

April 20, 2009

Dear Carol,

You asked for comments by 9 a.m., April 20, on the Third Party Review (TPR) report released on April 9, presumably before finalizing your report to Committee and Council for their meetings of May 12 and May 27 respectively.

This 126-page report is extremely technical and appears not written with any general public communications objective in mind. This is unfortunate. One should expect few comments to be forthcoming at this stage except from parties with deep technical knowledge that matches that of the consultants and their advisers.

I for one look forward to the review of this work by competent professionals I have learned to trust.

Still, here and there I picked up on some of the messages in the report. I list those below.

1. While the many adjustments described in section 3 (Hydraulic Models) are well beyond my competence to appreciate, the conclusion, embodied in Table 3-6 (page 41) seems clear enough, and puzzling. The report emphasizes the happy result that, downstream from Richardson Sideroad, the post-development peak water level will rise by no more than 11 cm, but this seems to come at the expense of increases in water levels of 18 to 28 cm at Maple Grove Road and Palladium Drive. What does that mean for established development in that stretch?
2. I fear that no-one who reads section 4 (Calibration Issues) will come away with a warm feeling that the issue is under control, given the implications of the report's concluding statement that "Any additional efforts with the calibration exercise will be more useful ... once additional monitored data is collected at other locations that have been previously recommended..." Conclusion #9 on page 80 supports my disquiet. The indictment of the Kanata West proponents to not have made the effort to collect the necessary data years ago stands.
3. It would appear to me that tables 6-2 and 6-4 (pages 66-68), and much of the subsequent information, compare apples and oranges. It's not clear to me what I learn from comparing results from a 12-hour storm applicable to rural conditions with a 4-hour storm applicable to urban conditions. Should the model storms not be chosen in accord with actual or projected conditions, and then for the appropriate duration?
4. Conclusion #10 (page 80) states that "The overall flood storage volume in the Carp River corridor will increase with the proposed restoration plan." Presumably, the proof of that miraculous outcome lies in the preceding analysis. It would be appreciated if the principles of this remarkable achievement were explained in lay

terms.

5. I note with approval the recommendation that “The overall model should be kept with one master overseer. ...This could be either a City department or an independent consultant not working for the developers in the area” (page 81). It remains most peculiar that two water resource engineers I know who work for the City and know the file have to date not been asked to fulfil this task and instead have to go to great lengths to register their concerns, on their own time. It is, however, never too late for the City to see the light.
6. The Two Zone Flood Plain Policy discussion on pages 92-93 simply does not pass the smell test. I am aware of the proposed changes to section 4.8.1 of the Official Plan (Flood Plains) and am generally supportive of them. Neither they nor any provincial policy that I am aware of refers to a “Modified One Zone.” Notwithstanding that, the report informs me, staff now propose, once Council has made a decision on the results of the Third Party Review, to bring forward an amendment to “deal with the lands as a modified one-zone approach because, in the final analysis, some lands will be entirely removed from the flood plain” (page 93). Once this is achieved, i.e., floodproofed buildings have been erected in the floodplain, the rest can be labeled One Zone again (ref. page 123). Surely this is a Magic Tricks scenario, impossible without the totally artificial construct of a “Modified One Zone” transition “policy.”
7. In this as in several other instances, the TPR does not appear to be a review as much as it serves simply as a mouthpiece for what the proponents intend to do. Where is the independence in that?
8. Equally unconvincing is the section on the Fernbank lands (pp. 102-103). Again, I am in no position to assess whether 29 or 40K cubic meters is an adequate number to allow for the runoff from 196 ha of this development. What strikes me is that the obvious approach – incorporation of the urbanization of this land in the models – is avoided. Why?
9. On page 123, the uncertainty about the reliability of the model results (absent calibration) is recommended to be resolved by limiting the Kanata West development to 34% (including Fernbank lands) until the models can be validated. Where does this number come from?

Beyond these specific concerns, what surprises me most is the strategy being followed by the proponents. Denial of reality and willingness to believe in fairytales has resulted in years of costly delay. One would think that the proponents would now bend over backwards to ensure that the cycle of Part II Order Requests will not be repeated.

Instead, one is provided with a so-called Third Party report that, even to this lay person, exhibits substantial weaknesses but essentially advises to sail ahead as planned. How will this prevent yet more delays?

Finally, I am aware of the Minister's Order of July 21, 2008 in this matter (<http://www.greenspace-alliance.ca/node/406> ) and will be interested to see staff's follow-up.

Looking forward to your report to Council.

Erwin Dreessen