

Friends of the Jock River

Annual Report 2000

Please note our new mailing address

11 Maitland Street
Richmond, Ontario,
K0A 2Z0

This page blank

Table of Contents

Item	Page Number
1. Agenda	4
2. Minutes of Annual Meeting February 15, 2000	6
3. Minutes of Special Meeting December 15, 2000	10
4. Membership List	12
5. Leadership List	13
6. Statistical Report	14
7. President's Report	15
8. Financial Reports	
8.1 Treasurer's Report	16
8.2 Financial Statements	17
9. Committee Reports	
9.1 Publicity Committee	20
9.2 Membership Committee	20
10.0 Project Reports.....	21
10.1 Spring Tree Plant.....	21
10.2 Walleye Tracking.....	22
10.3 Water Gauge Installation.....	24
10.4 Water Sampling.....	26
10.5 Garbage Clean-up.....	27
10.6 Shoreline Restoration	
10.61 Twin Elm.....	27
10.62 Other Locations.....	28
10.7 Education	
10.71 Jock River Walk.....	28
10.72 Shoreline Rehabilitation Project.....	28
10.8 Cedar Logs.....	30
10.9 MNR Restoration Tree Planting.....	30
11.0 Water Protection Advocacy Reports.....	31
11.1 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions.....	33
11.2 Water Taking Permits.....	36
11.3 Goulbourn Township Quarries.....	38
11.4 Other Water Protection Issues.....	41
12.0 Fundraising Report	
12.1 Blues Festival.....	44
13.0 Work Plan for 2001.....	44
13.1 Budget for 2001.....	46
14.0 Nomination Committee Report.....	48

**FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
AGENDA
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2001, 7:30 PM
Richmond Library**

Introduction

- 1.0 Approval of Agenda**
- 2.0 Minutes of February 15, 2000**
 - 2.1 Business arising from Minutes**
- 3.0 Minutes from Special Meeting Dec. 12, 2000**
- 4.0 Membership List**
- 5.0 Leadership List**
- 6.0 Statistical Report**
- 7.0 President's Report**
- 8.0 Financial Reports**
 - 8.1 Treasurer's Report**
 - 8.2 Financial Statements**
- 9.0 Committee Reports**
 - 9.1 Publicity Committee**
 - 9.2 Membership Committee**
- 10.0 Project Reports**
 - 10.1 Spring Tree Plant**
 - 10.2 Walleye Tracking**
 - 10.3 Water Gauge Installation**
 - 10.4 Water Sampling**
 - 10.5 Garbage Clean-up**
 - 10.6 Shoreline Restoration**
 - 10.61 Twin Elm**
 - 10.62 Other Locations**
 - 10.7 Education**
 - 10.8 Cedar Logs**
 - 10.9 MNR Restoration Tree Planting**

- 11.0 **Water Protection Advocacy Reports**
 - 11.1 **Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions**
 - 11.2 **Water Taking Permits**
 - 11.3 **Goulbourn Township Quarries**
 - 11.4 **Other Water Protection Issues**

- 12.0 **Fundraising Report**
 - 12.1 **Blues Festival**

- 13.0 **Work Plan for 2001**
 - 13.1 **Budget for 2001**

- 14.0 **Nomination Committee Report**
 - 14.1 **Election of President**
 - 14.2 **Election of Vice-President**
 - 14.3 **Election of Treasurer**
 - 14.4 **Election of Secretary**
 - 14.5 **Election of Director for Water Conservation and Usage**
 - 14.6 **Election of Director for Membership Roster and Management**
 - 14.7 **Election of Director for Projects and Actions**
 - 14.8 **Election of Director for Fundraising**
 - 14.9 **Election of Director for Publicity and Public Relations**
 - 14.10 **Election of Directors at Large**

- 15.0 **Nomination and Election of Members of Nominating Committee for 2001**

- 16.0 **Other Business**

- 17.0 **Adjournment**

2.0 Minutes of Annual Meeting February 15, 2000

FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER Minutes of the ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Chair: Niel Barrington

Minutes: Rob Dale

In Attendance:

Niel Barrington, Gary Belding, Tola Cooper, Chris Coupe, Rob Dale, Lynn Duffy, Brian Finch, Colin Heard (North West Goulbourn Community Association), John Jordon (NWGCA), Manjit Kerr-Upal (NWGCA), Frances Little, Ken McRae, Lynn Preston, Gordon Sample, Norman Siemens, Eric Snyder, Susan Springthorpe, Frank Stokes, Doug Watson, Tom Wright.

1. The agenda was accepted as amended.
2. The minutes of the 1999 Annual General Meeting were accepted as amended.

3. Business Arising from Minutes

4.1 Guide rail installation

Sue Springthorpe suggested that this should become part of the Jock River Watershed Plan.

ACTION ITEM: Niel to suggest inclusion of this in watershed plan.

4.2 Richmond Sewage System

The RMOC has assumed responsibility for this item.

4.3 Sign at Twin Elm

This Item is closed.

4.4 Frequency of Meetings

Some discussion on this issue was initiated by the chair. This item is now closed.

8.3 Greenprint

Sue Springthorpe reported that Greenprint has run into some charitable status problems. If certain changes are made, charitable status will be granted. The Greenprint AGM is on March 21, 2000, at 5:30 PM.

8.4 ECOS

At one point, there was optimism that funding could be secured for the Friends through ECOS. This has not materialized. GIS equipment and software was offered but not

accepted at this point. Sue Springthorpe pointed out that RMOC could be of some help in this area.

This item is now closed.

9.3 Education

Niel and Ken investigated the garbage situation at various points of the Jock in order to prepare for this year's Garbage Cleanup.

ACTION ITEM: Norm to investigate liability insurance for the Friends re: various projects.

The membership list was accepted as presented.

The leadership list was accepted as presented.

The Statistical Report was accepted as presented.

The President's Report was accepted as presented.

The Treasurer's Report was accepted as presented.

The Auditor's Report was accepted as presented.

The Financial Statements were accepted as presented.

(Norm moved acceptance. Brian seconded.)

The Publicity Committee Report was accepted as presented.

The Membership Committee Report was accepted as presented.

The Projects Committee Report was accepted as presented.

The Shoreline Rehabilitation Project Report was accepted as presented.

Tola suggested that specific monitoring of these types of projects could be carried out in future. For example, invertebrate sampling projects could be ongoing, with tracking in place to check for changes in invertebrate populations.

The Spring Tree Plant Report was accepted as presented.

The River Clean-up report was accepted as presented.

The Water Sampling Project Report was accepted as presented.

Brian reported that this year's sampling results are very similar to those amassed last year. Flowing Creek is in bad shape. Could the Friends initiate a project here? Brian wanted to point out that the majority of the water sampling volunteers are not members of the Friends.

The Walleye Tracking Projects were accepted as presented.

The walleye tracked so far appear to be fish that are endemic to one section of the Jock River, from Richmond to Half Moon Bay. Five more transmitters still have to be installed, and a schedule for monitoring the fish has to be worked out.

The Water Metering Project Report was accepted as presented.

Ken is to meet with Patrick Larson of the RVCA in early March to discuss locations for 2 permanent water level gauge locations and 12+ temporary stations on the Jock, which are to be checked by volunteers. Signage with all participating partners logos emblazoned thereon are to be erected at the stations.

ACTION ITEM: Niel and Ken to coordinate sending letters of thanks to those who made this project possible.

The Munster Sewage Treatment Report was accepted as presented.

The Blues Festival Beer Can Collection Project was accepted as presented.

The Water-Taking Permit Project Report was accepted as presented.

There were suggestions made by members to the effect that the Friends should try and bundle water issues into a single project. Eg: Aquifer depletion, water permits, water conservation etc.

The Water Navigation Project was accepted as presented.

ACTION ITEM: Niel to include in vehicular access crossings letter a question regarding water crossings. Are water crossings included?

The Cedar Logs Project Report was accepted as amended.

Someone has been stealing our logs.

PROPOSED WORK PLAN FOR THE YEAR 2000

Tree Planting

To obtain funding from Goulbourn, the Friends must make a presentation. 2 tree plants with total grants of \$6,000.00 are possible. Rob emphasized the importance of using native trees on these work projects.

Education

Niel would like the Friends to have a booth at the Wildlife Festival in April.

The Full Budget for 2000 was accepted as presented.

(Norm moved acceptance. Rob seconded.)

The Nomination Committee Report was accepted as amended.

Chris Coupe was nominated as Director-at-Large. Niel and Tola will head Publicity and Public Relations. Norm moved that those nominated be acclaimed as on the slate. Gordon seconded the motion, and the motion carried.

Appointment of an Auditor

Sue suggested that an accountant could do the annual audit, get paid for his services, and then donate the lion's share of his fee to the Friends.

Sue moved that the Friends inquire about alternative (cheap) auditing possibilities for the year 2000. Tom Wright seconded, and the motion carried.

Nomination and Election of Members for the 2000 Nominating Committee.

Gordon Sample and Doug Watson were nominated and elected for this task. The 2 members of the Board will be chosen later.

