

Friends of the Jock River

Annual Report
2003

Box 764
Richmond, Ontario,
K0A 2Z0

Table of Contents

*See Editor's note below

| Item | Page | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1.0 | Agenda | 4 |
| 2.0 | Minutes of Annual General Meeting, February xx, 2003 | 6 |
| 3.0 | Membership List | 10 |
| 4.0 | Leadership List | 11 |
| 5.0 | Statistical Report | 12 |
| 6.0 | President's Report | 13 |
| 7.0 | Financial Reports | 14 |
| 7.1 | Treasurer's Report | 14 |
| 7.2 | Financial Statements | 14 |
| 7.3 | Report on Communications and Correspondence Policy | 16 |
| 7.4 | Report on Incorporation and Liability Insurance | 16 |
| 8.0 | Committee Reports | 16 |
| 8.1 | Publicity Committee | 16 |
| 8.1.1 | Website | 16 |
| 8.1.2 | Newsletter | 16 |
| 9.0 | Project Reports | 16 |
| 9.1 | Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring Projects | 16 |
| 9.1.1 | Cedarview Spring Tree Plant | 16 |
| 9.1.2 | Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration | 18 |
| 9.1.3 | Aston Dam Wildlife Ramp | 19 |
| 9.1.4 | Richmond Shoreline Garbage Clean-up | 19 |
| 9.1.5 | Hepworth Memorial Tree | 20 |
| 9.1.6 | Jock River Stream Assessment | 20 |
| 9.1.7 | Richmond Conservation Area Membership and Projects | 24 |
| 9.1.8 | Jock River Reach 2 Watershed Plan | 32 |
| 9.1.9 | Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study | 32 |
| 9.1.9 | Maintenance of Previous Tree Planting Sites | 33 |
| 9.2 | Education Projects | 33 |
| 9.2.1 | National Capital Wildlife Festival | 33 |
| 9.2.2 | Richmond Fair | 34 |
| 9.2.3 | Signs for Significant Wetlands, Jock River Tributaries and FJR Project Sites | 34 |
| 9.3 | Water Protection Projects | 34 |
| 9.3.1 | Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions | 35 |

| | | |
|-------|--|----|
| 9.3.2 | Permanent Water Gauge - Franktown Road | 39 |
| 9.3.3 | Trail Road Dump Leachate Pipe | 40 |
| 10.0 | Fundraising Report | 41 |
| 10.1 | T-Shirts | 41 |
| 11.0 | Plans for 2004 | 41 |
| 11.1 | Work Plan for 2004 | 41 |
| 11.2 | Budget for 2004 | 44 |
| 12.0 | Nomination Committee Report | 46 |

* Editor's note:

A significant number of planned projects lacked resources (either funds or leaders) and were not performed. These projects have not been included in project reports.

1.0 AGENDA

FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING AGENDA

THURSDAY, February 19, 2004 7:00 PM
Barrhaven Loblaws Meeting Room

Introduction

- 1.0 Agenda
- 2.0 Minutes of Annual General Meeting, February xx, 2003
- 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
 - 7.3 Report on Communications and Correspondence Policy
 - 7.4 Report on Incorporation and Liability Insurance
- 8.0 Committee Reports
 - 8.1 Publicity Committee
 - 8.1.1 Website
 - 8.1.2 Newsletter
- 9.0 Project Reports

- 9.1 Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring Projects
 - 9.1.1 Cedarview Spring Tree Plant
 - 9.1.2 Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration
 - 9.1.3 Aston Dam Wildlife Ramp
 - 9.1.4 Richmond Shoreline Garbage Clean-up
 - 9.1.5 Hepworth Memorial Tree
 - 9.1.6 Jock River Stream Assessment
 - 9.1.7 Richmond Conservation Area Membership and Projects
 - 9.1.8 Jock River Reach 2 Watershed Plan
 - 9.1.9 Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study
 - 9.1.9 Maintenance of Previous Tree Planting Sites
- 9.2 Education Projects
 - 9.2.1 National Capital Wildlife Festival
 - 9.2.2 Richmond Fair
 - 9.2.3 Signs for Significant Wetlands, Jock River Tributaries and FJR Project Sites
- 9.3 Water Protection Projects
 - 9.3.1 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions
 - 9.3.2 Water Gauge Installation
 - 9.3.3 Trail Road Dump Leachate Pipe
- 10.0 Fundraising Report
 - 10.1 T-Shirts
- 11.0 Plans for 2004
 - 11.1 Work Plan for 2004
 - 11.2 Budget for 2004
- 12.0 Nomination Committee Report
 - 12.1 Elections
 - 12.1.01 Election of President
 - 12.1.02 Election of Vice-President
 - 12.1.03 Election of Treasure
 - 12.1.04 Election of Secretary
 - 12.1.05 Election of Director for Water Conservation and Usage
 - 12.1.06 Election of Director for Membership Roster and Management
 - 12.1.07 Election of Director for Projects and Actions
 - 12.1.08 Election of Director for Fundraising
 - 12.1.09 Election of Director for Publicity and Public Relations
 - 12.1.10 Election of Directors at Large
 - 12.2 Appointments
 - 12.2.01 Appointment of Editorial Board for FJR Newsletter

