

Pelee Coastal Resilience Committee Meeting 3 Notes

Friday November 24, 2023: 10:00 am - 12:00 pm on Teams

Attendees:

Municipality of Chatham-Kent

- Edward Soldo (ES)

Consulting Team:

- Pete Zuzek, Zuzek Inc. (PZ)
- Linda Mortsch, University of Waterloo (LM)
- James Knott, LURA (JK)
- Susan Hall, LURA (SH)

Pelee Citizens Advisory Committee:

- Charbel Saad (CS)

Ontario Greenhouse Vegetable Growers

- Aaron Cristine (AC)

Leamington and District Chamber of Commerce:

- Diane Malenfant (DM)

Leamington:

- Rob Sharon (RS)
- Bill Fuerth (BF)

Presteve Foods Ltd.:

- Vald DeMelo (VD)

Lower Thames Valley CA

- Mark Peacock (MP)

Parks Canada:

- Scott Parker (SP)
- Tammy Dobbie (TD)
- Julie Charlton (JC)

Essex Region CA

- James Bryant (JB)
- Jenny Gharib (JG)

Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks (Observer)

- Ngan Diep (ND)

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

- Emily Champagne (EC)
- Yamin Janjua (YJ)

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (Observer)

- Stephen Marklevitz (SM)

County of Essex

- Rebecca Belanger (RB)

Environment and Climate Change Canada

- Jody McKenna (JM)
- Greg Mayne (GM)
- Katie Windross (KW)

Caldwell First Nation

- Zack Hamm (ZH)

Absent:

Caldwell First Nation

- Susan Sullivan
- Jenna Maidment

Environment and Climate Change Canada

- Laud Matos

Fisheries and Oceans Canada

- Cindy Mitton-Wilkie

Wheatley Harbour Authority

- Mario Figliomeni
- Bobby Cabral

Parks Canada

- Martha Allen

Leamington Landowners Association:

- Wayne King

Ministry of Environment, Conservation and
Parks (Observers)

- Greg Wilson
- Heather Hawthorne

Actions:

- Distribute letters of support for the NRCan application
- Share draft Terms of Reference with the Committee

Meeting Purpose:

- Review modified Vision and Goals for the Pelee Littoral Cells
- Review/discuss draft terms of reference
- Discuss progress on NRCan Proposal submission and confirm next steps

Discussion – Draft Vision and Goals

Linda Mortsch presented an updated vision and goals for the Littoral Cell based on input received at the previous meeting. Discussions were held for the vision and each of the goals, summarized below.

Discussion on the draft vision was as follows:

- GM – Wondering if we can use “our” to make it resonate we are all in this together.
- GM – Could include “climate change.”
- DM – Can we consider rewording “economic prosperity” to “economies” so it matches with the other words in the sentence.
- MP – I think it makes sense to take out spatial scales and timeframes.
- PZ – “To increase coastal resilience” could be added at the end.
- GM – Cocreation includes partners, but partners suggest that this might leave out shoreline or riparian residents. Could include public, i.e. “empowers partners and the public.”
- ND – Can we provide feedback at a later date?
 - LM – Within a week would be appreciated.
- ES – Who is the intended audience?
 - LM – It is the committee itself. It is a technical statement, so when we go to the public would need to be reworded to be more public friendly.
- SP – “Wellbeing” sounds better than “quality of life.”

Discussion on the Integrated Coastal Governance goal was as follows:

- GM – The term “governance” is jargony. When going to the public, will need to explain what it means. We will need a process of making joint decisions.

Discussion on the Coastal Resilience Plan goal was as follows:

- JB – Co-developing means something different for different groups (i.e. priorities, resilient communities, ecosystems). We do need to think about regulatory and legislative requirements.
- LM – We do need to ensure we have a collective understanding of the terms.
- PZ – After “collective action” add “that respects existing legislative and regulatory frameworks.”
- JB – We want to define solutions that align with existing requirements.
- GM – That might belong in the governance statement.
- JB – It makes sense to me to move it there.
- GM – Co-develop is fine. Not sure we need “coordinated priorities” given it is co-developed.

- SP – Does it have to be all about “new ways?” There may be existing ways that just need a bit of support (e.g., capacity, planning, appraisal, inclusion).
- PZ – “Existing frameworks or best practices or networks.”