Report on Mother Teresa Water Quality Testing at Half Moon Bay

ACTION ITEM: Tom Wright to liaise with R. Howard (teacher at Mother Teresa) re Half Moon Bay water sampling and garbage clean-up.

Emergency Flood Planning

Tom made numerous inquiries to various government bodies to ask about telephone numbers that could be called in case of a Jock River flooding emergency, and about what emergency service would be available, and from where. It was finally ascertained that help in such an instance would come from Nepean Public Works at Moodie/Fallowfield (1159 Moodie Drive.) This assistance would only be available to Nepean residents. The person who can provide sand bags, sand, electric and gas pumps from this location is John Manconie of Nepean Public Works, who can be reached at 829-9640, x3240.

Tom moved that the Friends should have access to all municipal flood emergency contact persons names and numbers in the Jock River watershed in case of a flooding crisis. The motion carried.

Early April Canoeing on the Jock

Frank Stokes intends to create a list of those interested in the first paddle of the year on the Jock, when large sections of the river will be accessible to canoes because of high water levels. This can provide a good opportunity to scout large sections of the river normally inaccessible by boat, particularly in the upper portion of the Jock. An added bonus is that this outing can create more interest in the preservation of the river.

ACTION ITEM: Frank and Niel to publicize the Friends of the Jock Upper Jock River Canoe Outing.

3.0 Minutes of Special Meeting December 15, 2000

**FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER
GENERAL MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, December 12, 2000 7:30 PM**

Location: Upper Room, Richmond Firehall, Richmond, Ontario

Chair: Niel Barrington

Recording secretary: Eric Snyder

In Attendance: Niel Barrington, Brian Finch, Eric Snyder, Ken McRae, Chris Coupe

Agenda Items

1.0 Agenda

1.1 The agenda was approved.

2.0 Amendments to Constitution and Bylaws

2.1 Amendment to Article VII, §2.2 of the Constitution

2.11 Eric read the amendment to Article VII, §2.2 of the Constitution, approved by the Board at the Committee of the Whole meeting of December 5th, 2000. Brian proposed that a clause be added to the amended article.

2.111 Moved: Brian moved that the amended wording be revised to read 'All financial records shall be audited as required by the Board, or at the written request of at least 51 percent of the membership'.

Seconded: Ken.

Carried (unanimous).

2.112 Moved: Brian moved that Article VII, §2.2 of the Constitution of the FJR be deleted and replaced by 'All financial records shall be audited as required by the Board, or at the written request of at least 51 percent of the membership'.

Seconded: Ken.

Carried (unanimous).

2.2 Amendment to Article III, §6 of the Bylaws

2.21 Eric read the amendment to Article III, §6 of the Bylaws, approved by the

Board at the Committee of the Whole meeting of December 5th, 2000.

2.211 Moved: Ken moved that Article III, §6 of the Bylaws of the FJR be deleted.
Seconded: Brian.
Carried (unanimous).

2.3 Action: Eric will send a copy of the minutes of the December 12th General Meeting of the Membership, signed and dated by two members of the Board, to Canada Customs Revenue Agency, Charities Directorate.
Deadline: Jan. 5.

3.0 Meeting Adjourned

4.0 Membership List

Members in good standing as of December 31, 2000, are:

Volunteers

Niel Barrington
Tola Cooper
W. Barclay Cormack
Chris Coupe
Robert Dale
Frances Little
Ken McRae
Gordon Sample
Eric Snyder
Richard Stewart
Doug Watson
Marla Williams
Tom Osborne Wright
Tim van der Horn

Supporter

N. W. Broten
William G. Grant
Fred Hill
Ron Maybury
George Morris
Ryan Rattey
Otto Schreiber
Susan Springthorpe
Frank Stokes

Family

Dennis and Mary Ann Brown
Brian Finch and Teresa Rodrigues
Steven and Wendy Foster
Leslie Henry & Peter Wendt
Norman Siemens Family, Norman, Reta, Richard, and Julie

Corporate

Rideau Valley Conservation Authority
First Munster Scout Group

Region of Ottawa-Carleton
Muskie Canada - Ottawa Valley
NoreeTec Inc.

5.0 Leadership List

Officers of the Executive

President	Niel Barrington	823-3643
Vice-President	Brian Finch	825-8029
Treasurer	Norman Siemens (resigned September)	
Acting Treasurer	Brian Finch (appointed by executive)	
with assistance from	Chris Coupe (appointed by executive)	
Secretary	Eric Sneider	838-3572
Director for Water Conservation and Usage	Ken McRae	836-2011
Director for Membership Roster and Management	Tola Cooper (resigned December)	
Director for Projects and Actions	Tim van der Horn	838-4865
Director for Fund-raising	Vacant	
Director for Publicity and Public Relations	Vacant	
Director at Large	Chris Coupe	795-4203

Committee Chairs

Membership Committee Chair	Tola Cooper (resigned December)
Projects Committee Chair	Tim van der Horn
Nomination Committee Chair	Niel Barrington

Project Leadership

Twin Elm River Bank Stabilization	Tim van der Horn and Brian Finch
Spring Tree Plant	Niel Barrington
River Cleanup	Tim van der Horn
Water Sampling	Brian Finch
Walleye Tracking	Niel Barrington
Water Meters	Ken McRae
Munster Sewage	Brian Finch
Water Taking Permits	Ken McRae
Goulbourn Township Zoning By-law	Ken McRae and Norman Siemens
Cedar Logs Project	vacant

6.0 Statistical Report

Meetings	Number of Attendees
January 4	8
February 1	10
February 15 (Annual General Meeting)	20
March 7	13
April 4	12
May 2	13
June 6	5
July 4	8
August 1 no quorum; no minutes	?
September 5	6
October 3	13
November 9	9
December 5	6
December 12 (Special Meeting)	5

7.0 The President's Report

The year 2000 was a year of transition for the Friends Of The Jock River in more ways than one. Judging from the numerous kudos', awards and recognition we received from local politicians, the newspapers and The Rideau Valley Conservation Foundation, it is apparent we have matured from a fledgling environmental group to an organization that is respected as a real force for change in the Jock River Watershed. I believe that is because, from our very beginnings, the Friends of The Jock was an action oriented group. We at the Friends believed there had been enough talk, enough study -- it was time to take action to restore the health of the Jock River.

The year 2000 marked a transition in the executive for the first time since our formation. Eric Snyder became our new Secretary and has operated with great effectiveness in this position, improving communications between members and continuity between meetings. Keep up the good work, Eric!

Another change was Tola Cooper taking on Director of Membership from founding member Frances Little. Hats off to these fine ladies for all their work.

But it is with great respect, but sad heart, that I had to accept the resignation of founding member, long-time Treasurer and driving force in the Friends of the Jock River, Norman Siemens, whose work is taking him far from our little River. In fact, it is taking him around the world. Norm was instrumental in bringing the Friends from infancy to the group we are today; it was his great effort that finally got us the Registered Charitable Group status, in addition to countless hours of work, both in the field and in front of the computer, that helped bring about the legitimacy we enjoy today. On behalf of all The Friends, I am honored to thank Norm for all he has done for the Jock .

Niel Barrington

8.0 Financial Reports

These reports are being written by the acting Treasurer. Our elected Treasurer, Norm Siemens, moved to the US on a consulting contract in October. With his resignation from the post in September, he left a big hole in the organization. His control of the financial reins and his knowledge of the business side of the Friends of the Jock River have been particularly valuable. His advice during our start-up period, notably his experiences with the start-up of other organizations, his financial knowledge and his interest in the development of a precise constitution were critical during a critical stage.

Norm will continue to assist and advise by way of the internet. (He remains a member so on the occasional visit we may even be able to get him to plant a few trees.)

8.1 Treasurer's Report

Norm left the financial system and the finances in good order. Neither Chris Coupe nor I have Norm's knowledge of accounting but we have been able to follow the system established by Norm to get us safely to year's end.

The Friends undertook several financially significant projects this year. We received generous grants from the Canada Trust - Friends of the Environment, the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, the City of Nepean, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, and the Township of Goulbourn to fund our projects. A large financial commitment to one of our projects was made by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority. A number of businesses have taken out corporate memberships and we have also received donations from a number of individuals.

The RVCA continues to assist us on other matters such as photocopying and mail-outs which significantly defray our administrative costs.

The grants, donations and "in kind" donations have been greatly appreciated.

It is of note that the funding of the administrative side of the Friends has, to date, come entirely from donations and memberships since all of the grants have been tied to specific projects.

The overhead costs on projects is very low so that the vast majority of the funds we receive go directly into environmental benefits.