- 12.2.02 Appointment of Management Board for FJR Website
- 12.2.03 Appointment of Internal Auditor
- 13.0 Nomination and Election of Members of Nominating Committee for 2004
- 14.0 Other Business
- 15.0 Adjournment

2.0 Minutes of Annual General Meeting, February 27, 2003

**FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER
ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2003 7:00 PM**

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

Chair: Niel Barrington

Recording secretary: Eric Snyder

In attendance: Niel Barrington, Ryan Rattey, Brian Finch, Eric Snyder, Ken McRae, Norman Siemens, Frances Little, Gordon Sample, Richard Bendall, Harvey Snyder, Selena Walker, William Grant, Gaye Ansell, Brian Gosselin, Meg Sears, Charles Billington, Ron Maybury, Brian Gray, Lynn Duffy, Chris Herriots, Anne Herriots

Agenda Items

1.0 Agenda

1.1 Agenda moved for acceptance: Norm Siemens
 Seconded: Gord Sample
 Accepted unanimously.

2.0 Minutes of February 26, 2002

2.0.1 Minutes moved for Acceptance: Brian Finch
 Seconded: Ryan Rattey
 Accepted unanimously.

2.1 Business arising from minutes of February 26, 2002

- 2.1.1 Action 9.11111: The Tree Planting Project Team completing planting plans for 2002. Item complete.
- 2.1.2 Action 9.11112: Sue Springthorpe and Niel completed a funding application for the Community Foundation of Ottawa-Carleton. Item complete.
- 2.1.3 Action 9.1311: Ken was unable to organize temporary gauge monitoring. Item closed.
- 2.1.4 Action 9.3611: FJR members met to decide the FJR's position on the November 2001 Jock River Watershed Management Plan. Item complete.

3.0 Membership List

3.1 The report was accepted as presented.

4.0 Leadership List

4.1 The report was accepted as presented.

5.0 Statistical Report

5.1 The report was accepted as presented.

6.0 President's Report

6.1 The report was accepted as presented.

7.0 Financial Reports

7.1 Treasurer's Report

7.1.1 The report was accepted as presented.

7.2 Financial Statements

7.2.1 Moved: Ken moved that the 2002 financial statements be accepted.

Seconded: Ryan.

Carried unanimously.

7.3 Auditor's Report

7.3.1 The report was accepted as presented.

7.4 Report on Incorporation and Liability Insurance

7.4.1 The report was accepted as presented.

8.0 Committee Reports

8.1 Publicity Committee

8.1.1 Website

8.1.1.1 The report was accepted as presented.

8.1.2 Newsletter

8.1.2.1 The report was accepted as presented.

8.2 Membership Committee

8.2.1 Membership Drive

8.2.1.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.0 Project Reports

9.1 Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring Projects

9.1.1 Spring Tree Plant

9.1.1.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.1.2 Installation of Permanent Water Gauge

9.1.2.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.1.2.2 Action: The FJR will invite Mr. Patrick Larson (RVCA) to a future meeting for two purposes: (i) to have him explain how data from the new gauge station is being recorded, evaluated and distributed, and (ii) to ask him whether any funds are still available from the permanent water gauge initiative. Deadline: April 1.

9.1.3 Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration

9.1.3.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.1.4 Garbage Clean-up

9.1.4.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.1.5 **Water Sampling**

9.1.5.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.1.6 **Cedar Logs**

9.1.6.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.1.7 **Richmond Conservation Area Membership and Projects**

9.1.7.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.1.7.2 Moved: Gord moved that Eric Snyder's efforts to establish and further the objectives of the Richmond Conservation Area be recognized in the minutes.

