

Friends of the Jock River

Annual Report 2001

Please note our new mailing address

Box 764
Richmond, Ontario,
K0A 2Z0

Table of Contents

Item	Page
1. Agenda	4
2. Minutes of Annual General Meeting, February 14, 2001	5
3. Minutes of Special Meeting of December 4, 2001	12
4. Membership List	12
5. Leadership List	13
6. Statistical Report	14
7. President's Report	15
8. Financial Reports	15
8.1 Treasurer's Report	15
8.2 Financial Statements	16
9. Committee Reports	17
9.1 Publicity Committee	17
9.11 Website	18
9.12 Carlingwood Wildlife Festival and Richmond Fair	18
9.13 Newsletter	19
9.2 Membership Committee	19
9.21 Membership Drive	19
10 Project Reports	21
10.1 Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring Projects	21
10.11 Spring Tree Plant	22
10.12 Walleye Tracking	23
10.13 Water Gauge Installation	24
10.14 Water Sampling	26
10.15 Garbage Clean-up	26
10.16 Shoreline Restoration	26
10.161 Twin Elm	26
10.162 Other Locations	27
10.17 Cedar Logs	27
10.18 Richmond Conservation Area Membership and Projects	27
10.2 Education Projects	28
10.21 The Shoreline Rehabilitation Education Project	28
10.22 Information Board Project	28
10.3 Water Protection Advocacy Projects	28
10.31 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions	28
10.32 Water Taking Permits	31
10.33 Goulbourn Township Quarries	36
10.34 Testing for Contaminants at Abandoned Dump Sites	37
10.35 The Jock River Watershed Plan	38
11. Fundraising Report	38
11.1 Blues Festival	38
12. Work Plan for 2002	39
12.1 Budget for 2002	40
13. Nomination Committee Report	41

1. AGENDA

**FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
TUESDAY, February 26, 2002 7:30 PM
Ottawa Public Library, Richmond Branch**

Introduction

- 1.0 Approval of Agenda**
- 2.0 Minutes of February 14, 2001.**
 - 2.1 Business arising from minutes of February 14, 2001.**
- 3.0 Membership List**
- 4.0 Leadership List**
- 5.0 Statistical Report**
- 6.0 President's Report**
- 7.0 Financial Reports**
 - 7.1 Treasurer's Report**
 - 7.2 Financial Statements**
- 8.0 Committee Reports**
 - 8.1 Publicity Committee**
 - 8.11 Website**
 - 8.12 Carlingwood Wildlife Festival and Richmond Fair**
 - 8.13 Newsletter**
 - 8.2 Membership Committee**
 - 8.21 Membership Drive**
- 9.0 Project Reports**
 - 9.1 Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring Projects**
 - 9.11 Spring Tree Plant**
 - 9.12 Walleye Tracking**
 - 9.13 Water Gauge Installation**
 - 9.14 Water Sampling**
 - 9.15 Garbage Clean-up**
 - 9.16 Shoreline Restoration**
 - 9.161 Twin Elm**
 - 9.162 Other Locations**
 - 9.17 Cedar Logs**
 - 9.18 Richmond Conservation Area Membership and Projects**
 - 9.2 Education Projects**
 - 9.21 The Shoreline Rehabilitation Education Project**
 - 9.22 Information Board Project**

- 9.3 Water Protection Advocacy Projects
 - 9.31 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions
 - 9.32 Water Taking Permits
 - 9.33 Goulbourn Township Quarries
 - 9.34 Testing for Contaminants at Abandoned Dump Sites
 - 9.35 The Jock River Watershed Plan
- 10.0 Fundraising Report
 - 10.1 Blues Festival
- 11.0 Work Plan for 2002
 - 11.1 Budget for 2002
- 12.0 Nomination Committee Report
 - 12.01 Election of President
 - 12.02 Election of Vice-President
 - 12.03 Election of Treasurer
 - 12.04 Election of Secretary
 - 12.05 Election of Director for Water Conservation and Usage
 - 12.06 Election of Director for Membership Roster and Management
 - 12.07 Election of Director for Projects and Actions
 - 12.08 Election of Director for Fundraising
 - 12.09 Election of Director for Publicity and Public Relations
 - 12.10 Election of Directors at Large
- 13.0 Nomination and Election of Members of Nominating Committee for 2002
- 14.0 Other Business
- 15.0 Adjournment

2. Minutes of Annual General Meeting, February 14, 2001

FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING MINUTES WEDNESDAY, February 14, 2001 7:30 PM

Location: Lower Room, Ottawa Public Library, Richmond Branch, Richmond, Ontario

Chair: Niel Barrington

Recording secretary: Eric Snyder

In Attendance: Niel Barrington, Brian Finch, Eric Snyder, Ken McRae, Chris Coupe, Ryan Rattey, Frances Little, Ron Maybury, Doug Watson

Agenda Items

- 1.0 Agenda

1.1 The agenda was revised as follows: Item 14.7 was revised to read 'Election of Director for Projects and Actions'.

1.2 Revised agenda moved for acceptance: Ken McRae.
Seconded: Chris Coupe.
Accepted unanimously.

2.0 Minutes of February 15, 2000.

2.01 The minutes were revised as follows:

2.011 On page 9, under the heading 'Nomination and Election of Members for the 2000 Nominating Committee', 'Doug Watson' was substituted for 'Doug Wright'.

2.02 Revised minutes moved for Acceptance: Brian Finch
Seconded: Frances Little.
Accepted unanimously.

2.1 Business arising from minutes of February 15, 2000.

2.11 Numbered Action Items:

2.111 Action 4.1: Niel has suggested that installation of a guide rail at Half Moon Bay be identified as a desirable project in the Jock River Watershed Plan. Item complete.

2.112 Action 9.3: Norm and other directors have investigated how to acquire liability insurance. Item complete.

2.12 Un-numbered Action Items:

2.121 Action item under 'The Water Metering Project Report was accepted as presented': Niel and Ken have sent letters of thanks to project supporters. Item complete.

2.122 Action item under 'The Water Navigation Project was accepted as presented': The action item was not understood as recorded. Item closed.

2.123 Action item under 'Report on Mother Teresa Water Quality Testing at Half Moon Bay': It is not known whether Mr Wright did liaise with Mr R. Howard on this matter. Item closed.

2.124 Action item under 'Early April Canoeing on the Jock': Mr Frank Stokes and Niel did publicize the canoe race. Item complete.

3.0 Minutes of December 12, 2000.

3.01 The minutes were reviewed by the membership.

3.1 Business arising from minutes of December 12, 2000.

3.11 Action 2.3: Eric has sent a copy of the minutes, signed and dated by two members of the Board, to Canada Customs Revenue Agency, Charities Directorate. Item complete.

4.0 Membership List

4.1 The report was accepted as presented.

5.0 Leadership List

5.1 The report was accepted as presented.

6.0 Statistical Report

6.1 The report was accepted as presented.

7.0 President's Report

7.1 The report was accepted as presented.

8.0 Financial Reports

8.1 Treasurer's Report

8.11 The report was accepted as presented.

8.2 Financial Statements

8.21 Moved: Ken moved that the 2000 financial statements be accepted.
Seconded: Chris.
Carried unanimously.

9.0 Committee Reports

9.1 Publicity Committee

9.11 No report was available as there was no Publicity Committee in 2000.

9.12 Mr Doug Watson volunteered to assist with designing a website for the FJR. Brian observed that, at a cost of approximately \$40.00, the website could be referenced on the Ontario Environment League's website list.

9.2 Membership Committee

9.21 The report was accepted as presented.

9.211 There was some discussion on necessity of implementing the strategies, identified in the report, for increasing membership and improving membership participation. The need to find a dedicated director of membership roster and management was emphasized.

10.0 Project Reports

10.1 Spring Tree Plant

10.11 The report was accepted as presented.

10.2 Walleye Tracking

10.21 The report was accepted as presented.

10.211 There was some discussion concerning how the remaining five transmitters might be used. Members agreed that these should be inserted in walleye caught in the lower reaches of the Jock River, preferably fish that are spawning. However, Niel and Ken observed that this can only be done if (a) the transmitters are still available (b) spawning beds can be identified in the lower reaches of the river and (c) volunteers can be found to do the tracking on a regular basis.

10.2111 Action: Niel will contact Mr Scott Smithers (OMNR biologist) to determine if OMNR will support the

undertaking to place five radio transmitters in five walleye caught in the lower reaches of the Jock River, assuming that the FJR can identify spawning beds located within these reaches and enlist the necessary volunteers. Deadline: March 6, 2001.

10.3 **Water Gauge Installation**

10.31 The report was accepted as presented.

10.311 Moved: Brian moved (a) that the installation of a permanent water gauge station at the Franktown Rd bridge be adopted as the priority objective for the Water Gauge Installation Project in 2001 and (b) that funding be allocated accordingly, even if, in consequence, the installation of a second station must be deferred indefinitely.

Seconded: Frances.

Carried unanimously.

10.4 **Water Sampling**

10.41 The report was accepted as presented.

10.411 Brian affirmed that, although there was no water sampling project for 2000, Mr Patrick Larson (RVCA) has indicated that sampling will be required in the future to acquire more detailed baseline data than that currently available.

10.42 Ken suggested that, in view of the Beckwith Township cleaning fluid spill, perhaps sampling should be carried out around the many abandoned dump sites within the watershed, targeting contaminants which are not tested for in acquiring baseline data. Niel observed that this proposal would have to be pursued with the appropriate government corporations and ministries such as MOE and the City of Ottawa.

10.421 Moved: Brian moved that the FJR request of appropriate government corporations and ministries that they investigate the possible contamination of groundwater from abandoned dump sites in the Jock River watershed.

