

Monday, April 20, 2009

Dear Carol,

As you know, I've been involved in the Restoration project from almost day 1 and have been impressed with Management's effort to make sure the plan is accepted, more or less, as originally conceived. Glancing through Greenwood's report there's really nothing unexpected in their approval, would Greenwood have been selected if the outcome had been otherwise?

You might think that you've won something, but in broader terms the City is the big loser. A loser not only in terms of what could happen if the restoration plan doesn't work out but in losing the support of people like myself who would like to work in a meaningful cooperative way with yourself. Surely you must realize that those who are most informed about water issues in the region just shake their heads in disgust in the way you have handled this file.

One of my most vivid recollections of this whole fiasco will be how hard the City has worked to ignore two of its most informed water resource engineers in favour of highly questionable input from MVC.

As one of 3 people who originally conceived the idea of creating a Riverkeeper, what you have demonstrated more than justifies the importance of having this unbiased citizen driven organization who endeavours to put some good science into decision making.

So, what's next? Rather than a solution I would imagine there will be a fight back costing more time and money. How can you be satisfied with such an outcome?

Sincerely,

John Almstedt