Discussion on the Learning and Knowledge Mobilization goal was as follows:

- GM – Think about initiative for action. We added “capacity building.” It might be too jargony, but we do want to apply the knowledge.
 - LM – it was implied in “planning, priority setting and implement adaptation projects.”
- PZ – “Educate” is sometimes edgy. It implies we know, and the community needs to be educated. Suggest changing to “share knowledge with the broader community.”
- ND – Consider adhering to the two-eyed seeing approach.
- LM – That came up in the discussion in October. Would like to hear from the group, where and how to reflect that here.
- MP – It is the concept that both Traditional and western knowledge come together for better outcomes.
- ZH – The two-eyed seeing approach equally values western and Indigenous knowledge systems and application. Have not seen a lot of language in here yet about Indigenous leadership or governance. A lot of people do not know what that means, and there is nothing in the wording on education on two-eyed seeing here. It cannot be used in a tokenistic way and should be put at the front, if anywhere. If we say it, then we all need to be prepared to use Indigenous knowledge equal to western knowledge.
- ND – Thank you. It is a term that requires more exploration. It might need to go in the governance statement and should be upfront.
- PZ – there is an opportunity to make it clear. We will be meeting with the Chief to further discuss this project and opportunities for working together.

Discussion on the Implementation of Adaptation Projects goal was as follows:

- MP – Wondering about wording like “facilitate new approaches that move beyond support”, making it easier to do something better. In watershed planning, we talk about different approaches that are environmentally sensitive but make things easier.
- GM – Agree, knowledge mobilization and extension might be longer-term goal. There could be forums and workshops to make people more aware and share knowledge of adaptation. We could play a role in doing that.
- SP – We are creating conditions for collaboration, but should we consider how governance could be understood as a spectrum, with increasing levels of responsibility and accountability held by a shared governance structure (e.g., relationship-building bodies, collaborative decision-making, consensus-based management, etc.).

Discussion – Draft Terms of Reference

Pete Zuzek presented a draft terms of reference. Initial thoughts and feedback are summarized below:

- DM – Terms of reference are always open to be revised, and we can update as things evolve. As far as capping the committee, there are certain people that need to be around the table, so we might not want to cap it.
- JM – We may need a glossary to define how we are using words (e.g, action plan) that carry different means for groups.

- MP – I had the same question. I think of an action plan of the result of a management plan, it is the prioritization and movement of actions.
- PZ – We do not want to stop at the plan development, we want to move to action and make incremental improvements to increase our resilience and recognize the work is never complete.
- GM – We have a Lakewide Action and Management Plan. This initiative should acknowledge this, and explain how the two (action and management) are linked.
- EC – DFO would like a chance to review this and we can follow up with any more comments.
- SP – Should we have something in our vision or terms of reference about promoting investment and efficiency?

Discussion – NRCan Proposal Submission

Pete Zuzek presented an update on the NRCan proposal submission including the proposed timeline and process. The discussion that followed is summarized below:

- GM – What does engagement involve? You should clearly explain who will be engaged and what the desired outcomes are. What are we trying to achieve? It is awareness and knowledge transfer, and input back from the community – i.e., are we on the right track?
- SP – Assume the engagement work would be to understand the regional context, including biophysical assessment, uses, related governance, available finances, existing legislation and policies.
- PZ – The scope of engagement is not fully developed yet, because the submission is not fully developed. This committee is part of the engagement, but we envision holding public consultations as part of the process to further engage the community in the littoral cells.
- PZ – The options being presented here are early ideas. We want to put forward some potential ideas in the application to show the breadth of projects. We want to show breadth of opportunities, not a singular focus for resiliency.
- SP – There are some great ideas in the list.
- PZ – we have a template letter of support to share with the group. Looking to show that we have support to do this work within the littoral cell.
- EC – Just to confirm, federal dollars are not eligible towards the \$300,000 target for matching?
- PZ – For federal agencies, please identify one to two people to be involved, but matching funds need to be non-federal funds. We want to emphasize we have non-federal partners for the work. There are opportunities for in-kind resources to contribute to the match. Cash resources can be allocated any (or all) years from 2024 to 2027.
- PZ – Would be happy to chat about how to fill out information in the letter of support template.
- JM – Is there time for the group to review the application?
- PZ – We will be looking to create progress drafts and can set up meetings. We are being transparent. However, we should not share the submission beyond the group at this time. I (Pete) will be in Essex and would be happy to meet in person with anyone on November 29.

Future Meeting Dates

- January 26, 2024, 10am-12pm via Teams
- February 23, 2024, 10am-12pm via Teams

Meeting adjourned at 12pm.