Seconded: Ken.

Carried unanimously.

10.5 **Garbage Clean-up**

10.51 The report was accepted as presented.

10.6 **Shoreline Restoration**

10.61 **Twin Elm**

10.611 The report was accepted as presented.

10.62 **Other Locations**

10.621 Restoration at other locations was dealt with under 10.72.

10.7 **Education**

10.71 **The Jock River Walk**

10.711 The report was accepted as presented.

10.72 **The Shoreline Rehabilitation Education Project**

10.721 The report was accepted as presented.

10.722 Eric observed that the progress made in planning and implementing this project has been slow. The reason, he argued, seems to be twofold. First, the FJR has completed neither the lecture presentation nor preparation for the field work. Second, due to secondary school teachers having boycotted extracurricular activities, the response from local high schools has been less positive than anticipated. The second point raised an additional problem. Numbers of students involved in the project will be significantly less than originally expected. Probably only about 30 students, from two schools, will be involved. Hence the funds budgeted for the purchase of trees is far more than will be needed since the amount of planting to take place has to be reduced.

Members agreed that Canada Trust will have to be apprised of the situation, and some changes to the project will have to be made. It appears that either some of the funds will have to be returned or the timeframe for the project will have to be extended. It was agreed that what precisely the FJR will propose is to be decided at its Committee of the Whole meeting of March 6.

10.7221 Action: Members will meet on February 17 to (a) investigate alternatives for continuing the project and (b) identify and prioritize all actions required to get the project underway.

10.8 Cedar Logs

10.81 The report was accepted as presented.

10.9 MNR Restoration Tree Planting

10.91 The report was accepted as presented.

10.911 Ken suggested that planting in areas where planting has already occurred be prioritized based on the success of previously planted trees.

11.0 Water Protection Advocacy Reports

11.01 The summary report and conclusions were accepted as presented.

11.011 Brian added that at a recent town hall meeting, hosted by Minister John Baird, he and Ken addressed the minister, and were subsequently invited to meet with him.

11.0111 Action: Brian will undertake to arrange the meeting. Deadline: April 3.

11.1 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions

11.11 The report was accepted as presented.

11.2 Water Taking Permits

11.21 The report was accepted as presented.

11.3 Goulbourn Township Quarries

11.31 The report was accepted as presented.

11.4 Other Water Protection Issues

11.41 The report was accepted as presented.

12.0 Fundraising Report

12.1 **Blues Festival**

12.11 The report was accepted as presented.

13.0 **Work Plan for 2001**

13.01 The work plan was amended as follows:

13.011 Include two additional items under '1. Water Protection Advocacy', *i.e.*,

c. Testing for Contaminants at Abandoned Dump Sites.

d. The Jock River Watershed Plan

13.012 Revise item (c) under '6. Education' to read

c. We will continue to have displays and booths at community events such as the Richmond Fair, the Carlingwood Wildlife Festival and Sportsman's shows.

13.013 Add the following items:

12. Composting at the Richmond Conservation Area (RCA)

13. RCA Management Committee Membership and Projects

14. Publicity

For purposes of publicity, as well as to assist in keeping the membership informed, the FJR will establish its own website.

13.02 Moved: Ken moved that the revised work plan be adopted.

Seconded: Chris.

Carried unanimously.

13.1 **Budget for 2001**

13.11 Moved: Chris moved that the 2001 budget be adopted.

Seconded: Frances.

Carried unanimously.

14.0 **Nomination Committee Report**

14.0001 The report was accepted as presented. Mr Ron Maybury was nominated as Director of Membership Roster and Management.

14.001 **Election of President**

14.0011 Niel Barrington was elected.

14.002 **Election of Vice-President**

14.0021 Chris Coupe was elected.

14.003 **Election of Treasurer**

14.0031 Brian Finch was elected.

14.004 Election of Secretary

14.0041 Eric Snyder was elected.

14.005 Election of Director for Water Conservation and Usage

14.0051 Ken McRae was elected.

14.006 Election of Director for Membership Roster and Management

14.0061 Ron Maybury was elected.

14.007 Election of Director for Projects and Actions

14.0071 Tim vander Horn was elected.

14.008 Election of Director for Fundraising

14.0081 No nominations were made for the position.

14.009 Election of Director for Publicity and Public Relations

14.0091 No nominations were made for the position.

14.0092 Eric emphasized the need to have this position filled as soon as possible.

14.010 Election of Directors at Large

14.011 No nominations were made for these positions.

15.0 Nomination and Election of Members of Nominating Committee for 2001

15.1 Niel Barrington, Brian Finch, Gordon Sample and Doug Watson were elected.

16.0 Other Business

16.1 There was no additional business.

17.0 Adjournment

3. Minutes of General Meeting of December 4, 2001

FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING MINUTES TUESDAY, December 4, 2001 7:30 PM

Location: Lower Room, Ottawa Public Library, Richmond Branch, Richmond, Ontario

Chair: Niel Barrington

Recording secretary: Eric Snyder

In Attendance: Niel Barrington, Brian Finch, Eric Snyder, Tim van der Horn, Ken McRae, Doug Watson, Stew Hammil

Editor: General Meeting portion was dealt with in item 5.22

5.22 Membership Renewal Date

5.221 Moved: Eric moved that Article III, §4 of the Constitution of the Friends of the Jock River, which states 'The term of membership shall be for one year on a calendar year basis, starting on the date that the membership was issued', be deleted and replaced by 'The membership year shall be from February 1 to January 31. Membership applications dated from October 1 to January 31 shall be valid for the following membership year'.

Seconded: Brian.

Carried.

4. Membership List

Members in good standing as of December 31, 2001 are:

Volunteers

Niel Barrington
Chris Coupe
Jennifer Havelock
Irwin McCaffrey
Ken McRae
Ryan Rattey
Gordon Sample
Eric Snyder
Doug Watson
Marla Williams
Tom Osborne Wright
Tim van der Horn
Shane Emard (Honorary membership)
Michelle Emard (Honorary membership)
Thomas Guest (Honorary membership)

Scott Clement (Honorary membership)
Nick Clement (Honorary membership)

Supporter

N. W. & E. Broten
Tola Cooper
Fred Hill
Frances Little
Ron Maybury
George Morris
Frank Stokes
Doug Watson

Family

Brian Finch and Teresa Rodrigues
Norman Siemens Family, Norman, Reta, Richard, and Julie
Joseph Dafoe Family
Richard Bendall Family

Corporate

Noreetec
Muskie Canada

5. Leadership List

Officers of the Executive

President	Niel Barrington	823-3643
Vice- President	Chris Coupe	795-4203
Treasurer	Brian Finch	825-8029
Secretary	Eric Snyder	838-3572
Director For Water Conservation And Usage	Ken McRae	836-2011
Director For Projects and Actions	Tim van der Horn	838-4865
Director For Membership Roster and Management	Ron Maybury	836-5953
Director For Fund-raising	<i>vacant</i>	
Director for Publicity and Public Relations	<i>vacant</i>	

Committee Chairs

Membership Committee Chair	Ron Maybury
Projects Committee Chair	Tim van der Horn
Nomination Committee Chair	Niel Barrington

Project Leadership

Spring Tree Plant	Tim van der Horn & Niel Barrington
River Clean-up	Tim van der Horn
Water Sampling	Brian Finch
Walleye Tracking	Niel Barrington
Water Meters & Permits	Ken McRae
Munster Sewage	Brian Finch
Cedar Logs Project	<i>vacant</i>

Other

Editor of 2001 Annual Report	Brian Finch
------------------------------	-------------

6. Statistical Report

Meetings of the Friends of the Jock River held in year 2001 (Committee of the whole unless otherwise noted:

Jan. 2	- 7 people
Feb. 14 (Annual General Meeting)	- 9
March 6	- 10
April 3	- 9
May 1	- 7
June 5	- 7
July 3	- 6
Aug.	- no quorum, no data
Sept. 4	- 9
Oct. 2	- 14
Nov. 6	- 8
Dec. 4 (a General Meeting component)	- 7

7. President's Report

Munster Monster Not Dead Yet

The Ontario Municipal Board allowed the appeal in part. While the City's plans to pipe Munster Hamlet's sewage 60 km to the other side of the region are still on the table, the high tech sewage treatment options are also back on as well. The OMB decision forces the city to re-evaluate the options and to "perfect its case".

Friends of the Jock River should be sure to read the section of this Annual Report dealing with the Munster Issue. The Munster issue is not dead and we will continue our fight to stop the export of water out of our watershed. We will "pull no punches" and "take no prisoners".

Watershed Plan Finally Released

Late in the year, the Jock River Watershed Plan was released for final scrutiny. While I think the document does a good job in identifying the problems facing the River, I was truly disappointed to find that the work plan suggests the expenditure of far too many resources for more study, rather than for actual action. The Plan calls for \$3,257,000 in studies and only \$439,500 in action (pages 32 through 34 of the plan). Haven't they been working on and studying the watershed for eight years already? A more cynical fellow than myself could well conclude that the action plan does more for the bureaucracy than it does for the River. There is no chance this plan will succeed when 88% of funding is diverted away from action. Most of the available funds should go to direct action for the next fifty years or so. After that time, someone can do a study to see how much the River has improved.

The Plan has not suggested the spending of one cent to fix the erosion problem in Heart's Desire. It's the weir that is causing the erosion. The problem should be fixed, not studied.

The roundtable proposal suggested in the work plan may be more about meetings than action but we will be at the meetings to ensure that there is some action.

The Friends, while supporting the plan, reserve the right to act unilaterally in taking action to protect, to preserve and to restore the Jock River.