Brian Finch - Acting Treasurer

8.2 Financial Statements

	Balance Sheet	-- As of	December 31	2000	
			<u>2000</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>Variance</u>
<u>ASSETS</u>					
Chequing in Canada Trust Account	\$	8,238.49	2,653.08	5,585.41	
Petty Cash	\$	352.80	0.60	312.20	
Accounts Receivable	\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Other assets					
Advances/Loans	\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Prepaid Expenses	\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total assets	\$	8,591.29	2,653.68	5,897.61	
<u>LIABILITIES</u>					
Accounts Payable	\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Other Liabilities	\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Liabilities	\$	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Equity - Beginning	\$	2,653.69	118.75	2,534.94	
Receipts Minus Dispersements for Year	\$	5,937.60	2,550.93	676.67	
Equity - Ending	\$	8,591.29	2,653.68	5,897.61	
Total Equities	\$	8,591.29	2,653.68	5,897.61	
<u>EQUITY</u> <u>minus</u> <u>LIABILITIES</u>	\$	8,591.29	2,653.68	5,897.61	

DISPERSEMENTS

<u>GENERAL</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>Variance</u>
Advertising	\$ 0.00	1,020.00	1,020.00
Bank Charges	\$ 59.50	70.50	11.00
Books & Subscriptions	\$ 35.00	37.94	2.94
GST - Non-Project	\$ 11.69	28.70	17.01
Miscellaneous - Gen	\$ 0.04	0.00	-0.04
Funds			
Office Supplies	\$ 55.05	6.99	-48.06
Photocopy Costs	\$ 0.00	236.83	236.83
Postage	\$ 82.50	64.00	-18.50
PST - Non-Project	\$ 6.61	9.51	2.90
Telephone - Non Project	\$ 63.02	6.77	-56.25
Audit	\$ 300.00	0.00	-300.00

Total General	\$ 613.41	1,481.24	867.83

PROJECTS

Munster Sewage

Bank Charges	\$ 0.00	3.25	3.25
Documentation	\$ 0.00	10.00	10.00
Office Supplies	\$ 11.35	16.93	5.58
OMB Appeal	\$ 0.00	125.00	125.00
Parking	\$ 0.00	7.47	7.47
Photocopy Costs	\$ 22.60	48.37	25.77
Photographic	\$ 74.25	149.31	75.06
Postage	\$ 16.40	29.45	13.05
PST	\$ 8.67	14.47	5.80
GST	\$ 8.73	18.79	10.06
Telephone	\$ 0.00	7.23	7.23

Total	\$ 142.00	430.27	288.27

River Bank Stabilization (Twin Elm)

Total	\$ 0.00	1110.90	
-------	---------	---------	--

Water Gauges

GST	\$	0.13	0.09	-0.04
Postage	\$	1.84	0.00	-1.84
PST	\$	0.00	0.10	0.10
Telephone	\$	0.00	1.28	1.28
Water gauges	\$	12,207.70	0.00	-12,207.70
		-----	-----	-----
Total	\$	12,209.67	1.47	-12,208.20

Water Taking Permits

GST	\$	5.89	0.00	-5.89
Miscellaneous	\$	12.60	0.00	-12.60
Office Supplies	\$	71.43	0.00	-71.43
PST	\$	6.73	0.00	-6.73
		-----	-----	-----
Total	\$	96.65	0.00	-96.65

Clean-Up

GST	\$	6.39		
Miscellaneous	\$	91.30		
PST	\$	7.30		

Total	\$	105.00		

Spring Tree Plant

Food	\$	200.00		
GST	\$	12.39		
Miscellaneous	\$	18.72		
PST	\$	8.09		
Toilet Rental	\$	75.00		
Tree Purchase	\$	1,769.65		

Total	\$	2,083.85		

9.0 Committee Reports

9.1 Publicity Committee

There was no Publicity Committee in 2000.

9.2 Membership Committee

Tola Cooper resigned in December because of work pressures and we have since learned that she is moving to a new job in BC. Thank you Tola for your assistance and participation. We wish you the best in your new job.

We had hoped to get our members more actively involved this year by:

- following up on lapsed memberships; and
- sending out a newsletter at regular intervals to indicate what we were up to and what activities were coming up.

Unfortunately, we were not able to complete either. Recognizing the importance in communicating with our members, Eric Snyder, our Secretary, started working on a newsletter in December. The result is included with the AGM mail-out. The newsletter is a notable start that we hope will become a regular feature of similar high quality.

In past meetings of the whole, we have recognized and discussed the need to develop recruitment and communication strategies for the Friends. Several of the strategies discussed to date are: consulting with other organizations on how their strategies have worked; consider maintaining a website (can anyone assist us on this one?); conduct regular walks in areas of interest; organize a mudpout derby; get birders involved; maintain membership fees at present low level; set up information booths at public events; sponsor lectures at schools or for other interest groups (provide lecturers and bring in others); and act as stewards of particular areas. Some of the strategies are currently being worked on.

Brian Finch

10.0 Project Reports

Report From the Director of Projects and Actions

The year 2000 has been another success beginning with our fourth annual river clean-up. Each year we clean the Jock River of debris that has accumulated over the years. There is, however, always new garbage added each year, by irresponsible persons. Some of this garbage gets into the river with the help of the annual spring flooding. This need not happen if persons think ahead and put things which may float away out of the flood zone, or secure items so they won't float away. Other major problem areas are popular fishing spots and around bridges.

In the clean-ups prior to 2000, we netted four and one half automobiles and two three ton truck loads of other garbage for the Trail Road landfill site. These loads included tires of all sizes and a 200 gallon oil tank. This year the haul was smaller but still netted just under 2000 pounds of garbage. The McBean Street bridge in Richmond seems to be the end of the road for dishwashers, bikes, pop cans, undelivered circulars and numerous tires - just about anything that can be lifted over that railing.

Despite all of this, the mighty Jock River is making a remarkable come-back. Just last summer I saw peregrine falcons in Richmond, and just outside of town a pair of river otters. The quality of water has visually improved since the Friends of the Jock was formed.

Since 1997, approximately 12,000 trees have been planted. Some of the trees which were planted three and a half years ago have reached over five feet in height. I believe our projects such as the one at the Twin Elm site will make a huge difference in the Jock River's future (as well as improve the quality of ground water) and in keeping the watershed healthy and beautiful.

I hope people will come to realize that we have a wonderful healthy river in our own backyards, not a ditch to throw garbage into.

Come out to enjoy the river, or better yet become a member.

Tim van der Horn

10.1 Spring Tree Plant –2000

The Friends asked for \$4,000 and received a grant in the amount of \$2,000 for tree planting from the Township of Goulbourn under the Community Grant Program. In our presentation of our grant request, it was gratifying to receive

the many complements on our work from members of Goulbourn Council.

The site chosen for this plant was the Richmond Conservation Area, which is located on the Jock River just downstream of Richmond. The plant was carefully planned to follow the management plan for the conservation area (as prepared by the Goulbourn Environmental Advisory Committee (GEAC)).

The Friends enlisted the services of retired forester Mark Schaefer, who walked the site with Niel and Eric before "P-day" (plant day) to determine which trees should go where. Other planning involved the ordering of food, the mobilization of the Boy Scouts, getting a portable toilet on site, as well as getting 20 bags of seedlings into the ground. Members of the Friends who should be recognized in this endeavor are Director of Projects, Tim van der Horn, member Doug Watson (who had access to a trailer to bring the trees from Kemptville), and Eric Snyder, who had a great knowledge of the area to be planted.

This year we put in 500 burr oaks, 500 silver maples, 500 green ash and 2000 white cedars. The plant went very well and I would like to thank all the Boy Scouts and Scout leaders who came out. As usual, I ordered more trees than we could plant in one day. The leftover seedlings were "heeled in" on site, and over the next two weeks were planted by the Friends. With ideal growing conditions this year, I have high hopes for this plant. I am looking forward to spring 2001 to get on site to see how they did, and get some tending in. The 3500 trees were a good number, but I think we can do better!

Niel Barrington

10.2 Walleye Tracking

The Walley Tracking project is a joint program of the Grenville-Carleton Conservation and Sportsmen's Club, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and the Friends of The Jock. The project was funded by the MNR.

The project started in 1999 with the netting of walleye and the implantation of radio transmitters. The fish were tracked through 1999.

This 2000 report is made with a thank you to the various organizations involved but especially to the volunteers who have given of their time to work on the project. Thank you.

Our project for this year started in late March with the monitoring of water temperature, observation of spawning locations/numbers and the tracking of the subject fish in the river, primarily at the Twin Elm Bridge and in the Village of Richmond near the spawning beds.

In the observations below, the fish implanted with radio transmitters are identified with numbers (#100).