Seconded: Norm.

Carried unanimously.

9.2 **Education Projects**

9.2.1 **Information Board Project**

9.2.1.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.2.2 **Richmond Fair Display**

9.2.2.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.2.3 **Signs for Significant Wetlands, Jock River Tributaries and FJR Project Sites**

9.2.3.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.3 **Water Protection Advocacy Projects**

9.3.1 **Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions**

9.3.1.1 Discussion: Mr Brian Gray raised objections to some of the conclusions drawn in Brian Finch's discussion of his report. Brian Finch refuted his objections in rebuttal.

9.3.1.2 The report was accepted as presented.

9.3.2 **Water Taking Permits**

9.3.2.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.3.3 **Goulbourn Township Quarries**

9.3.3.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.3.3.2 Action: The FJR will contact the OMNR to inquire whether Thomas Cavanagh Construction requires an amendment to its quarry license because of the illegal drain extension, for which it was fined \$60,000.00, and if it does: (i) will there be an opportunity for public comment, and (ii) can Cavanagh be required to do rehabilitation work as part of the conditions for approval?
Deadline: April 1.

9.3.3.3 Action: The FJR will decide its position on the Henderson Quarry proposal prior to the pre-hearing for the Ontario Municipal Board hearing on the issue. Deadline: April 1.

9.3.4 **Testing for Contaminants at Abandoned Dump Sites**

9.3.4.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.3.5 **Wetland Protection**

9.3.5.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.3.5.2 Moved: Gord moved that Selena Walker be recognized for her work with the FJR on wetland protection issues.

Seconded: Ron.

Carried unanimously.

9.3.5.3 Action: The FJR will review the City of Ottawa's draft official plan to determine whether the representation of the boundaries of the Manion Corners Long Swamp reflect an attempt by the city to legalize the expansion of the Dwyer Hill RV Resort and Campground into the provincially significant wetland. If that is the case, it will submit comments requesting the boundary representation be changed. Deadline: April 1.

9.3.6 **The Jock River Watershed Plan**

9.3.6.1 The report was accepted as presented.

9.3.7 **City of Ottawa's Official Plan**

9.3.7.1 The report was accepted as presented.

10.0 **Fundraising Report**

10.1 **Blues Festival**

10.1.1 The report was accepted as presented.

11.0 **Work Plan for 2003**

11.0.1 Moved: Gord moved that the work plan be adopted on the condition that members can be found to volunteer for the proposed projects within the next month or two.

Seconded: Eric.

Carried unanimously.

11.0.2 Action: The president will organize an informal gathering of the membership during March, to meet the new board of directors and other members, and to volunteer for projects on the workplan. Deadline: March 31.

11.1 **Budget for 2003**

11.1.1 Moved: Brian moved that the budget be accepted subject to availability of funding from granting sources.

Seconded: Ken.

Carried unanimously.

12.0 **Nomination Committee Report**

12.01 The report was accepted with revisions to the nominations.

12.1 **Elections**

12.1.01 **Election of President**

Brian Finch was elected.

12.1.02 **Election of Vice-President**

Eric Snyder was elected.

12.1.03 **Election of Treasurer**

Norman Siemens was elected.

12.1.04 **Election of Secretary**

Niel Barrington was elected.

12.1.05 **Election of Director for Water Conservation and Usage**

No nominations were made for this position.

12.1.06 **Election of Director for Membership Roster and Management**

Frances Little was elected.

12.1.07 **Election of Director for Projects and Actions**

No member in good standing was nominated for this position.

12.1.08 Election of Director for Fundraising

Frank Rockett was elected, having agreed to hold the position effective following the FJR having acquired liability insurance.

12.1.09 Election of Director for Publicity and Public Relations

No nominations were made for this position.

12.1.10.1 Election of Directors at Large

No nominations were made for these positions.

12.2 Appointments

12.2.04 Appointment of Editorial Board for FJR Newsletter

Deferred.

12.2.05 Appointment of Management Board for FJR Website

Deferred.

12.2.06 Appointment of Internal Auditor

Deferred.

13.0 Nomination and Election of Members of Nominating Committee for 2003

13..1 Niel, Brian, Ryan and Gord were elected.