Niel Barrington
President
Friends of the Jock River

[The Friends has not yet studied the report in detail and has not arrived at a formal position. See also section 10.35 for the report on The Jock River Watershed Plan. – Editor]

8. Financial Reports

8.1 Treasurer's Report

The financial activities of the Friends were fairly slow in year 2001 as there were only three grant-driven projects.

Education and shoreline restoration 2000/2001, project number 22, was funded by the Friends of Environment Foundation and spanned two years. As noted elsewhere, the cooperation and participation of local teachers was a critical component of project but the teachers' suspension of their participation in extra-curricular activities made the successful completion of the project impossible. The unspent funds (\$6,743.27) were returned to the Friends of Environment Foundation.

There were two tree plant/maintenance projects: the 2000/2001 OMNR (Community Fish and Wildlife Involvement Program) grant was for \$1,000 (project 23). Part of the project was run in 2000. The remaining portion run in 2001 was merged with the 2001 OMNR (Community Fish and Wildlife Involvement Program) grant (project 30) for \$2,000. Under CFWIP, the project expenses are reimbursed after the fact by OMNR. Our accounting was submitted in the latter part of fiscal 2001 and we received a cheque in January 2002. The debts incurred by a FOJR member and the Ferguson Forest Centre (unpaid bill) were paid in 2002 and the accounting will show up in the financial statements for year 2002.

We took out membership in the Ontario Environmental Network, although we have not heard from the organization.

Through the year we investigated the requirements for the incorporation of the Friends and established a budget. Money generated by the Blues Festival beer can collection project was the source of the funds. Late in the fall we started the process to incorporate and some steps such as the corporate name search have been completed at year-end. The expected completion date is some time in March 2002. It should be pointed out that most of the requirements for incorporation have already been addressed by the terrific job that Norm Siemens did on our constitution and bylaws. Note that incorporation of the FOJR is a requirement for funding from the Trillium Foundation, a major source of grants in Ontario. Also, incorporation will limit the liabilities of the executive.

Respectfully submitted
 Brian Finch - Treasurer

8.2 Financial Statements

Balance Sheet

	<u>2001</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>Variance</u>
<u>ASSETS</u>			
Chequing in TD- Canada Trust Account	\$ 3437.30	8,238.49	(4801.19)
Petty Cash	\$ 219.37	352.80	(133.63)
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	\$ 3656.67	8,591.29	(4,934.82)
	=====	=====	=====
<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	\$ 8591.29	2,653.69	5937.60
Receipts Minus Dispersements for Year	\$ (4,934.62)	5,937.60	(10,872.22)
Equity - Ending	\$ 3656.67	8,591.29	(4,934.82)
	-----	-----	-----
Total Equities	\$ 3656.67	8,591.29	(4,934.82)
	-----	-----	-----

<u>EQUITY</u>	\$	3656.67	8,591.29	(4,934.82)
<u>minus</u>				
<u>LIABILITIES</u>				
		=====	=====	=====

Cash Flow Report

INFLOWS

2000Carry-Chequing	8,243.85
2000Carry-Petty Cash	382.80
Blues festival	1,250.00
Donation- Hepworth Memorial	325.00
Donation- Ont.Envir.Network	40.00
Donation- Trees	30.67
Donation- Undirected	35.00
Grant-Project23	541.08
Membership-Corporate	100.00
Membership-Family	100.00
Membership-Supporter	90.00
Membership-Volunteer	100.00
TOTAL INFLOWS	11,238.40

OUTFLOWS

Administration	238.86
Project 22 -CanadaTrust	6,743.27
Project 27 -TwinElm	24.02
Project 23 -Trees	575.58
TOTAL OUTFLOWS	7,581.73

<u>OVERALL TOTAL</u>	3,656.67
-----------------------------	-----------------

9. Committee Reports

9.1 Publicity Committee Report

In 2001, the Friends made a number of initiatives towards getting publicity and gaining new members. As in previous years, we manned a booth at both the Wildlife Festival at Carlingwood and at the Richmond Fair (report below). Doug Watson built a terrific web site for the Friends of the Jock River (report below).

Late in the summer, the Friends were able to garner good coverage of the terribly low water levels, focusing on stranded suckers and pike that had barely enough water to swim in. Richard Bendall of

the Friends made a series of calls resulting in a partially successful rescue effort of these fish by Niel, Ken, Tim and many others. We captured space in the Citizen (with a fine letter from Richard); a story and photos in the Stittsville News; and a TV spot on CHRO ("the new RO"). The kids who had first saved the fish from a rapidly diminishing pool upstream were presented with Certificates of Appreciation and honorary memberships to the Friends of the Jock River (identified on membership list).

The Friends need someone to chair the Publicity Committee for this very important coming year. Now is the time to help publicize the new watershed plan to gather a momentum of public support so that positive action comes out of it.

Respectfully submitted,
Niel Barrington

9.11 Website

This year, Doug Watson, almost single-handedly, made a big step forward in our promotional and communication abilities. Doug built a terrific web site for The Friends of the Jock River. It's located at www.geocities.com/jockriver. Have a look – you will be pleased.

The site presents information and activities related to our organization. The web site lists our executives, minutes for past meetings, agenda and dates for upcoming meetings, links to other web sites, a map of the Jock River watershed, photographs of scenes along the Jock River as well as descriptions and photos of our work projects. Members of the Friends can now post photos of environmental damage, such as those currently displayed of the damage done by snowmobiles to our Spring Tree plant seedlings in the Richmond Conservation Area.

People visiting the web site are invited to submit comments about their own observations and concerns relating to the health of the Jock River watershed.

Many thanks to Doug for his great work on this site! We need more members like Doug who see something in the Friends work that needs to be done, take it on and do it.

Respectfully submitted,
Niel Barrington

9.12 Carlingwood Wildlife Festival and Richmond Fair

At Carlingwood, we had a sign-up sheet for people who wanted to come out to our Spring Tree Plant. The sheet was soon filled with signees, many who actually came out to our plant! The late winter scheduling of the wildlife festival makes for perfect timing getting recruits for our tree plant. I think we should sign on again as a way of publicizing the now completed Jock River Watershed Plan.

The Friends also manned a booth at the Richmond Fair, sharing a space with the Richmond Village Association and the Richmond Conservation Area Conservation Management Team. Your secretary, Eric Snyder, took the lead role on this event. We rigged up an aquarium (borrowed from David Spence of the Friends of the Carp River. Thank you, David.) with crayfish, dace, creek chubs and tadpoles right from the Jock. The aquarium was a big hit with the kids.

Respectfully submitted,
Niel Barrington

9.13 Newsletter

The year 2001 was the first year that the Friends of the Jock River published a newsletter. Four issues were published beginning in January. In the second issue, we began a regular feature on the fauna of the Jock River, and articles were written on the fisher, river otter and common raven. Other subjects covered included such controversial matters as the Munster Lagoons and Jock River Watershed Plan, as well as Friends of the Jock River initiatives with the Macoun Field Club, the Girl Guides of Canada, the Ecotech Club of Richmond, the United Church and the Eastern Ontario Biodiversity Museum. Of course, we also provided reports on our tree planting and shoreline rehabilitation projects.

The newsletter has become our most effective means of keeping our membership informed about what we are doing. In addition, it has become important for increasing our membership, particularly since excerpts are regularly reprinted in the Stittsville News and copies are made available to the public at the Richmond Branch of the Ottawa Public Library.

The task of writing, editing and illustrating the newsletter this year fell entirely to our secretary, Eric Snyder. Since this has left him without any social life at all, we will try to rectify the situation in 2002, allowing Eric to begin the slow process of reintegration into society. We are looking for someone to take over as editor of the newsletter. We are also seeking funding to improve the newsletter format. We hope to be able to include more illustrations and some photographs, and to include articles from a number of writers. Perhaps a letters page would also be a good idea. We welcome suggestions and submissions of articles from the membership.

Whatever direction it takes, the newsletter will continue to be published in 2002. Members can look forward to receiving their copy every three months.

Respectfully submitted
Eric Snyder, Secretary

9.2 Membership Committee

9.21 Membership Drive

The need for a strategy to improve membership has been discussed on several occasions. The approach of other organisations has been reviewed, The following points seem important:

Web Site: Emphasise use of the web site as a means of recruiting members. The OFNC gets a third of it's recruits this way.

Membership Fees: Maintain a low membership fee. It has been decided to maintain the present fee structure.

Annual Membership Cards: These should be sent out when membership is taken out or renewed.

Membership Renewal: Memberships should expire at the same time of the year, to coincide with the AGM. They would be valid from February 1st to January 31st and new memberships taken out after October 1st will be valid until the end of the next membership year. The membership renewal form should be included with the first newsletter of the year, outlining projects for the season and indicating where members can volunteer to help. Membership applications should be sent to the treasurer when received who will handle the fees, then forward the application to the membership director.

Membership lists: A computerised data base of members and other contacts has to be established. Suitable software must be identified, to contain all past and present members, volunteers and useful contacts, with the ability to sort lists of each category for printing or making changes. It would also be useful to produce envelope address labels from this base.

Brochure: Print a revised brochure with an incorporated membership application form. Give information on the vision and objectives of the organisation, and a section to indicate the interests of the applicant.

Recruitment: Work through appropriate local organisations to find members by attending meetings, making presentations and supplying brochures. Place information booths at local events, fairs, shopping centres etc. Consider joint displays with other groups, such as RTA, RVA, RCA. Display panels, a slide show and posters are needed for this. (Communications Officer)

Events: Organise public walks with special interests such as birding, plant life, aquatic life, trees to attract interested people as members. Build up a list of potential leaders for these events, co-operate with the RCA, OFN, RVCA, etc.

Publicity: There should continue to be regular press reports - need for Communications Officer and Newsletter Editor.