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Temp.</u>	<u>Observations</u>
March 29	Spawning beds	3C	no fish recorded or seen
March 30	Spawning beds	3C	no fish recorded or seen
March 31	Spawning beds	3C	no fish recorded or seen
April 2	Spawning beds	6C	30 small males, #100 above beds
April 4	Kettle's Barn	5C [^]	#200 & 220 on beds
April 7	George's	3C	no fish recorded or seen
April 11	Twin Elm	3C	no fish recorded or seen
April 12	Twin Elm	3C	no fish recorded or seen
April 14	Spawning beds	8C	20 eyes; no fish recorded
April 15	Spawning beds	12C	35 eyes at head of beds; no fish recorded
April 16	Munster Road	9C	no fish recorded or seen
April 16	Kettle's barn	10C	#200-good signal; no eyes
April 20	Munster-Golf Club	10C	#220 in bay above Joy's road;strong signal
May 16	Joy's Road	---	#200 near railroad; #210 downstream near pipeline
June 14	Twin Elm-Bow	19C	#120 & 130 opposite Moodie's; #100 at Eddie's bend
June 15	Twin Elm-Bow	19c	#120 & 130 same place
July 17	Joy's Road	---	#200 between road and railway
July 30	Twin Elm	---	#130 near infill at Moodie's; #120 downstream at pine tree:#140 behind McVicar's
Aug 13	Joy's Road	20C	#200 near pipeline-strong signal
Aug 15	Twin Elm	20C	#120-130 at Moodie's 140 behind MCVicar's
Aug 16	Upper river	---	Checked spawning beds; no fish recorded or seen. Scott and Neil discussed plans for remaining transmitters -will find spawning beds in lower river spring 2001
Aug 28	Twin Elm	20C	#120 & 130 same locations*

- Notes: 1. [^] the fall in water temperature was due to a large snowstorm we received on April 5 -6 or thereabouts.
 2. * indicates my belief that these fish are dead or that the transmitters are just lying on the bottom of the river. I was unable to detect any movement from early spring till late fall.

This concludes the technical information gathered during the spring and summer.

We will continue to monitor the fish this winter with snowmobiles, and endeavor to find new spawning beds in the spring of 2001.

Respectfully submitted

Alastair Munro
 Grenville-Carleton Conservation and Sportsmen's Club
 838-5501

10.3 Water Gauge Installation

There is presently only one permanent water gauge station on the Jock River. This station has been located at Moodie Drive, in Nepean, for 30 years and is operated by Environment Canada.

The RVCA's "Jock River Watershed Plan Interim Report" indicated that more stream flow monitoring was required to better understand the hydrological effects of the main wetlands and to quantify base flow at strategic locations in the watershed. It suggested that a minimum of two additional flow monitoring stations was required. Consultations with the RVCA have determined that installation and first year of operation for two permanent water gauge stations would be about \$34,600.

After about 2 years of effort, Ken McRae secured the funding (cash or commitments for goods and services) for the project. The contributors have been: the Township of Goulbourn - \$2,000.00 (1999); the City of Nepean \$5,260.00 (2000); the Regional Municipality of Ottawa - Carleton \$5,260.00 (2000); and a commitment from the RVCA for the remaining amount. The RVCA, as a critical partner in the project, committed to install, operate, maintain, and provide all data collection and data management. In year 2000, the funding we had obtained from the contributors was turned over to the RVCA.

The FOJR organized the project and agreed to organize, with the assistance of the RVCA, volunteers to take manual readings at 12 or more temporary locations for a period of at least 3 years.

At the time of last year's report (Jan./2000), it was expected that 2 new permanent water gauge stations would be installed by early summer 2000 and that readings would begin in April or May 2000. For a host of reasons, this works has not been carried out.

In regard to the temporary stations, the FOJR identified 33 potential locations. About 20 of these were visited in 2000 to assess whether they would be appropriate. Unfortunately, due to a shortage of people and to other more pressing matters, this is as far as the FOJR portion has progressed. We will address this project with renewed vigor this spring, determine all manual station locations, determine the data to be collected at each, purchase and put together needed equipment and manuals, and line up volunteers to gather the data.

Please see the letter I received from Patrick Larsen, RVCA, summarizing the status of the permanent water gauge station part of the project:

The goal of this part of the streamflow monitoring project is to install two permanent water level/streamflow monitoring stations at strategic sites along the system to complement the existing station at Moodie Dr. The objective is

to gain a better understanding of the flow characteristics of the Jock including the outflow from the upper part of the system and the role of the wetlands. A specific objective is to more accurately quantify the available supply of water taking from the Jock River, particularly in the upper part of the watershed.

A reconnaissance was conducted in July, 2000 to identify appropriate locations. Three suitable sites were found:

- The Franktown Road bridge*
- Ashton Dam*
- upstream of the Richmond Weir*

The Franktown Road site was considered to be the best site for the following reasons:

- it is reasonably representative of the upper jock River watershed being upstream of both the Richmond Fen and the confluence of Kings Creek.*
- channel characteristics are suitable for the range for flow measurements with the installation of a low level weir*
- located at the Riverbend Golf Course to allow direct measurement of available water for course irrigation.*

The pumphouse in the golf course adjacent to the footbridge to the first tee immediately upstream from the Franktown Road bridge offered a simple and cost-effective location for the station being an existing building. It would require a minor construction project to install a low concrete weir under the footbridge to confine flows during the driest periods to allow accurate measurement. It was decided to seek the co-operation of the owner of the golf course, Mr. Frank Chiarelli, for the installation. Such a relationship seemed to be worth pursuing because it would give the Authority and FOJR a good site to get continuous flow data. At the same time, in exchange for the short-term inconvenience of the installation work, the data to comply with the golf course water taking permit would be available to the Ministry of the Environment with no effort on Mr. Chiarelli's part. Mr. Chiarelli was contacted and referred us to the engineering consultant (OMMTrow) he had retained to do the analysis required for The Permit To Take Water.

Unfortunately, it was not until late October that we received a letter from OMMTrow stating that Mr. Chiarelli had agreed to the installation. It was then necessary to contact Mr. Chiarelli to make arrangements for the installation. However, with the end of the golf season, Mr. Chiarelli was in the process of shutting down the course and the gauge installation project was not a high priority. It finally required a visit to the course to meet with Mr. Chiarelli. The result of that discussion was that Mr. Chiarelli decided to withdraw the permission to install the gauge station on the golf course property because he felt that it would be better for all parties to remain at arms length. He thought

that the issue of water taking for irrigation of the course would always be contentious and it would be difficult to maintain a co-operative arrangement under the circumstances.

With the onset of cold weather, sites at Jock Trail and at Munster Sideroad were revisited but the same conclusion was reached as previously that neither is as good as the Franktown Road site. At that time, it was decided that there was nothing further that could be done until spring.

It is possible to install the gauge station in the road allowance adjacent to the Franktown /Road Bridge and a low flow can probably be installed but it will be more difficult and, therefore, more expensive. As mentioned above, data from this site would be very informative, probably as much as data from two other sites combined. We will attempt to monitor conditions as often as possible in the Spring at these three locations to gain some corroborative information and make a final assessment at that time. However, at this time we recommend the following:

That a sufficient portion of the funding originally intended for the installation of two permanent streamflow monitoring stations on the Jock River be diverted to enable the construction of one good quality station in the vicinity of the Franktown Road bridge.

The use of any remaining funds can be determined at a later date.

Patrick Larson –Water Resources Technician, RVCA

10.4 Water Sampling Report 2000

There was no water sampling project in year 2000. The RVCA felt that there were sufficient data gathered over the past years to establish a fairly detailed picture of the water quality of the Jock River. The RVCA continued to conduct a scaled back sampling program with its own staff so data collection continued at key sites.

The Friends were approached by two Carleton students in environmental science, for advice and assistance in their projects on the Jock River. With our assistance, the students conducted some limited water sampling in the Fall. We received their report which tends to confirm previous sampling results. They hope to continue sampling in 2001.

Based on previous years results, it is safe to assume that the upper end of the river is in better shape than the bottom part and that some tributaries, notably, Flowing Creek and Monaghan Drain, are in poor shape.

The continued sampling of the Jock River is critical in monitoring the health (or lack thereof) of the watershed. Invertebrate surveys should be conducted at different times through the coming year.

Brian Finch

10.5 Garbage Clean-Up

The year 2000 saw our fourth annual river clean-up. In the clean-ups prior to 2000, we netted four and one half automobiles and two three ton truck loads of other garbage for the Trail Road landfill site. These loads included tires from cars, trucks, and from tractors. One 200 gallon oil tank was removed by eight people, a four wheeler and a back-hoe. The autos were removed by a wrecker and a back-hoe, and a flat bed truck.

This year the haul was smaller but still netted just over 1800 pounds of garbage. This amount does not include the dozen or so garbage bags of plastic, paper and glass that were sorted and recycled. Amongst the interesting finds were **many** dozens of advertising circulars that someone, too lazy to deliver, tossed off the McBean Street bridge in Richmond.

Tim van der Horn

10.6 Shoreline Restoration

10.6.1 Twin Elm

The very low spring run-off barely touched the bottom of the fence this year. It will remain for a higher run-off to test the strength of the fence and the design of the protector posts.

The cattle are using the nose pump and are staying in the general vicinity of the pump. Consequently, there does not appear to be any tendency for cattle to test the fence.

As noted in last year's report, many trees from previous plantings did not survive the previous two drought summers (1998 and 1999). However, those that made it into 2000 prospered. Despite our only moderate success rate in the Twin Elm property, expert foresters have indicated that shoreline planting of the type we undertook is very challenging. Their evaluation was that our success rate is actually very good. There was a minor planting in the Spring of about 100 small trees, primarily ash, to augment plantings in previous years. These trees were placed in the lowest, wettest portion of the field (NE portion).

Grasses (some planted) and other ground cover have claimed the cattle-damaged portions of the shore. In the areas that were stabilized with the coir

(cocoa nut fibre) mats, the new vegetation sometimes makes it difficult to find the mat. The shallow water aquatic plants destroyed by the cattle re-established themselves in the fall of 1999 and have done very well in 2000. Many large bull frogs and fish were using the protection of the pickle weed patches.

