representative) or indirectly (a contact) in the future?

Yes – 21

Additional comments:

- I can be contacted as a contact but on a peripheral level.
- Yes, indirectly as a contact in the future.
- Yes, however decision within our agency on who would be involved.
- I am interested in either one.
- MOE – London previously said yes.
- Workload prevents.

- To be determined.
- I can connect with Urban League, Heritage River groups.
- MOE will be involved – need to sort out interests, resources, and roles.

8. *Would you attend a follow-up meeting/session/event in the Fall/2010 to continue these discussions and collaborations?*

Yes – 23 No – 1

Additional comments:

- Unlikely, but please invite.
- Yes, if available.
- Looking forward to the next meeting to begin an action strategy.
- This is necessary.

9. *Is London a good location to host a follow-up meeting?*

Yes – 22

Additional comments:

- It is central.
- Yes, but should look at moving it around.
- Yes or another location in the watershed.

G. Participant's List (Total of 40 in attendance)

Name	Position	Office	Email
Mary Simpson	Member	Thames River Canadian Heritage Committee	marysimpson@xplornet.com
Rosemary Dickinson	Member	Thames River Canadian Heritage Committee	sdickins@uwo.ca
Ian Wilcox	General Manager	UTRCA	wilcoxi@thamesriver.on.ca
Karen Maaskant	Water Quality Specialist	UTRCA	maaskantk@thamesriver.on.ca
Chris Harrington	Coordinator, Research & Planning	UTRCA	harringtonc@thamesriver.on.ca
Jack Robertson	Water Management Supervisor	LTVCA	Jack.robertson@ltvca.ca
Leo Denys	General Manager, Infrastructure & Eng Services	Chatham-Kent	leod@chatham-kent.ca
Marsha Coyne	Senior Planner	Chatham-Kent	marshac@chatham-kent.ca
Gary Northcott	Director of Engineering and Transportation	Municipality of Chatham-Kent	gary.northcott@chatham-kent.ca
Bill Armstrong	Regional Planner	MOE London	Bill.armstrong@ontario.ca
Ted Briggs	Great Lakes Advisor	MOE London	Ted.briggs@ontario.ca
Mary Ellen Scanlon	Great Lakes Advisor	MOE Hamilton	Mary.ellen.scanlon@ene.gov.on.ca
Maureen Looby	Manager of Public Works and Engineering	Middlesex Centre	loobym@middlesexcentre.on.ca
Ray Nothdurft	Deputy Director of Engineering and Public Works	Stratford	rnothdurft@city.stratford.on.ca
Eric Boere	Director of Environmental Services	Thames Centre	eboere@thamescentre.on.ca
Mitch Wilson	District Manager	MNR Alymer	Mitch.wilson@mnr.on.ca
Sandra George	Canadian Co-Chair of the Lake Erie LAMP	Environment Canada	sandra.e.george@ec.gc.ca
Durk Vanderwerff	Manager of Planning	County of Middlesex	dvanderwerff@county.middlesex.on.ca
Richard Drouin	A/Assessment Supervisor	Lake Erie Mgmt Unit, MNR	Richard.drouin@ontario.ca

Name	Position	Office	Email
Brian Locke	A/Lake Manager	Lake Erie Mgmt Unit, MNR	
Jennifer Esbjerg	COA Coordinator	Lake Erie Mgmt Unit, MNR	jennifer.esbjerg@yahoo.ca
Andrea Doherty	SARA Science Coordinator	Department of Fisheries & Oceans	
Chris Smart	Professor	Geography Dept, UWO	csmart@uwo.ca
Cathy Crawley	Researcher	Geography Dept, UWO	ccrawley@uwo.ca
Tom Davie	Researcher	Geography Dept, UWO	tdavie@uwo.ca
Kristen Hendrick	Councilor	Chippewa of the Thames First Nation	kristenhendrick@hotmail.com
Darlene Whitecalf	Councilor	Chippewa of the Thames First Nation	
George Henry	Sr. Councilor	Chippewa of the Thames First Nation	gehenry@cottfn.ca
Sharilyn Johnston	Environmental Officer	Aamjiwnaang First Nation	sjohnston@aamjiwnaang.ca
April Varewyck	Environment Coordinator	Oneida Nation of the Thames	april.varewyck@oneida.on.ca
Mary McLaughlin	Partner	Excalibur Communications	mary@excaliburcommunications.ca
Ed Gazendam	President	Water's Edge Consulting	egazendam@watersedge-est.ca
Jack Gorrie	Vice-President, Environmental Management	Stantec Consulting	Jack.gorrie@stantec.com
Pat Donnelly	Urban Watershed Program Manager	City of London	pdonnelly@london.ca
Richard Todd	Wastewater and Treatment/ Pollution Control Ops	City of London	rtodd@london.ca
Tony Van Rossum	Pollution Control	City of London	tvanross@london.ca
Tom Copeland	Div. Mgr, Wastewater and Drainage	City of London	tcopelan@london.ca
Bruce Page	Planner	City of London	bpage@london.ca
Ron Standish	Director, Wastewater and Treatment	City of London	rstandis@london.ca
Pat McNally	General Manager & City Engineer	City of London	pmcnally@london.ca