Volunteer Centre of Ottawa: Membership in this organisation may be useful, with the following considerations:

1. specific job descriptions must be written for the volunteer positions to be filled and revised regularly
2. preference should be indicated for people living in the watershed area.
3. the best volunteers are people with a stake in the objectives of the organisations. Those who volunteer to get something on their resumé do not always work out.
4. membership is useful for networking with other groups (cross referrals) and for the credibility it gives to the organisation (Member of the Volunteer Centre of Ottawa)
5. it allows us to display our brochures at the Volunteer Centre

Membership in the organisation, while favoured initially, has been postponed until the goals of our programs for which volunteers would be used are clearly defined, job descriptions written, and a person responsible for the volunteers identified.

Membership Drive. Letters and brochures could be sent to all past members, brochures placed in libraries and other community locations and possibly sent out in the mail or door to door in the area.

Respectfully Submitted
Ron Maybury
Director for Membership Roster and Management

10. Project Reports

10.1 Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring Projects

At our June 5 Committee of the Whole Meeting, Friends of the Jock River Vice President, Chris Coupe, and Secretary, Eric Snyder, initiated a review of our tree planting projects. They made a number of recommendations, which became the basis of a set of draft guidelines for tree planting projects put forward by Treasurer, Brian Finch. Following a revision by the Tree Planting Project Team, the Board of Directors agreed that all plans for tree planting projects must include:

1. a description of the vegetative community to be established;
2. an explanation as to why that community is desirable;
3. a projection of the numbers of trees of given species required to establish the community during the current executive's term and for subsequent years;
4. specification of the location where the community is to be established;
5. a list of organizations involved in the project; and
6. a proposed planting date, to be finalized no less than 2 months in advance of the project's implementation.

Following approval of the project plan, either by the membership or executive, the following must also be approved:

1. a provisional budget;
2. a provisional project schedule; and
3. an initial site plan approved by the executive approximately 4 months in advance of the project's implementation. Revisions must be finalized at least 3 weeks in advance. Budgets can be confirmed, through confirmation of funding, any time prior to the project plan's implementation.

Project managers are not authorized to spend money on projects without the prior approval of a budget by the executive. Since the Friends of the Jock River cannot operate any projects on a deficit, the executive is prevented from granting the approval until funds have been received from the granting organization(s) or until sufficient funds are transferred into the project account. The only exceptions to this condition will be situations in which the executive has obtained a written commitment from the granting organization(s) that states: the funds have been approved and will be available on a specified date, or the granting organization(s) will pay the bills for goods or services.

Project schedules must include time lines for pre-implementation, volunteer education initiatives, tree planting, tree protection (e.g. mulching), site monitoring and maintenance.

Initial site plans are to include a map of the site identifying significant features (streams, roads, etc.), existing vegetation communities and locations where trees of given species will be planted. Prior approval for the project and initial site plan must be obtained in writing from the land owner at least 4 months in advance of implementation. Even if the Friends of the Jock River has planted on the site before, approval must be obtained for the planned project.

To provide for the implementation of these guidelines it was agreed that more information on existing vegetation cover and land ownership along the river would need to be obtained. To that end, Doug Watson provided a base map of the river corridor; Marla Williams supplied a list she had previously compiled of all landowners along the river; and Eric Snyder contacted City of Ottawa environmental planner, David Miller, to supply us with maps showing vegetation cover classes and more detailed attributes related to vegetation communities.

At the June 19 Tree Planting Project Team meeting, we also began an initial evaluation of planting priorities. Tree planting objectives have been prioritized as follows:

1. The planting location most threatened by development is Jockvale. A planting plan is required, as is maintenance and monitoring on trees already planted. Permission from the landowner, *i.e.*, the City of Ottawa, is required before more planting can occur;
2. Foster's Farm requires a planting plan and maintenance on trees already planted;
3. Trees planted on the RVCA lands in Richmond require maintenance and monitoring; and
4. The Munro Farm (Twin Elm) requires a planting plan and maintenance of previously planted trees.

If you would like to contribute to any of our planting projects in the above areas please contact our Director of Projects, Tim van der Horn, at 838-4865.

Respectfully submitted
Eric Snyder, Secretary

10.11 Spring Tree Plant/ Maintenance Projects

The Friends of the Jock River annual spring tree planting and maintenance project was a great success this year. Most of the planting occurred on the weekend of May 5 and 6, with the remaining trees planted during the evening on May 7 and 9. Planting locations included the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) land along York St. in Richmond, the Jock River Park, also in Richmond, and Foster's Farm, near the Twin Elm Bridge. We planted in excess of 2,000 trees. This included 960 trees purchased under a 2000/2001 OMNR (Community Fish and Wildlife Involvement Program) grant (project 23), an additional 910 trees, purchased under a 2001 OMNR (Community Fish and Wildlife Involvement Program) grant (project 30), and yet another 200, heeled in from a previous FOJR tree plant. The species planted were Eastern White Pine (*Pinus strobus*), Scots Pine (*Pinus sylvestris*), White Spruce (*Picea glauca*), Eastern White Cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*), Willow (*Salix sp.*), Sugar Maple (*Acer saccharum*), White Ash (*Fraxinus americana*) and Common Elderberry (*Sambucus canadensis*).

The cedar seedlings were the smallest we have ever seen, which made them very difficult to plant.

Our approach to tree planting this year was an improvement over previous years. We are pleased to inform our membership that much more emphasis was placed on planning and maintenance. Tree maintenance was conducted in all of the noted areas plus both sides of the Jock River downstream of the Jockvale Bridge. Trees in the planting from 2001, as well as those from previous plantings (some going back 4 years), were protected with spiral plastic trunk wrap. Weed barrier fabric and mulch were applied to areas planted within the land owned by the RVCA and the Jock River Park. This was done, for the most part, on May 10 and 21, and on June 4. We believe that trees planted/maintained/protected this year will prove more viable as a result of our efforts.

We thank all those who contributed to this project: all Scouts Canada troops from the western district of Ottawa-Carleton, including Richmond; a visiting contingent of 30 Girl Guides from England, Japan,

Jamaica, Mexico and other parts of Canada (Ontario, Alberta and Newfoundland); the Richmond Branch of the Knights of Columbus; the Richmond Village Association; members of the Ottawa Fly Fishing Club; Rudy Dyck of the RVCA; Mike Rosen of OMNR; and both David Miller and Paul Donnelly of the City of Ottawa. We also thank GeoSynthetic Systems for its generous contribution of weed-barrier fabric/mulch. Lastly, we thank all those dedicated Friends of the Jock River members who have been instrumental to our tree planting success.

Respectfully submitted
Eric Snyder, Secretary

Postscript to the above report:

Once the snow flew, some young snowmobilers (four; all identified) ran their machines back and forth over the largest area of planted trees along York St. in Richmond. The destruction of trees was deliberate. Quite a few trees have been destroyed but we will have to wait until spring to assess the extent of the damage. The same snowmobilers were also in the Richmond Conservation Area with similar intent. The issue made the evening news (CJOH).

A meeting was held with the Richmond Conservation Area Management Team, Friends of the Jock River (Tim van der Horn), City bylaw officers, the local snowmobile club and Ottawa police to address the problem. Many promises were made to deal with the situation but we are uncertain whether anything will happen. As a minimum, the snowmobilers should be made to replace the damaged trees.

Tim van der Horn

10.12 Walleye Tracking

The walleye-tracking project was scheduled to finish in the spring of 2000 but ran over into 2001. This project was ill conceived and ran out of gas due to poor leadership (for which I accept the blame) and the fact that, as volunteers working in what little spare time we may have, we must accept the fact that we will not have time to carry out this type of long term project. This type of project would have worked (perhaps) if we had some funding for a student or perhaps a retired person, somebody who had the time. I think we can learn a few lessons from this project. The Friends should not commit to long term monitoring projects without more members. If someone conceives and initiates a project, they should be prepared to see it through to the very end.

Conclusions about the walleye: The data gathered show that walleye in the Richmond stretch are real homebodies. They do not venture far from the spawning grounds just above Richmond to their summer haunts of deep pools above and below Richmond. By comparison, other populations of walleye in the province travel hundreds of miles through lake or river systems.

Niel Barrington

10.13 Water Gauge Installation

Background

In the "1996 Jock River Watershed Plan – Interim Report" the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority's (RVCA) identified the need for more water flow data collection within the watershed. At that time, and still presently, there was just one permanent water gauge station in the watershed located along the

Jock River at the Moodie Drive bridge crossing. It's operated and managed by Environment Canada.

Water flow data is needed for proper control of water takings of large amounts of both surface and groundwater water from the watershed. Such information is also needed to aid in improving water quality, for protecting and enhancing habitat for fish, waterfowl and other species, for flood forecasting, for providing more accurate information for storm water management plans for building subdivisions, shopping centres, business and industrial parks, and for developing better wastewater management plans, etc.

The Friends of the Jock River (FOJR) agreed with the need for more water gauge stations, especially as we became aware of water usage by golf courses, quarries, other businesses, municipalities, and others within the watershed. As a result the FOJR asked the RVCA what they were doing to establish additional gauges. The answer was that they didn't have the resources (money) to establish any new gauges at that time. FOJR asked Environment Canada, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources whether they would be interested in establishing additional gauges on the Jock, and whether they would be able to find the money necessary to do so. They all indicated a lack of available money to use for such a purpose.

We contacted the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, the former Township of Goulbourn, the former City of Nepean, the County of Lanark, and the Township of Beckwith. The three former municipalities and the RVCA indicated an interest forming a partnership with us to establish two new additional permanent water gauge stations on the Jock.