Tim van der Horn erected signage for the Twin Elm project on the opposite side of the river from the project, along a fence near the Richmond Road. The sign identifies the project and those that contributed. The site for the sign was chosen for its visibility to passing motorists. Tim also planted some trees near the sign so the sign will not get lonely.

Brian Finch

10.6.2 Other Locations

See the Education Project below.

10.7 Education Projects

10.7.1 Jock River Walk

The Jock River Walk in June was a big success. The team of Tola Cooper, Eric Snyder and Ryan Rattey provided an environmental education tour of the Jock River at Jock Park for kids ages 6-13 from the Richmond St. Paul's Church Eco-Group. The aim of the walk was to show what's in and around the Jock River, learn about the different ecosystems in 3 smaller tours called "The Walk" (by Eric), "Bugs" (by Tola) and "The Stream" (by Ryan), and how to monitor using the *Save Our Streams* guide. The children were divided into the 'Shells', 'Fish' and 'Butterflies' and alternated between the three small tour areas to lead up to the final talk called "How to be a Friend of the Jock River" showing on a chart in the handout how kids can monitor. Children responded to questions very well and understood some very complex problems.

This side project was based on "Life Along the Water" in *On the Waterfront* by the RVCA, an important publication on understanding the good side and bad sides of shorelines and what to monitor.

10.7.2 Shoreline Rehabilitation Education Project

We received funding from the Friends of the Environment Foundation (\$7,000) in June 2000 but the progress on the project has been slow. A considerable amount of planning and consultation has been required. The only expenditures in 2000 have been for chest waders. The team's specific tasks need to be on-schedule to meet spring and summer activity implementation deadlines.

The schedule for late winter/spring 2001 contains:

- the lecture component composed of a handout, poster presentation, mapping exercise and research-planning; and
- the field instruction component which includes:
 1. planning for shoreline rehabilitation of the sites (agricultural land)
 - land restoration - this will involve ecosystem management planning of reforestation on agricultural land using best management practices and forest management planning information such as the landowner's tool, the Managed Forest Tax Incentive Plan. Other tasks include natural resource inventory and investigating permanent agriculture, or permaculture.
 - restoration of the aquatic ecosystem - this will involve discussing the Watershed Report Card with students.
 2. macroinvertebrate sampling; and,
 3. tree planting.

Project Locations:

1. Chris Ledderhoff property, 7555 Soldier's Line, Richmond, Lot 13, Concession 2 shorelines: 1800ft, 1300ft.
2. (proposed) Twin Elm Rehabilitation 1999 site, Alastair Monro property, Richmond Rd.
3. (proposed) Flowing Creek, Perth Rd & Eagleson, Richmond.

The schedule is being discussed with five (5) regional schools: South Carleton Secondary School, Bell High School, Nepean High School, Merivale High School and John McRae Secondary School. A few more schools may be added.

The handout for the Lecture and Field Instruction stages is based on field guides: *Stream Assessment Protocol for Southern Ontario 1996*; *Save Our Streams - Volunteer Trainer's Handbook 1994*, and adaptations from ecosystem management training from Sir Sandford Fleming College. These guides are to be used cooperatively with students and FOJR during the planning and/or research sections of the Lecture and Field Instruction in the winter months to better understand these activities before their implementation in spring and summer. With such cooperation we can make informed decisions or 'ecosystem statements' together about site recommendations for action.

The project is an experiment in learning how to plan ecological activities. It is a

way in which the FOJR and young people can better understand and connect with the Jock River ecosystems. Furthermore, some of the implementation will benefit the health of the Jock River. The FOJR will receive some much-needed investigation into the needs for shoreline rehabilitation in selected parts of the Jock River watershed.

Project Leader: Ryan Rattey

Other Team Members: Tim van der Horn, Eric Snyder, Niel Barrington, Brian Finch

Respectfully submitted,
Ryan Rattey
723-1205

10.8 Cedar Logs Project

The cedar logs donated by Goulbourn township are currently piled in the Twin Elm field owned by Mary and Alastair Munro. We had intended to peel and cut the logs to lengths suitable for fencing in 2000 but we were unable to get a leader to handle the project.

The logs will have to be peeled and cut in 2001 to prevent their deterioration.

Brian Finch

10.9 MNR Restoration Tree Planting

This project was not in our year 2000 project plan discussed and approved at the beginning of the year. We applied for this grant at the urging of Mike Rosen, Stewardship Ottawa-Carleton. We requested \$2,000 for shoreline restoration planting and received a grant for \$1,000. The grant was received too late for a spring plant and trees are difficult to obtain in the fall. (In addition, trees planted in the fall have a high failure rate.) Therefore, no work was planned for 2000. Just under 1,000 trees have been ordered, to be planted in Spring 2001. We will be getting the Boy Scouts involved again to assist in the planting. As the planting date gets closer, more trees will be ordered. The total number of trees could reach 2,000.

Niel Barrington

11.0 Water Protection Advocacy

This is the largest section in the annual report. Its length indicates the large

number of water protection issues in the watershed and the importance the Friends of the Jock River places on water protection.

In 2000 the Friends of the Jock River (FOJR) addressed the matter of water protection issues on a number of fronts which included Permits To Take Water (PTTW), protecting wetlands from development pressures, sewage treatment solutions, water monitoring and, more recently, groundwater pollution. Our Vice President, Brian Finch, capably represented our position at an Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) hearing, regarding the issue of how Munster sewage should be treated in the future. Please see Brian's more detailed individual report, below. Two other members of the FOJR, Gordon Sample and Richard Bendall, both residents of the Munster area, were involved in the issue of Munster's sewage treatment long before they joined the FOJR. Believing strongly in their views on this matter, they each filed "Bump-up EA" requests and made appeals to the OMB. Gordon put his own money and time where his mouth was to hire a lawyer and a consultant planner to act on his behalf at that hearing. He allowed other parties to the appeal access to his lawyer and consultant planner which helped to share information and to formulate arguments for the hearing. Thank you and a salute to Brian, Richard and Gordon for their fortitude in dealing with this matter. We're all hopeful that your efforts will bear sweet fruit.

Please see the separate reports following this report.

Conclusions on Water Issues

The various water issues over the past few years have drawn me to 5 conclusions regarding water problems and their solutions:

1. The various government entities (MNR, MOE, and the conservation authorities) responsible for protecting water resources in this province are grossly under-funded and understaffed by the present government of Ontario. This under-funding, combined with this provincial government's policies of self-regulation and privatization have caused a significant deterioration in the quality and quantity of our water. The Ontario government needs to quickly increase the funding and staff levels of these government bodies for them to properly carry out their mandates to protect the environment and citizens.
2. Ontario needs a Wetlands Act or Wetlands Protection Act. The Provincial Policy Statement under the Planning Act doesn't provide any penalties for landowners who carry out actions which negatively impact and in numerous cases destroy wetlands. Legislation is needed to empower courts to be able to impose hefty fines and restoration orders.
3. At one time, MNR carried out all of the Wetland Evaluations but, since cutbacks, they've had to rely more and more upon wetland evaluations

produced by developers' environmental consultants. These consultants are under pressure to provide their clients with Wetland Evaluations or Wetlands Impact Studies which provide the client with a significant financial return, such as by making a boundary smaller than it really is or by scoring a wetland so as to make sure it doesn't get provincially significant status. The chances of anyone recognizing and pointing out any significant deficiency in a consultant's report and pressing the matter enough to get it corrected are very slim. Also, developers can presently have 2 or more different consultants do impact studies and/or evaluations and pick whichever one best suits their interests.

To eliminate these problems, I suggest that the proponent be required to give MNR payment up front for the study or evaluation. Then MNR will have the choice of having its own staff or its independent consultant do the work. The resulting study would be done at arms length and independent from the proponent.

If a consultant or MNR staff person is found to be incompetent, they should lose their MNR certification for carrying out such work, until they take more training and pass a test.

4. Many Wetland Evaluations have resulted in incorrect scoring and mapping because many landowners refuse access to their property, thus denying proper evaluation. A Wetlands Act or Wetlands Protection Act should be enacted authorizing MNR or their approved agent(s) to go onto any lands to properly evaluate, map and or monitor wetlands/adjacent lands/buffers. Wetlands would be much more accurately scored, mapped and protected.
5. Municipal governments do a poor job of monitoring to ensure that the "Terms and Conditions of Approval" for developments are in fact complied with and carried out in an appropriate time frame. All too often, sedimentation and erosion controls are called for, but ignored. The result is a negative impact upon water habitats and species. Municipal governments need to have sufficient, trained staff to monitor compliance. If they don't have the budget they should consider empowering volunteers to do some of the work for them.

Respectfully submitted

Ken McRae
Director for Water Conservation and Usage

11.1 Munster Sewage Treatment Issue

The issue relates to a decision by the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton

to install a 11 km pipeline to transport sewage from Munster Hamlet to Richmond. The sewage would then be pumped into the RMOC sewage collector system for eventual treatment at the RMOC sewage treatment facility at Green's Creek (ROPEC) some 50 km away. The effluent from this facility is treated to a secondary quality (and chlorinated in the summer months) before being discharged to the Ottawa River. All of the other Munster options, besides the status quo (the existing failed lagoons and spray field), involved on-site treatment of the sewage to tertiary effluent quality. The option favoured by the FOJR was on-site treatment of the sewage with discharge of a high quality effluent to the Jock River. Our contention was that this option would retain the water within the watershed and would augment the flow of the upper Jock River with water of better quality than the water currently in the Jock. The added flow would be particularly important during the summer months in dry years.

In 1999, the FOJR appealed to the Ontario Minister of the Environment to conduct a "bump-up" environmental review of the project's environmental assessment. The Minister rejected the request. This was not a surprise as we now understand that the Minister has rejected all bump-up requests in recent years. It is of note that the Ontario's so-called "Class Environmental Assessment (Class EA)" process absolves the provincial government of involvement in the assessment, passes the task of assessment to the proponents (heard the story about the foxes managing the chicken coop?) and establishes who and how proponents are to consult. Surprisingly, it says nothing about how the environment is to be evaluated or valued. The process is sadly lacking.

Also in 1999, the Friends appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board to reject the RMOC's request for an amendment of the RMOC Official Plan to allow a pipeline from Munster to Richmond and to remove the sewage lagoon in Munster. The main reasons for the appeal were similar to those identified in the request for an EA bump-up. However, we also noted a concern over the acceptance of non-compliant tenders in the request for proposals process, and the evaluation of the proposals and pipeline route by the RMOC's consultant, Connestoga Rovers and Associates (CRA).

Three other parties also appealed the RMOC's decision: Gordon Sample, Richard Bendall (both active members of the Friends) and the Citizen Review Committee for Waste Management of Ottawa-Carleton.

A pre-hearing was held Jan 21, 2000, followed by three weeks of hearings, spread over three sessions, ending on July 10, 2000. The Board ordered the engineer expert witnesses on both sides to prepare a report due August 15, 2000. **As of January, 2000, the OMB's decision is still pending.**

All of the appellants stated concerns about the Regions handling of objections to the request for amendment of the region's official plan. Committee members of the RMOC's Planning and Environment Committee were poorly informed of the

issue and the Committee Chair severely restricted dissenting discussion on the choice of the pipeline option. In addition, the Committee's decision was rushed to full Council the next day rather than, as usual, dealing with it at the following Council meeting. These concerns would not be judged by the OMB to be pertinent to the appeal.

The major issues in the OMB case were:

- the RMOC's official planners were not adequately involved in the process. The planners had no involvement prior to the writing of the amendment to the Official Plan and had not familiarized themselves with the consultant's evaluation. During the hearing, the OMB Chair was critical of the planners lack of involvement in the planning process. It is hoped that this criticism finds its way into the OMB decision and that the new city of Ottawa takes note.
- the pipeline bids should have been rejected as non-compliant. The original request for proposals (RFP) was for high tech treatment of sewage in Munster Hamlet.
- the evaluation of the treatment options was criticized:
 - residents of Richmond were not involved in the public liaison committee for the evaluation of the sewage handling options. Ultimately, with the choice of the pipeline option and the subsequent choice of the route (in a second study), the residents of Richmond (and not those of Munster) would be most affected by the installation of the pipe and by the potential loss of sewage handling capacity within Richmond.
 - the costs of the pipeline were not properly known and factored into the evaluation. For example, the amount of rock to be removed in the laying of a pipe, a significant cost factor, was completely unknown at the time. An upgrade of the Richmond pumping station would be required in the Munster pipeline option but the proportional cost of the upgrade was not factored into the cost of the pipeline option. The pipeline cost used by the Region's consultant was significantly different from cost estimates made in another study by Totten Sims Hubicki in 1998.
 - the matrix used to evaluate the different options was criticized. Some of the factors in the matrix did not carry their normal meanings. The evaluation of the pipeline option under some factors did not consider that the Munster sewage would proceed beyond Richmond and into the RMOC sewage network for eventual treatment at ROPEC. In our opinion, the net benefits for treated

effluent discharge to the Jock or other local discharge (Snowfluent) were not adequately rated for several of the options. For one option, the benefits from the decommissioning of the current lagoons by construction of an artificial wetland were inadequately rated.

- some of the proponents of the alternate on-site treatment options felt that the Region's consultants did not adequately inform themselves of the design and operation of proposed options and consequently, could not properly evaluate them. These proponents also felt that the three year operating costs in their fixed cost bids should not have been modified upwards.
- the additional cost of hauling the Munster sewage to ROPEC (currently \$600,000 on an annual basis) was not factored into the pipeline option. The pipeline option required additional time for the evaluation of the pipeline route and would take longer to construct than the on-site options. The additional cost of the consultant's study (\$250,000) required for the selection of the pipeline route was not included in the cost of the pipeline option in the initial study.
- the on-site design-build submissions were firm bids with known costs and relatively short construction times. By comparison, the pipeline option to Richmond had uncertain costs (with considerable potential to escalate from the estimates) and longer construction times.
- the Region's Official Plan specifically prevents the extension of central services (e.g., central sewage treatment) to outlying areas unless there is a health problem. The current Munster Hamlet sewage lagoons leak and the spray fields lack assimilative capacity but there is no health problem.
- the route of the pipeline is through the Richmond Fen, a provincially significant wetland. There was concern for the potential for damage to the Fen due to construction of the pipe in the road shoulder and to spills in the event of possible pipe ruptures. (Note: the RMOC was not required by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment to conduct an environmental assessment because the pipe would be placed in the road shoulder. If it were placed a few metres away from the roadbed, the highest level of environmental assessment would have been required. We think the MOE assessment requirements are seriously flawed.)

The OMB appeal was made on the behalf of the Friends of the Jock and argued by Brian Finch. Considerable assistance was provided by Ken McRae in gathering background documents and in the development of the arguments. Richard Bendall, Gordon Sample and Gordon's lawyers, Terrence Denison and Joyce Taylor, provided valuable advice and critique of our arguments.

11.2 Water Taking Permits Project

1. Monarch Construction applied for a Permit To Take Water (PTTW) to take up to 153,000 gallons of water per day from its proposed 9 hole golf course water trap/ storm water management ponds, from April 1 to October 31 each year, in perpetuity, to irrigate the golf course. It was also asking that if, because of a lack of precipitation or whatever, their ponds were going dry, they be authorized to pump up to 136,800 gallons of groundwater per day from a well. They intend to ask for another permit to irrigate the other 9 holes of their 18 hole golf course, when it is closer to completion. A letter, dated March 2, 2000, was sent to Clyde Hammond, Supervisor Water Resources Unit, (MOE). I met with Monarch Construction staff and their hydrogeological consultant concerning some uncertainties in their application posted on MOE's Environmental Bill of Rights Registry (EBR). Comments were submitted to Mr. Hammond at MOE. Not surprisingly, the MOE "Decision" posted later indicated that a permit had been issued, pretty much as requested, except the permit is for 10 years. Surprisingly, the decision posted on the EBR indicated that no comments had been received about the permit application. Hammond admitted that it was an error that would be corrected. Since no correction had been made as of December 30, 2000, a follow-up will apparently be necessary.

2. The Region of Ottawa-Carleton made comments in the press on the Omya PTTW application from the Tay River. Regarding our concern for permits to take water within Ottawa-Carleton, the following comments on our frustrations with water taking permits were sent to the Planning and Environment Committee of the Region of Ottawa-Carleton, May 23, 2000 the Region: (Note: *the FOJR is not involved in the Omya issue. - ed.*)
 1. At the time there were 23 PTTW on the EBR for the Ottawa-Carleton region. The combined allowable taking on these permits was 234,912,760 gallons of water per day.
 2. At that time there were 9 proposals for new water taking permits within Ottawa-Carleton, totaling 5,780,315 gallons per day.
 3. There are a number of other existing water taking permits within Ottawa-Carleton which aren't indicated on the EBR because they were either issued before the EBR began and haven't required renewal or are exempt from being posted. An example of the former is a permit that the Riverbend Golf Club received in 1994

which allows it to take up to a maximum of 50,000 gal/d, for any 15 days per year from June 1 to August 31. That permit expires in 2004. An example of an exemption is the former Region of Ottawa-Carleton's water taking permits for communal wells in Munster and in Richmond. The combined allowable water taking for the two is 1,051,870 gal/d.