Results

The RVCA estimated a cost of \$34,000.00 to establish, operate and maintain two additional gauges for their first year of operation. Data collection and management included. We estimated an additional \$600.00 for signage at the two gauges. After 15 months of effort we finally had the cheques and written commitments for the funding and goods and services in lieu of actual cash for this project. The former Township of Goulbourn gave us \$2,000.00, the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, and the former City of Nepean each gave us \$5,260.00 for the project. In the winter of 2000, we turned this money over to the RVCA, which had agreed to provide the rest of the funding in cash, goods and services, and carry out the installation of the stations, their ongoing operation-maintenance, and data management.

The FOJR organized the project and agreed to arrange, with the assistance of the RVCA, volunteers to take manual readings at 12 or more temporary station locations.

Patrick Larsen, RVCA Water Resources Technician, told us that we could expect the gauges to be installed in the early summer of 2000. That didn't happen. Both Mr. Larsen and Bruce Reid of the RVCA verbally assured me in the late summer and early fall of 2001 that at least one new permanent water gauge station would be established on the Jock River before the end of 2001. No new gauge has yet been installed as of the middle of February 2002.

A contradictory January 8, 2002 letter from Mr. Larsen gives us no confidence that the RVCA will be installing any new gauge in the near future. We are frustrated and disappointed with the RVCA's actions, or rather the lack thereof. At the regular monthly meeting in February, 2002, FOJR approved a letter to be sent to Dell Hallett, the RVCA's General Manager, and a copy of Mr. Larsen's letter to indicate our problems, frustrations and disappointments with the RVCA. We also indicated our doubts "...about the RVCA's intention to establish, maintain and operate such gauges."

We asked Mr. Hallett to “give us a written assurance that at least one new gauge station will be in place before the end of spring 2002.” Without the assurance, we suggested we might ask for the return of the money we gave the RVCA in 2000.

Our letter also states, “We strongly believe in the need for and worth of having more flow data for the Jock River Watershed. As such we are determined to obtain this data one way or another, with or without the RVCA. Our preference is to obtain this data with the RVCA, but we have been given reason to believe that would not occur any time soon. In 2000 and 2001 an opportunity to collect flow data during one of the wettest years on record and during the driest year in memory were missed. Collection of flow data from new gauges needs to begin as soon as possible.”

I’m hopeful that the RVCA will provide a positive response to our letter in time for our February 26th, 2002 Annual General Meeting. If the response from the RVCA is not positive I will look into other possibilities for establishing new gauge stations.

To further illustrate the need for new gauge stations, the MOE has held two interagency meetings regarding water takings in the Goulbourn portion of the watershed. This is due in no small part to concerns raised by us and others regarding the impacts and potential impacts from proposed water takings from 5 quarries (3 existing and 2 proposed). MOE has indicated that it will organize a meeting of all stakeholders, presumably including the FOJR, to discuss this matter. We will indicate the need for additional water gauge stations and suggest the creation of a partnership to establish and operate them. Hopefully this would be a new partnership in addition to our present one with the RVCA.

In regard to the 12 or more manual temporary stations, the FOJR identified 33 potential locations. In May of 2001 myself and 2 other members of the FOJR, Eric Snyder and Ryan Rattey, visited a number of locations along Flowing Creek and the Hobb’s Municipal Drain (a natural watercourse that’s been widened, deepened and artificially straightened in several locations). We collected several different types of data and videotaped its collection. Unfortunately, due to the immediate need to document and report a large number of other destructive actions by landowners to Provincially Significant Wetlands and watercourses, as well as carry out inventory and mapping work on threatened wetlands, we were unable to carry out further detailed data collection on Flowing Creek and the Hobb’s Municipal Drain in 2001. We will see about continuing this data collection this spring but more people are needed to work on monitoring and data collection.

Respectfully submitted
Ken McRae, Director for Water Conservation and Usage

10.14 Water Sampling

There was no water sampling by the Friends in year 2001. As in 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.

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.

Brian Finch

10.15 Garbage Clean-up

There was no project leader for the project and, consequently, no clean-up. A volunteer is needed to lead the project in 2002.

10.16 Shoreline Restoration

10.161 Twin Elm

The shoreline fence closest to the Twin Elm Bridge suffered some damage from the spring runoff. One cedar post disappeared and one of the large posts we installed along the shoreline to protect the fence from the ice was sheared off. It is safe to say that, in larger runoff years, we will lose a few more. The few plastic posts remaining after spring runoff 2000 were destroyed by runoff 2001.

At the far end of the field, someone cut through the fence to install a pump and did a poor job of putting it back together after the pump was removed. The pump was used to irrigate an adjacent field. We believe that the pump was installed without a permit to take water.

Some young, crafty cattle introduced to the herd in the summer exploited the small gaps in the poorly tensioned wire in two locations and trampled portions of the shoreline vegetation. Damage was slight.

In the fall, a work party repaired and strengthened the fence. Following spring runoff 2002, the section cut to make way for the pump will have to be repaired again and re-tensioned as I did not do the best possible job in the fall. If the pump is to be used in the future, we will have to consider installing a gate.

A work party assessed the trees from the previous plantings and found that the trees in the riparian zone (the band along the river) had fared poorly. In the first place, the riparian zone is known to have a fairly low success rate but two droughts in the last three years have definitely made matters much worse. An exact tally for this zone has not been made but the success rate is probably below 10%. By comparison, the spruce planted four years ago near the upstream end of the field away from the river have done very well. The small cedars at the very end have not done as well since the cattle also like the area. The success rate for the cedars is likely below 20% but it is difficult to assess, as the cedars are still small and are still difficult to find in the grass.

Brian Finch

10.162 Other Locations

See the Education Project below.

10.17 Cedar Logs

The cedar logs donated by Goulbourn township in 1999 have been piled in the Twin Elm field owned by Mary and Alastair Munro. Late in the spring 2001, work parties peeled, cut and stacked about half the pile. To prevent deterioration, the rest of the pile will have to be dealt with and the finished posts stored properly.

Brian Finch

10.18 Richmond Conservation Area Membership and Projects

In its work plan for the year 2001 the Friends of the Jock River included an item to pursue membership on the Richmond Conservation Area Management Team (RCAMT). At that time, we had already organised a Bioblitz Day at the Richmond Conservation Area (RCA), in August of 2000, which had contributed a great deal to the existing knowledge of the flora and fauna of the area. In addition, we had undertaken a significant tree-planting project for the RCA during the preceding spring and planned to continue with another such project in the spring of 2001. Moreover, we had acquired a great amount of expertise on the RCA with our new secretary, Eric Snyder, who had been instrumental in founding the RCA, writing the RCA Management Plan (RCAMP) and lobbying for its implementation. Because of this experience with the area, we were convinced that we occupied a position from which to play an important role in the protection of the RCA, which has been under attack since 1998. Furthermore, given that the RCA is a large natural area, situated within the boundaries of the Village of Richmond, to be managed primarily for birding and other kinds of nature appreciation, we believed that it could benefit the Jock River Watershed in at least two ways. First, through its protection, a large area of the Jock River flood plain, and riparian habitat along the Jock River and Marlborough Creek, could be preserved in a natural condition. Second, if properly managed, the RCA could become an important means of promoting the natural values of the entire Jock River Watershed. Hence, we asked to have a representative appointed to the RCAMT and the City of Ottawa agreed. While not yet officially on the RCAMT, the Friends of the Jock River has attended meetings for much of the year and has played an active role on the team. We have nominated Eric Snyder to be our representative; appointment of members to the RCAMT will occur in early 2002.

Not only have we continued tree planting in the RCA during 2001, we have also been instrumental in holding the City accountable for commitments to implement the RCAMP made by its predecessors, Goulbourn Township and the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton (RMOC). We have done this in two ways. First, we have assisted the City in writing its terms of reference for the RCAMT, thereby ensuring that past commitments were reflected in the updated document. Second, we have acted as a watchdog in regard to the City's efforts to reclaim the Richmond Lagoons as part of Richmond's sewage facilities. Although the Lagoons had become part of the RCA in 1993, in January 1998, with the support of Goulbourn Township, RMOC began a Class Environmental Assessment to justify using the Richmond Lagoons once again as a sewage works. In the course of completing the resulting study both RMOC and Goulbourn agreed to certain conditions that were intended to ensure that the RCA would in no way be adversely affected by the use of the lagoons for sewage storage. However, in implementing the recommendations of the study, during 2001, the City of Ottawa has not respected those conditions. In fact, the manner in which it has undertaken implementation will make it practically impossible to implement the RCAMP. Furthermore, in doing so it has unnecessarily destroyed trails and wild life habitat in the conservation area, littered the Richmond Lagoons with used condoms and other such refuse, and caused a sewage spill on RCA land. Eric Snyder has documented this destruction and, through the Friends of the Jock River, made a formal complaint to the Assessments and Approvals branch of the Ministry of Environment. The Ministry has opened an investigation into the matter. We expect to receive their assessment of the situation very soon, and we will respond accordingly.

Respectfully submitted
Eric Snyder

10.2 Education Projects

10.21 The Shoreline Rehabilitation Education Project

Education and shoreline restoration 2000/2001, project number 22, was funded by the Friends of Environment Foundation and spanned two years. The cooperation and participation of local teachers was a critical component of project but the relationship between the Ontario teachers and the Ontario government, in particular, the teachers' suspension of their participation in extra-curricular activities made the successful completion of the project impossible. It was with considerable regret that the project could not be completed as planned. The unspent funds (\$6,743.27) were returned to the Friends of Environment Foundation. Graciously, the Foundation allowed us to retain the funds already spend on chest waders (\$222.23) and aerial photographs (\$34.50).

The considerable amount of planning for the project will not be lost as a significant portion is applicable and could be used for other projects.

Respectfully submitted
Ryan Rattey

10.22 Information Board Project

There was no project leader for the project and, consequently, no work was conducted.

10.3 Water Protection Advocacy Projects

10.31 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions

Background:

The issue relates to a decision in 1999 by the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton to proceed with the installation of an 11km pipeline to transport sewage from Munster Hamlet to Richmond. The sewage would then be pumped into the RMOC sewage collector system for eventual secondary treatment at the RMOC sewage treatment facility at Green's Creek (ROPEC) some 50 km away. In 1999, the FOJR and others 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 requests. Also in 1999, the Friends appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board to reject the RMOC's amendment to the RMOC Official Plan for a pipeline from Munster to Richmond. The OMB appeal was made on the behalf of the Friends of the Jock River and argued by Brian Finch. Three other parties also appealed the RMOC's decision: Gordon Sample, Richard Bendall and the Citizen Review Committee for Waste Management of Ottawa-Carleton.

More background and a listing of the major issues in the OMB case were given in last year's annual report.

Year 2001

The Ontario Municipal Board brought down its decision June 8, 2001. It allowed the appeal, in part. The OMB was critical of the evaluation and planning processes used by the City in the project and of some of the City's witnesses in the hearing. It also said,

“the best evidence is not before the Board. ... Instead of turning down the Official Plan Amendment as proposed, the Board would like the City to request the City to perfect its case.”

The OMB also instructed,

“the pipeline, the CMS (on-site tertiary treatment with discharge to Jock) and the Snofluent (snow-making treatment) ought to be subjected to a thorough reevaluation using the best available evidence, secured from the proponents of the systems where applicable.”

The OMB apparently chose this avenue as a significant concession to the City to save it time. Full acceptance of the appeal would have sent the City right back several years in the planning process. (Note that the OMB lacked the power to order the installation of an on-site treatment facility.)

Almost as soon as this decision was released, Ward 6 councilor, Janet Stavinga, publicly stated her intent to have the City of Ottawa appeal. In July, an in camera committee of City Council unanimously instructed City staff to seek leave to appeal the OMB decision to the Ontario Superior Court on the grounds that the OMB “exceeded its jurisdiction by considering and determining matters under the Environmental Assessment [EA] Act”. The City contended that the “OMB should not be allowed to deal with issues that are the subject of a bump-up” request under the EA Act. Another committee of Council decided one week later to proceed with the reevaluation as ordered in the OMB decision. Curiously, the City planned to appeal and implement the decision at the same time.

The four original appellants were most concerned about the implications of an appeal and felt compelled to respond. A few major national environmental groups, including the Canadian Environmental Law Association, were also concerned but chose not to get involved at the “motion to seek leave” stage. The four appellants jointly responded to the motion through a single law firm and filed a motion for a cross appeal. Our cross appeal contended that the OMB erred in law by asking the City to re-evaluate the alternatives. If the City did not have the best available evidence and there was insufficient evidence to allow the Official Plan amendment, the OMB should have allowed the appeal in full.

Both the City’s and the four original appellants’ motions to seek leave to appeal the OMB decision were rejected by the Ontario Superior Court.

The City’s first step in implementing the OMB’s decision was a request for proposals sent to four consulting engineering firms. As of the end of December 2001, the City had not made its selection on which firm will conduct the reevaluation [now known to be R.J. Anderson]. We are guarded in our expectations of the reevaluation process for several reasons:

- The City’s work plan called for “(a) complete review of all information and data that was available at the time of the preparation of the addendum will be undertaken. The assignment will include the consultant soliciting input from the proponents and CRA in order to ensure the completeness of the information being reviewed.” However, the OMB concluded overwhelmingly that the City did not have sufficient information and data at the time of the preparation of the addendum. Additional information and data were presented at the OMB hearing, well after the preparation of the addendum. In addition, some information available at the time of the preparation of the addendum was incomplete (e.g., the functioning of the Snofluent process) or wrong (e.g., spring peak flow data);
- The four consulting engineering firms selected to bid have significant experience with pipelines and conventional secondary sewage treatment but we have concerns about their level of expertise and experience with high tech tertiary sewage treatment systems; and
- We worry about the level and type of consultation the selected engineering firm will have with the original bidders (CMS and Delta Engineering) and the original appellants. Inadequate consultation could place the City in contempt of the OMB decision.

Conclusions

The advice and service provided by the City's legal staff has to be questioned for several reasons:

- The legislation under which the OMB operates clearly states that the OMB has jurisdiction over all planning matters, including those relating to the environment. While this legislation and the environmental legislation overlap in scope, nothing in any Ontario legislation states or even suggests the EA process pre-empts the jurisdiction of the OMB on planning issues;
- During the OMB appeal, the City's made three other failed legal attempts to exclude the EA issues from the purview of the OMB; and
- Fully 80-90% of the evidence presented by the City and all but one of its witnesses had to do with the environmental assessment.

Also, where were the City's politicians in this issue? We feel they were badly served by staff but they also failed to inform themselves of the facts when the facts were presented.

Fiscal responsibility has gone out the window. Original estimates for the pipeline option were in the range of \$12 - \$15 million (M), when the required upgrades to the Richmond pumping station were included. (Actually, some consultants used considerably lower estimates but without justification.) The City chose the more expensive alternative over a guaranteed fixed bid of \$3.1M to install an on-site, high tech, tertiary treatment facility with discharge of high quality effluent to the Jock River. The effluent would have been of higher quality than the water that flows in the river. Furthermore, it would have been up and running more than a year ago. At latest count, the City has spent in excess of \$9M on attempts to deal with the Munster Hamlet sewage problem and has yet to put a shovel in the ground. Note that, prior to the OMB hearing, the City awarded a design and management oversight contract for the pipeline - now on hold - at a cost of \$1.1M. (This is more than one third of the total installed cost of the high tech facility, which was already designed, needed no management oversight and included a three years of operating costs.) The \$9M spent to date does not include the cost of the sewage solution (high tech installation or pipe between \$3.1M and \$15M), the cost of this winter's haulage of sewage (\$650,000), the legal costs of the OMB and the appeal of the OMB decision (\$?) or the cost of the upcoming reevaluation required by the OMB (\$163,000). Lastly, the figure does not include the costs of pending, unresolved litigation against the City.

We will continue to be involved.

Much of the documentation on the Munster issue is now on the website: www.ottawasewergatefiasco.com. I urge you to have a look at it but be patient as there is a lot of material.

Brian Finch, Treasurer

10.32 Water Taking Permits and Wetlands Issues

Water Taking Permits

In 2001 comments were submitted by the FOJR to MOE regarding several water taking permit applications.

1/ Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd. applied for an amendment to its permit for its Goulbourn Quarry on Flewellyn Road, in Goulbourn. It wants to pump water out of and away from its quarry year round. Pumping is done to keep quarries de-watered. We oppose pumping during the spring freshet. Several hundred feet of the Hobbs Drain creek is severely eroded, downstream of the Fallowfield Road where the quarry's discharged water enters it. Quarry water discharging into the creek during an average year's freshet when water levels and flow velocity are high would exacerbate erosion and sedimentation. No MOE decision has yet been posted on the Environmental Bill of Rights Registry regarding this application.

Cavanagh's present Goulbourn Quarry Permit To Take Water (PTTW) permits it to take up to 2,727.6 litres per minute (600 imperial gallons per minute), which works out to 3,927,744 litres per day (864,000 imperial gallons per day). It is presently permitted to take water from April 1st to December 20th of each year.

2/ Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd. applied for a PTTW for a new proposed quarry, to be called Henderson Quarry, on the west side of Jinkinson Road, in Goulbourn. We indicated that it would be premature to issue the permit because Cavanagh is still in the process of carrying out additional studies regarding its water taking. MOE did not issue the permit and closed the file because the application was incomplete. Cavanagh will have to reapply for a PTTW after finishing additional studies.

Cavanagh had applied for a PTTW to take up to 5,456 l/min. (1,200 gal/min.), which works out to 7,856,640 l/d (1,728,000 gal/d). They applied for a year round, 10 year permit.

3/ Monarch Construction applied for an amendment to its existing permit to reflect the enlargement of its Stonebridge Golf Club course from 9 to 18 holes. The permit was issued on Feb. 4, 2002. This means that Monarch was irrigating its enlarged course during the 2001 drought before being issued an amended permit. MOE has been asked to investigate this matter. Follow-up is required. A suggestion made by FOJR to put a condition in the permit regarding the specific hours each day when water could be sprayed for irrigation was adopted. This was to limit evaporation. It is permitted to irrigate between 7pm and 10am each day.

In Monarch's amended PTTW it is permitted to take up to 1,391,076 l/d (306,000 gal/d) to irrigate the golf course. It is permitted to take water from April 1st to October 31st each year of the 10 year permit.

4/ Courtyard Development Inc. applied for a permit for a communal well for a proposed development in Richmond. FOJR suggested that, if this building proposal goes forward, low water flush toilets, low water usage shower heads, and other low water usage plumbing fixtures be required. I suggested that MOE staff contact the City of Ottawa, or former mayor Stavinga to request a copy of the study done a number of years ago on the local aquifer and its water supply capacity. No decision has been posted yet.

The proponent has applied for a year round PTTW, for a 10 year period. Ten years is the maximum length for which permits are now issued. Near the end of 10 years, a renewal of the permit has to be applied for. The proponent has asked for a PTTW to take up to 400 l/min. (88 gal/min.), which works out to 576,000 l/d (126,705 gal/d).

The above amounts are proposed for the first 40-townhouse phase of development. Two additional phases of similar size are planned with a proposed future amendment of the PTTW to include a second well as a stand-by supply well.