4. There are some exemptions from EBR posting, such as agricultural irrigation of crops, most municipal takings and those sought for a specific reason for less than a year. We suggested that all proposals for PTTW for more than 7 days be posted on the EBR to make it possible to track individual and cumulative amounts of water taken from the Jock River Watershed and others.
5. MOE has been doing a very poor job of administering water taking permits. Their biggest problem is that they don't have sufficient staff and funds to do their jobs properly.
6. MOE doesn't have a readily accessible list of all PTTW holders by watershed. Therefore, they do not know how much water has been already allocated via permits when they review applications for new permits and permit renewals.
7. There are many takers of large amounts of water that should have a PTTW but don't. We are aware of a local golf course, quarry, and cement making plant that currently don't have a PTTW.
8. MOE carries out little or no monitoring of PTTW holders to ensure compliance with conditions of their permits. Permits only show the maximum amounts of water a holder can take and generally over a long period of several months, up to year round. This does not provide accurate information on how much water is actually being taken and when. This information is crucial for the proper management of our water resources on a watershed/ecosystem basis. It should be compulsory for all permit holders to keep records showing this information.
9. MOE doesn't know what the sustainable and environmentally appropriate water taking capacity is for groundwater and/or surface water takings by watershed.
10. We agreed with the Region's Director of Water Environment Protection Division, that there is a need for adequate and up to date flow data. I reminded and thanked them for the Region's partnership with the FOJR to establish 2 new permanent water gauge stations in the Jock River Watershed.

11. We asked the RMOC to consider lobbying the Ontario government to adequately fund MOE so it can carry out its legislative and policy responsibilities. We also encouraged the Region to review and comment on "Proposals" for water taking permits within Ottawa-Carleton. We have not received any comment from that Committee or any of its members regarding this representation. If and when the time can be found, the matter may be taken up with the new City of Ottawa.

Ken McRae

11.3 Goulbourn Township Quarries

1. Cavanagh Construction Limited applied for a Permit To Take Water (PTTW) to pump up to 2,700 gallons of water per minute from the groundwater aquifer to de-water their quarry on Jinkinson Side Road. On February 12, 2000, I sent a letter to the Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE) stating our concerns by asking the following questions:

1. What would the effects of the proposed water taking be upon the water-table or aquifer?
2. Where will the pumped water go and what effects will that water have off the quarry site?
3. Will the permit holder comply with the "Terms and Conditions" of the permit?
4. Will MOE monitor and inspect to ensure that the permit holder is in fact complying with the "Terms and Conditions" of the permit?

Each concern was elaborated upon in detail. The MOE has not yet issued a decision. As part of Cavanagh's development of its quarry site on Jinkinson Side Road, it excavated a large drainage ditch from the quarry property to Fernbank Road and on to Flewellyn Road. In doing so it excavated across several other landowners properties, without permission, and without any government approvals. The excavating has had several negative environmental impacts, particularly upon the local wetland. Charges were laid against Cavanagh Construction Limited by the RVCA and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). I am told that after many preliminary legal proceedings that this will finally go to trial in mid-January, 2001.

2. R.W. Tomlinson Limited requested re-zoning to allow development of a third quarry on the Jinkinson Side Road. In March, we sent a letter to Goulbourn Township noting our concerns about the potential impacts

upon the nearby Provincially Significant North Goulbourn Wetland, the quality and quantity of the discharged water, and the need for a new quarry when there are already 5 others nearby. Council deferred the matter until the applicant submitted several studies required - hydrogeological, etc. - with comments from the necessary government agencies.

On September 12, 2000, Brian Finch and Ken McRae, attended a Goulbourn Township Committee of the Whole public meeting regarding the Tomlinson re-zoning application. Tomlinson had submitted various reports regarding the application. We reiterated the concerns expressed in the earlier letter. We pointed out that the Jock River is subject to MOE's Policy 2 water quality standards for total phosphorus (max 0.03mg/l) and that higher levels of phosphorus were found in some of the water samples on the proposed quarry site. Other concerns were raised by members of the Goulbourn Environmental Advisory Committee and some members of the Committee of the Whole. The Committee deferred any decision to their next meeting to give the proponent an opportunity to prepare a response to concerns raised at the meeting. In a letter, October 4, 2000, to Goulbourn Township Council we responded to Tomlinson's biological impact study and RVCA's comments on the study, dated September 29, 2000. Several errors and omissions were pointed out. Our letter recommended that the re-zoning application be deferred until the concerns have been addressed. Goulbourn Township Council approved the re-zoning application in October.

On November 22, 2000 a "Proposal" was posted on the EBR for a PTTW for the Tomlinson quarry site asking for a year round permit. The proponent asked to pump up to 5,400 litres of water per minute, 24 hours a day (7,776,000 litres or 1,710,515 gallons per day). Donald A. MacIver, Manager, Planning & Regulations for the RVCA, in his letter of September 29, 2000, said, "A condition of the quarry license should be that pumping will not occur during the spring freshette...". We agree.

The 5,400 litres of water per minute was calculated by Tomlinson's consultant, Golder Associates Limited, to be the maximum annual amount of water to be pumped out of the quarry during the peak period in April and only during the extraction of the third bench, the deepest level of the proposed quarry. Golder's reports say that in the first 10 years, only the second bench will be reached and that the maximum annual amounts in April would be 4,320 litres per minute. Why then is Tomlinson asking to pump a maximum 5,400 litres of water per minute for the 10 year permit when its consultant says it would only be needed at the third bench, more than 10 years away?

Given our numerous concerns regarding the proposed Tomlinson quarry,

we sent MOE opposition to the issuance of a water taking permit. We have just learned as this report was being written that the request has been rejected pending the completion of several significant studies and the collection of critical data. It appears that the MOE shares many of our concerns which will have to be addressed by Tomlinson.

In an addendum to the topic, neither the Dibblee quarry right beside the proposed Tomlinson quarry, and the current Cavanagh quarry just over a mile away have water taking permits. (As noted above, Cavanagh Construction has applied for a PTTW for up to 2,700 gallons per minute or 12,274 litres per minute.) Further, the Glen Mar Golf Club is only about 3 miles or 5 kilometres away from the Tomlinson proposed quarry site and it has no water taking permit. The nearby Canadian Golf & Country Club has a PTTW for a substantial amount of water for irrigation but it uses only surface water.

3. On October 11, 2000 the FOJR organized a meeting of the quarry operators, government organizations and other interested parties to explore the possibility of sending groundwater pumped from the quarries to the Glen Mar and Canadian golf courses for irrigation. Representatives from MNR, the Region of Ottawa-Carleton, the Township of Goulbourn, R.W. Tomlinson Ltd., Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., the Northwest Goulbourn Community Association, the Glen Mar Golf Club, the Canadian Golf & Country Club, the Goulbourn Environmental Advisory Committee, and the FOJR attended the meeting. Representatives from RVCA, MOE and the Dibblee Quarry were unable to attend.

We asked about the feasibility of sending water from the 3 quarries west along the former railway line corridor, now part of the Trans Canada Trail, to the Jinkinson Municipal Drain, which passes through the Glen Mar Golf Club. Any excess water not used by the Glen Mar would continue through the Jinkinson Municipal Drain into the Jock River. (At the meeting we were told that the Canadian only uses surface water to irrigate and would only need extra water in particularly dry years.) In this way, the water from the quarries would be entering the Jock River much further upstream than would otherwise be the case. This would help, perhaps totally solve, the water volume problems such as those experienced in the summer of 1999 where numerous stretches in the upper Jock River dried up completely.

There is also the potential to create new fish habitat via a new water course along the Trans Canada Trail. Further, there may be potential financial advantages for the quarry operators in joint cooperation. For instance, if there are problems with the amount of phosphorus in the ground water, there is a possibility for a single shared common treatment facility for all 3 quarries, rather than each having individual treatment facilities. We expressed the belief there would be benefits in managing

water on a sub-watershed and watershed basis, rather than on a haphazard site by site basis.

The meeting was to get the initial views of the various parties involved. There was a common concern for the possible costs, such as for impact studies and equipment, and possible flooding at some sites in the spring. There may also be a lack of trust between the parties involved. It may not be possible to work out a cooperative joint water use agreement. Time will tell. A second meeting will be organized to look at approvals required, pluses and minuses, costs, who would pay, etc.

Ken McRae

11.4 Other Water Protection Issues

1. In January, 2000, then FOJR Treasurer, Norm Siemens, and I attended Goulbourn Township municipal meetings regarding its Draft Comprehensive Zoning By-law (By-law 40-99). We submitted 21 written comments, dated January 9th, making suggestions regarding allowable uses within areas zoned Provincially Significant Wetlands, Environmental Protection Areas, and Natural Environment Areas. Some of the comments also pertained to setbacks from such areas. Considering that we entered late in the process, perhaps it is fortunate that some of our suggestions were adopted. Many others were not.
2. In March, a letter was sent to Goulbourn Township regarding a re-zoning application to allow a new golf course along Ashton Station Road. Most of the subject property is presently wetland that would have to be destroyed in order for a golf course to be built. We raised concerns regarding the need for a PTTW, a hydrogeological study and a Wetlands Impact Study. Also, we raised questions about how the future expansion of Highway 7 will impact the subject property. Council deferred the matter until the applicant submits the necessary studies.
3. In April, the trailer park on the corner of Highway 7 and the Dwyer Hill Road was expanding into the neighboring Provincially Significant Manion Corners Long Swamp Wetland. I was told by the Director of Planning at Goulbourn Township that the campground owners had not applied for re-zoning approval or other approvals, and had not submitted a proposed site plan. The Township asked them to submit the required applications and to stop work until they had received the required approvals. The Township appears to think it is okay for people to act without getting approvals and permits, as long as they apply for them afterwards.