5/ Dibblee Paving & Materials Ltd. has the Bell Quarry on the Jinkinson Road, in the former Township of Goulbourn. Since about 1970, it has been operated off and on without a PTTW, In that time MOE has neither forced it to apply for a PTTW nor issued an order to cease taking water. In November 2001, Dibblee finally applied for a year round PTTW for 10 years. It has applied to pump up to 4,344 l/min. (955.56 gal/min.), which works out to 6,255,360 l/d (1,376,014 gal/d).

Dibblee's quarry license under the Aggregates Resources Act allowed Dibblee to pump water in two directions; one easterly into a part of the Provincially Significant North Goulbourn Wetlands Complex, off its property; the other southerly into an unevaluated, unmapped and unclassified marsh wetland on Dibblee's property, from which water then flows onto properties owned by others. In Dibblee's application for a PTTW it indicated that it wanted to pump the Bell Quarry water easterly.

R.W. Tomlinson Ltd. now owns the property on the northerly and easterly sides of the Bell Quarry. Tomlinson has received a PTTW for its proposed Stittsville Quarry beside the Bell Quarry. The PTTW issued in December, 2001, permits Tomlinson to take water year round, for a period of 5 years and to take up to 5,400 l/min. (1,188 gal/min.), which works out to 7,776,000 l/d (1,710,515 gal/d). Tomlinson wants to pump Stittsville Quarry water into the part of the North Goulbourn Wetlands Complex on its property. Tomlinson is on record as opposing the pumping of Dibblee water onto Tomlinson's property. Tomlinson has applied for an "Approval for Sewage Works", which is required before Tomlinson can start to pump and dispose of the water. MOE is assessing the application.

Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd. has its Beagle Club Quarry, also on Jinkinson Road, just a short distance south of Dibblee's Bell Quarry. In a November 2001, meeting at the Beagle Club Quarry site, Mr. Cavanagh indicated that he is opposed to the pumping of Bell Quarry water that would flow onto his property. He understandably doesn't want to pump Bell Quarry water out of his quarry, which would affect his PTTW of December 2001. The Cavanagh PTTW is from April 1st to December 20th each year, for 5 years, and permits it to take up to 12,274.2 l/min. (2,700 gal/min.), which works out to 17,674,848 l/d (3,888,000 gal/d). Cavanagh still has to apply for and be issued an "Approval for Sewage Works" before it can de-water its quarry.

Where can Dibblee send its quarry water?

In the opinions of the FOJR and the Goulbourn Wetlands Group (GWG), MOE's "Decisions" to issue the Tomlinson Stittsville Quarry and Cavanagh Beagle Club Quarry PsTTW have a number of serious flaws. One main flaw is, in our view, MOE's failure to take a watershed-ecosystem approach in evaluating the surface water discharge impacts of the applications for these PsTTW, as per its own policies and regulations.

The GWG made application to the Ontario Environmental Review Tribunal (ERT) for a "Request For Leave To Appeal" both of MOE's "Decisions". On behalf of the FOJR, I made application regarding the Tomlinson PTTW "Decision" only. I would have made application for the Cavanagh one as well, but didn't have time to do so. There is only a 15 day period from the time of the posting of the "Decision" notice on the EBR Registry for submission of a "Request For Leave To Appeal". In these two cases the period started about a week before Christmas.

The ERT denied our "Requests for Leave to Appeal". The ERT based its decisions upon responses from the MOE and the proponents. These responses have many significant errors and contradictions. In our opinion the ERT's "Decisions" are flawed and we are therefore considering further actions.

Respectfully submitted
Ken McRae, Director for Water Conservation and Usage

Wetlands and Related Issues

1/ Wetlands Protection Matters

Destructive Actions Carried Out

During the past two years there have been a growing number of cases where landowners, within the former Goulbourn Township portion of the Jock River Watershed, have carried out actions destructive to Provincially Significant Wetlands upon their property. Myself, on behalf of the Friends of the Jock River (FOJR), and Selena Walker, on behalf of the Goulbourn Wetlands Group (GWG) in particular, as well as others spent a considerable amount of time in 2001 documenting, monitoring, and reporting these actions.

(i) In part of Lots 17 & 18, Concession 11, the landowner clear-cut a large portion of the Provincially Significant North Goulbourn Wetlands Complex two years ago. In the summer of 2001 the landowner excavated 2 large drainage ditches with a High-ho through the part of the wetland earlier clear cut and stripped the cattails and tree stumps with a large bulldozer. Last summer's drought had dried out this and many wetlands sufficiently to allow landowner's to get heavy earthmoving equipment into them. By coincidence I was giving a tour of some area wetlands to a biologist from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) when suddenly we came upon this bulldozer in action. By the next week the work had stopped and the bulldozer was gone.

(ii) In part of Lots 16 & 17, Concession 11, it appears that the landowner excavated part of a drainage ditch through another part of the North Goulbourn Wetlands Complex 2 years ago and had the job finished in 2001. Some clear cutting was again carried out. The work stopped just out of sight of the Trans Canada Trail.

(iii) In part of Lot 18, Con. 10, in 2000 another landowner excavated a drainage ditch through yet another part of the North Goulbourn Wetlands Complex. There was also clear cutting and excavation work for a street network in a ill conceived country estate lot subdivision for which no approvals applications had been made.

(iv) In part of Lots 12 & 13, Con. 10, and in part of Lots 13, 14 & 15 in Con. 9 Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd. excavated a drainage ditch through a wetland and in an existing watercourse for the propose of de-watering it's Beagle Club Quarry on Jinkinson Road. This action was carried out without any approvals. According to the MNR, 8 charges have been laid against the company. After numerous postponements this matter is finally scheduled to come to trial in March, 2002.

(v) In part of Lot 6, Con. 11 the Dwyer Hill Road Trailer Park owners were again carrying out work within the Provincially Significant Manion Corners Long Swamp Wetland and it's adjacent lands without first receiving rezoning and site plan approvals. The actions carried out this past summer and fall were also in violation of a stop work order issued earlier by the former Township of Goulbourn.

(vi) In part of Lot 16, Con. 5 the landowner dredged out about 800 feet of the Hobb's Drain (creek) passing through part of the Provincially Significant Richmond Fen Wetland, without receiving any government approvals first.

(vii) Additional clear cutting and drainage ditch excavation was carried out without approvals in 2001 in 2 other locations in the Richmond Fen Wetland. In yet another case, some drainage ditch

excavation and some filling were carried out without any approvals.

To our knowledge charges have only been laid in relation to one of the above destructive actions.

Stittsville Quarry Impacts On North Goulbourn Wetlands Complex

R.W. Tomlinson Ltd.'s plans for its proposed Stittsville Quarry on Jinkinson Road proposes that the water to be discharged from the quarry hole be discharged eastward into part of the North Goulbourn Wetlands Complex. The company has been issued a Permit To Take Water (PTTW), by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment(MOE). The permit allows the company to discharge up to 7,776,000 liters of water per day, year round, into the wetland.

Members of the FOJR, the GWG and others worked together in the summer and fall of 2001 to carry out an inventory of plant and other species in the part of the wetland where water is proposed to be discharged. We also marked trees we believe to be on the boundary of that part of the wetland and carried out work mapping this boundary.

We believe that a large amount of water pumped into this part of the wetland would drown and destroy many plant species, some regionally significant, and their habitat. The habitat of other species would also be lost. To our knowledge the impacts from discharged water passing through this part of the wetland are unknown at this time.

It's still unknown as to where this water will exit from the North Goulbourn Wetlands Complex. Potential cumulative impacts from this water joining with large amounts of water proposed to be discharged from neighboring quarries has not been adequately addressed by the quarries, nor by government agencies.

The FOJR and GWG "Requested Leave To Appeal", from the Ontario Environmental Review Tribunal (ERT), to appeal MOE's decision to issue Tomlinson this PTTW. Our requests were denied. In our opinion the ERT's decision to deny our requests was based on flawed information in the MOE and Tomlinson responses to our requests. Flaws, which the ERT was unaware of. Tomlinson still requires an Approval For A Sewage Works under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act before it can legally pump any water. If our concerns are not adequately addressed by MOE in its consideration of that approval, the FOJR will "Request Leave To Appeal" the decision to the ERT and we will point out all of the aforementioned flaws.

Change In Legislation

An amendment to the Conservation Authorities Act was passed in January 2000 to allow conservation authorities, through new regulations, to better protect wetlands from destructive actions such as those described above. The MNR is presently working on regulations. I've been told that there will be an opportunity for the public to comment on draft versions of these regulations later this year. This action by government is long overdue. Better late than never. The amendment to the Act doesn't address the problem of landowners denying MNR access to their properties for the propose of properly evaluating, mapping and classifying wetlands. However, it does allow for significant punishment of those people who carry out destructive actions such as those described above. The public needs assurance that the final regulations have enough clout to protect wetlands.

Complexing of Wetlands

The local Kemptville MNR office has finally carried out work to complex the Provincially Significant Upper Poole Creek Wetlands Complex with the Provincially Significant North Goulbourn Wetlands

Complex. MNR had indicated previously that this work would be carried out in the summer of 1999. Better late than never. The really good news about this is that they have realized and accepted that the Rothbourne Wetland should be included in this new Provincially Significant Goulbourn Wetlands Complex. The Rothbourne Wetland didn't have Provincially Significant status previously and was therefore even more vulnerable to be destroyed than already identified Provincially Significant wetlands.

As good as this news is there is still a major problem with the presently officially accepted boundaries of these newly complexed wetlands. Those boundaries are smaller than what they should be. There are 2 reasons: the MNR hasn't sufficient funds to have enough qualified staff to properly evaluate, map and classify wetlands; and landowners can and have denied MNR staff access to their properties.

Development Applications Commented On.