The RVCA has been informed of this matter and they carried out an

investigation. To date we don't know if they have concluded the investigation or if any charges have or will be laid by the RVCA. We will have to follow up on this item.

When I first informed the MNR of this matter I was asked if fish habitat was involved. The Federal Fisheries Act has teeth, via potentially large fines and potential restoration or other compensation orders; by comparison, there are no teeth in the Ontario Wetlands Policy. Given all of the MNR staff movements in the past year, I don't know what action, if any, MNR has taken regarding this matter. I will have to follow up on this.

I noticed a couple of times over the summer that the campground was carrying on site work before having received any approvals. While the Township was informed of this work in violation of their stop work order, the work wasn't reversed. Goulbourn Township appears to have acted in a very weak-kneed fashion in dealing with this whole matter.

Also in April, there was a "Proposal" on the EBR for a PTTW for this campground. Comments were submitted to MOE that the proposal requested a maximum taking of 34,095 litres per day and that a PTTW is only required if taking 50,000 litres of water in any day of the year. A number of other questions and concerns were also raised. The MOE withdrew the "Proposal" explaining that since it was for less than 50,000 litres that it shouldn't have been posted in the first place.

Initially, the posted "Decision" stated that no comments had been received but both the FOJR and the Northwest Goulbourn Community Association had submitted comments. After discussing this with Clyde Hammond, MOE, a correction was posted indicating that comments had been received and their effect. The campground did submit a re-zoning application and a Wetlands Impact Study, much after the fact, but it never came before the Township's Committee of the Whole for planning. Now that Goulbourn has been amalgamated into the new City of Ottawa, a follow-up will have to be made with the new city.

4. In September, I informed the RVCA that a new drainage ditch had been excavated in the eastern-most arm of the Provincially Significant North Goulbourn Wetland Complex where it meets the Fernbank Road, in the now former Goulbourn Township. The ditch runs for about one kilometre from Fernbank Road towards the Trans Canada Trail and is draining the wetland. Several side ditches have also been excavated. Some of the ditches go through an old long closed garbage dump quite close to Fernbank Road. Are any contaminants leaving this dump site via the water, causing pollution problems?

There is a proposal for a 60 lot country estate lot subdivision on property

which includes part of the wetland. Forest clearing and excavation for roads have already occurred without approvals. Some of the roads are within 120 metres of the wetland and would legally require a Wetlands Impact Statement before any such work was carried out. The RVCA investigation would be completed by the end of January, 2001. This matter will be followed.

5. In December, 2000, Brian Finch, on behalf of the FOJR, gave participant testimony to an Ontario Municipal Board hearing at a public input evening hearing on a re-zoning application and draft plan of subdivision for Westridge 3B, in Stittsville, a part of Goulbourn Township. Although the site is just outside of the Jock River Watershed, the FOJR decided to express its views on the need to protect such wetlands from development pressures. (The issue revolved around a mapping of the boundary of part of the Provincially Significant Upper Poole Creek Wetland. The Goulbourn Wetlands Group, a group of several people, including myself, mapped a significantly larger boundary. MNR's findings confirmed the larger boundary and the township forced the developers to amend their subdivision plan to comply with the new MNR approved boundary. The developer appealed to the OMB. The hearing has been halted but it is fairly evident that the new boundary will remain. The group is also involved in another adjacent wetland. Several of the issues are the same: incorrect reporting of wetland boundaries and draining of wetlands without approvals.)
6. In the spring of 2000 we heard news reports of groundwater contamination in part of Beckwith Township, Lanark County. The contaminants include trichloroethylene (TCE) and its breakdown products, dichloroethylene and vinyl chloride. TCE is a solvent used as a degreaser in dry cleaning. The contamination was thought to be coming from an old dump site outside of the Jock River Watershed.

Recently , it was announced that that the plume of contamination has spread into the Jock River Watershed's headwaters area. Some 240 wells have been contaminated. There was a recent news release that 110 well owners would be receiving special filters for their water. Some studies have been done and others are ongoing. An uncle of mine who lived for 11 years near the dump site, recently died of a very rare form of cancer.

People with wells rely on a standard water test, however, TCE and it's by products aren't tested for in a standard well water test. What about other contaminants not tested for in a standard well water test?

Surface water flow is easy to see and boundaries to the Jock River watershed can be readily followed from maps but the ground water flow and the aquifers under the watershed are hard to relate to. These

aquifer(s) extend beyond (perhaps well beyond) the watershed. Furthermore, they are connected to the surface water in the Jock River watershed and, most likely to other watersheds. Consequently, groundwater contamination can not only ruin our wells, it has the potential to affect our surface waters.

There are a number of old abandoned dump sites within the Jock River Watershed. If more detailed water tests haven't already been carried out around them they should be and quickly. This matter requires follow up.

Ken McRae

12.0 Fund Raising Report

12.1 Blues Festival

Unfortunately, we were not able to collect beer cans from the Ottawa Blues Festival as it changed its marketing of beer to plastic cups. The funds from our collection of the cans would have gone a long way to funding some of our "un-granted" projects and administrative costs.

Brian Finch

13.0 Work Plan for 2001

(not listed in order of priority)

1. Water Protection Advocacy (see reports for follow-up items)
 - a. Water Taking Permits
 - b. Goulbourn Township Quarries

2. Tree Planting

Funding of \$1000 was obtained from MNR in the year 2000 for tree planting. However, the grant arrived too late for planting. Trees have been ordered for this spring.

3. Walleye Tracking

This is a continuation of the project started two years ago to implant radio transmitters in walleye and to track them. There are 5 more transmitters to be implanted this spring. These transmitters are to go in spawning walleye in the Hearts Desire stretch to determine whether these fish are coming up from the Rideau.

4. Installation of Water Flow Meters On Upper Jock

The funding for this project was secured over the past two years. This year, the meter(s) will be installed by the RVCA . (See report)

5. Water Sampling

As part of the Education project, there will be some sampling. Further, we expect some Carleton students will be doing sampling as part of an undergraduate program. The RVCA will likely be conducting a limited sampling program with its own staff.

6. Education

- a. See the Education Report
- b. We plan to erect a kiosk at a site to be selected to inform visitors of the ecology of the Jock and of the activities of the Friends. Funding for the kiosk will be sought.
- c. We will continue to have displays and booths at community events such as the Richmond Fair and Sportsman's shows.
- d. At tree planting and other work sites, signs will be put up to acknowledge the work of the Friends, volunteers and sponsors, and to identify the boundaries of the sites. Signs could be put up to mark river access sites, features of interest, etc.

7. Garbage Clean-Up

Earlier clean-ups have been in the Richmond area and there is still work that could be done in the area. Other portions of the river between Richmond and River Bend Park are possibilities.

8. Membership Drive (see Membership Committee report)

9. Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration

The Twin Elm site will require monitoring and maintenance due to the annual effects of the spring flood on the fence and trees. The considerable efforts put into the project in 1998 and 1999 will disappear if the fence is not maintained.

10. Shoreline Restoration

This will be a component of the Education project. (see report).

11. Cedar Logs

The logs supplied by Goulbourn (now on the Munro property at Twin Elm) have to be peeled, cut and stored in a secure area if they are to be of value in future projects. We should do this very early in the season, as we have been warned that wasps take up residence in log piles, which could lead to most unfortunate circumstances for us later in the year.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Finch
Vice-President

Niel Barrington
President

13.1 Budget for 2001

Planned Income

General

Anonymous Donations	0	
Receipted Donations	300	
GST Rebates	100	
Corporate Membership	300	
Family Membership	200	
Supporter Membership	200	
<u>Volunteer Membership</u>	<u>200</u>	
Total General		\$1300

Projects

Educational Kiosk	1500	
Spring Tree Plant	1000	
Tree Plant Maintenance	50	
Twin Elm Maintenance	50	
Water Sampling	0	
Water Flow Meters	0	
Education	6,788	(from \$7,000 received in 2000)
River Clean-up	200	
Water Protection Advocacy	150	
Walleye Tracking	0	
<u>Signage</u>	<u>50</u>	
Total Projects		\$9488

Total Receipts	\$10788
----------------	---------

Planned Dispersements

General

Advertising	100	
Bank Charges	100	
Books and Subscriptions	50	
Office Supplies	200	
Photocopy Costs	100	
Photographic Supplies	50	
Photographic Development	50	
Postage	100	
Taxes	100	
<u>Total General</u>	\$	850

Projects

Educational Kiosk	1500	
Spring Tree Plant	1000	
Tree Plant Maintenance	50	
Twin Elm Maintenance	50	
Water Sampling	0	
Water Flow Meters	0	
Education	6778	
River Clean-up	200	
Water Protection Advocacy	200	
Walleye Tracking	0	
Membership drive	100	
<u>Cedar logs</u>	0	
<u>Total Projects</u>	\$	9878

Total dispersements	\$	10728
---------------------	----	-------

Total receipts minus total dispersements	\$	60
--	----	----

14.0 Nomination Committee Report

The Nomination Committee Report will be distributed at the Annual General

Meeting, February 14, 2000.

Please note that nominations from the floor are permitted under our constitution. Nominations for any of the slate of officers are invited.