(i) In December of 2001, on behalf of the FOJR, I submitted comments to the City of Ottawa's Planning and Development Committee regarding rezoning and site plan applications for two additional building lots along Conley Road, in the former Township of Goulbourn. Part of the Provincially Significant Richmond Fen Wetland is on the two proposed new lots. The rezoning application proposed changing the zoning of the parts of the wetland involved to a RU-5 zoning. The FOJR, the GWG, and an individual citizen (Lynn Duffy) opposed this change. Changes to the application were made to retain the wetland zoning and then the application was approved.

(ii) In the January and March of 2001 I made comments, on behalf of the FOJR, to City of Ottawa staff regarding a re-zoning application and site plan application by Ashfield Farms Day Camp. The original applications could have led to the construction of a commercial 9 hole golf course along part of King's Creek, a major tributary to the Jock River. It would have also meant more likely destruction of the unevaluated wetland along that part of the creek. These concerns were expressed and changes were made in the applications to address these concerns while still allowing the applicant to have approvals for their stated needs. The outcome was satisfactory.

(iii) Application for rezoning for Henderson Quarry. Please see Water Taking Permits report.

Respectfully submitted
Ken McRae, Director for Water Conservation and Usage

10.33 Goulbourn Township Quarries

There are 3 operating quarries presently. Cavanagh's "Goulbourn Quarry", between Flewellyn Road and Fallowfield Road, and "Beagle Club Quarry" on Jinkinson Road. The other one is the Dibblee "Bell Quarry" also on Jinkinson Road. There are details about these PsTTW in the "Water Taking Permits" report.

A fourth quarry is a R.W. Tomlinson Ltd. proposed new quarry. They've named it the Stittsville Quarry. A 5th quarry is Cavanagh's proposed Henderson Quarry, also on the Jinkinson Road. Cavanagh has applied to MNR for a quarry licence, and to the City for a rezoning approval. Decisions on these applications are on hold awaiting additional studies from Cavanagh's consultants.

Both Cavanagh and Tomlinson still require an Approval For Sewage Works, under Section 53 of the Ontario Water Resources Act, before they can discharge water from their quarries. I submitted comments to MOE regarding Tomlinson's application for this approval, on FOJR's behalf. Further comments will be made. There will be an opportunity to "Request Leave To Appeal" if MOE issues the approval before concerns are addressed and if we think it necessary. Cavanagh hasn't submitted an application yet for this approval.

The sewage works approval process is supposed to address surface water discharge issues. We'll see.

Check our Newsletters on our website for updates on water taking permits issues and other matters.

Respectfully submitted by Ken McRae, Director for Water Conservation and Usage

10.34 Testing for Contaminants at Abandoned Dump Sites

Background

In the spring of 2000 we became aware of a very significant groundwater contamination from an abandoned dump in Beckwith Township, Lanark County. Some 240 wells were contaminated. A large part of the Jock River Watershed is in Beckwith. The contaminants include trichloroethylene (TCE) and its breakdown products dichloroethylene and vinyl chloride. TCE is a solvent used as a degreaser in dry cleaning. Discovery of the contamination was by accident. The Beckwith problem was discovered only when a housing developer had groundwater samples tested.

A map of the large contaminated area indicates that although this old dump site is outside of the Jock River Watershed the contamination has spread out into the groundwater in the Jock River Watershed.

Results

A number of homes and businesses have to use bottled water and a large number now have special water filter systems. The last I heard was that the contamination has not spread any further. Testing of surface water in the Jock watershed showed no contamination problem.

On behalf of the FOJR, I sent a letter, April, 200, to Steve Burns, Ottawa District Manager, Ontario Ministry of the Environment (MOE), stating our concern that other old abandoned dump or landfill sites within the watershed might also be leaking contaminants into groundwater and perhaps into surface water, without anyone being aware of it.

In response to the letter, MOE carried out an evaluation of 10 closed landfill sites within the Jock watershed and wrote a report. The report sent to us indicates that there is at least one other major abandoned dumpsite within the watershed they are apparently unaware of. We will bring it to their attention.

The MOE report is very inadequate. No groundwater samples were tested at, or around any of the sites. Surface water samples were tested from only one site. Only visual observations were made at the majority of the sites. In some cases even visual observation was limited or non-existent as the landowner denied MOE access to the property, or the MOE staff thought a closer look was unnecessary or thought the site was too physically difficult to access.

Another letter will be sent to MOE indicating our view that the MOE response is insufficient.

We understand that the new City of Ottawa is doing some work in regards to old abandoned landfill sites within its boundaries. The City will be asked about its current work and its future plans.

Our April, 2001 letter to the MOE indicated that the Friends of the Jock River would be willing to collect well water and surface water samples from around the old landfill sites and to deliver them for testing. If there is some other way that we could be of assistance we are open to other suggestions.

Respectfully submitted
Ken McRae, Director for Water Conservation and Usage

10.35 The Jock River Watershed Plan

The Friends of the Jock River have been involved in several drafts of the "Jock River Watershed Management Plan".

The Friends submitted detailed written comments regarding an earlier draft version in November 2000. We also made a number of verbal additional comments to Lynn Preston, a Watershed Planner with the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA), in a January 24, 2001 meeting.

A subsequent and very different draft version of the plan came to our attention in May 2001. Given our previous involvement in commenting on what should be in the plan, and given our involvement in water issues in the watershed we expected that the RVCA would routinely circulate this document to us. Such was not the case. We had to contact the RVCA to request a copy.

We didn't have time to comment on the May version within RVCA's time frame. Regardless, we did submit 35 comments. Lynn Preston gave a detailed verbal response to most of our comments over the telephone. Dell Hallett, General Manager of the RVCA, sent us a written but general response.

The RVCA released its long awaited final version of the "Jock River Watershed Management Plan" in November 2001. The FOJR has not yet discussed the final plan as a group so we have no formal position at this time. We hope to have a special meeting in early 2002 to discuss this matter. RVCA staff has agreed to meet with us as well.

Respectfully submitted
Ken McRae, Director for Water Conservation and Usage

11. Fundraising Report

11.1 Blues Festival Beer Can Collection

The Blues Festival was bigger than ever this past July. As the Festival opened, the Friends managed to borrow eight large portable recycling bins from Can Waste. Over the next two weekends, Niel and Ryan Rattey worked like dogs collecting the beer cans on site. Brian Finch, Doug Watson, Chris Coupe and Ken McRae showed up as well. In the end, we collected well over 12,000 cans to generate \$1250.00 for the Friends of the Jock River. Some of this money was earmarked for legal fees & such for the incorporation of the Friends. Incorporation has many advantages for the Friends

in terms of procuring grants, protection of officers against lawsuits, credibility, liability insurance requirements, etc.

Niel Barrington, President

12. Work Plan for 2002

(not listed in order of priority)

1. Water Protection Advocacy (see reports for follow-up items)
 - a. Water Taking Permits
 - b. Goulbourn Township Quarries
 - c. Water sampling around abandoned dump sites
2. Tree Planting
3. Installation of Water Flow Meters On Upper Jock
(See report)
4. Water Sampling
If RVCA is interested.
5. Education
 - a. 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
 - b. We will continue to have displays and booths at community events such as the Carlingwood Wildlife Festival, Richmond Fair and Sportsman's shows.
 - c. 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.
6. 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.
7. Membership Drive (see Membership Committee report for the many proposals)
8. 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 past years will disappear if the fence is not maintained.
9. Cedar Logs

The remaining logs have to be peeled, cut and stored in a secure area if they are to be of value in future projects.

10. Web Site

Only updating as required.

11. Jock River Watershed Plan

Provide constructive comments to the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority's Jock River Watershed Plan.

12. Richmond Conservation Area Management Team Membership

Provide active membership on the Richmond Conservation Area Management Team.

13. Newsletter.

Respectfully submitted,

Niel Barrington
President

12.1 Budget for 2002

Planned Income

General

Anonymous Donations	0
Receipted Donations	300
GST Rebates	100
Corporate Membership	200
Family Membership	200
Supporter Membership	200
<u>Volunteer Membership</u>	<u>200</u>
Total General	\$1200

Projects

Educational Kiosk	1500
Trees	1000
Tree Maintenance	1000
Twin Elm Maintenance	50
Water Sampling	0
Water Flow Meters	0
Education	200
River Clean-up	200
Water Protection Advocacy	150
Newsletter	200
<u>Signage</u>	<u>50</u>

Total Projects	\$4350
<hr/>	
Total Receipts	\$5550

Planned Disbursements

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
<hr/>	
Total General	\$850

Projects

Educational Kiosk	1500
Trees	1000
Tree Maintenance	1000
Twin Elm Maintenance	50
Water Sampling	0
Water Flow Meters	0
Education	200
River Clean-up	200
Water Protection Advocacy	150
Newsletter	200
<u>Signage</u>	<u>50</u>
Total Projects	\$4350

<hr/>	
Total disbursements	\$5200

Total receipts minus total disbursements \$350

13. Nomination Committee Report

The Nomination Committee is made up of the following members: Gordon Sample, Doug Watson, Brian Finch and Niel Barrington. The committee submits the following list of nominations for the Board of Directors for the year 2002:

President	Niel Barrington
Vice-President	Ryan Rattey
Treasurer	Brian Finch
Director for Water Conservation and Usage	Ken McRae
Secretary	Eric Snyder

Director for Membership
Director for Projects and Actions

Ron Maybury
Tim van der Horn

I would bring to the attention of all members that the Nomination Committee would be pleased to accept nominations prior to the meeting for the Director of Fund-Raising, and Director for Publicity and Public Relations. Please also note that nominations for all positions may be made from the floor during the AGM; however, those nominated must be members in good standing and must agree to the nomination.

Respectfully submitted,
Niel Barrington
Nomination Committee Chair