14.0 Other Business

15.0 Adjournment

3.0 Membership List

The 56 members in good standing as of December 31, 2003 were:

Volunteers

Niel Barrington
Bette Hoppe
Irwin McCaffrey
Ryan Rattey
Hewat Richardson
Gordon Sample
Eric Snyder
Venn Cooper
Dave Mullington

Family

Richard Bendall
Joseph Dafoe
Hon. Willian/Dore Doody

Supporter

Gaye Ansell
Jim Bendall
Joan Howe
Frances Little
Gerry Loucks
Ronald Maybury
J. Eric Moore
Sheila Newton
Evelyn Nugent
Evelyn Nunn
Lee Saunders
Frank Stokes
Marlene Thomas
Doug Watson
Bev Wigney

Penny/Chris Ellis
 Brian Finch
 Steven Foster
 Lucia/Tibor Horbasz
 Anthony /Jennifer MacDonald
 Terry Matte
 Allan McCartin
 Alfred/Nancy Mitchell
 James Rennie
 Ken & Darlene Scales
 Bill Schissel
 Norman /Reta Siemens
 Frank / Doreen Slingerland
 Doug / Pat Vaughn
 David/Laurie Weymouth
 Janet / Howard Dudley
 Ed Filby
 J.Allan McCartin/ Brenda Singbeil
 Dr.J.S. & Marsha Riordan
 Rick Stewart
 Selena Walker/ Alan Blair
 Anthony & Jennifer MacDonald

Marla Williams
 Tom Wright
 Grant Totten

Corporate

Rideau Valley Conservation Authority
 Greater Ashton Community Association
 Muskies Canada - Ottawa Valley Chapter
 Old Mill at Ashton

4.0 Leadership List

Officers of the Executive

| | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| President | Brian Finch | 825-8029 |
| Vice-President | Eric Snyder | 838-3572 |
| Treasurer | Norm Siemens | <i>(resigned June 14, 2003)</i> |
| <i>Acting Treasurer</i> | Eric Snyder | 838-3572 |
| Secretary | Niel Barrington | 823-3643 |
| Director For Water Conservation And Usage | <i>vacant</i> | |
| Director For Projects and Actions | <i>vacant</i> | |
| Director For Membership Roster and Management | Frances Little | 825-1065 |
| Director For Fund-Raising | <i>vacant</i> | |
| Director for Publicity and Public Relations | <i>vacant</i> | |

Committee Chairs

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------|
| Membership Committee Chair | <i>vacant</i> |
|----------------------------|---------------|

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| Projects Committee Chair | <i>vacant</i> | |
| Nomination Committee Chair | Niel Barrington | 823-3643 |

Project Leadership (see also individual reports)

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| Spring Tree Plant | Niel Barrington | 823-3643 |
| Munster Sewage | Brian Finch | 825-8029 |
| Communications and Documents Policy | Norm Siemens | - |
| Jock River Stream Survey | Eric Snyder | 838-3572 |
| Richmond conservation Area | Eric Snyder | 838-3572 |
| Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp | Doug Watson | 828-5461 |

Other

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------|
| Website | Doug Watson with assistance from Chantelle Dooley and Eric Snyder | |
| Editor of 2003 Annual Report | Brian Finch | 825-8029 |

5.0 Statistical Report

| Month | Number of Attendees |
|--------------|----------------------------|
| January | 12 |
| February | 13 + 1 guest |
| March | 10 |
| April | 6 |
| May | 8 |
| June | 7 + 1 guest |
| July | 7 |
| August | 5 |
| September | 4 |
| October | 7 + 4 guests |
| November | 4 + 2 guests |
| December | 5 |

6.0 President's Report

The seventh year for the Friends of the Jock River has ended with a mixed score card:

- Our ability to influence environmental issues continues to grow at both the local and provincial levels.

- Our success rate on newly-planted trees has improved dramatically, even though we are planting fewer trees.
- We have had to cut back on some activities because of the shrinkage of our core group. Unfortunately, some of our executive positions went unfilled. Most regrettably, our treasurer and valued "detail guy", Norm Siemens resigned and moved to another country.

Niel Barrington explains in his report our much stronger emphasis on protecting our newly-planted trees. With the exception of sumacs and taller cedars, every single tree installed this year was protected with a spiral tree wrap to protect against mouse damage and with a carpet square to mulch and control encroachment of tall grasses. While the seedlings that went in this year did not have to contend with a severe drought (as in 3 of the past 5 years), our more extensive protective measures undoubtedly played a role in the high success rate. This method of planting will be required for all future tree plant projects.

The comprehensive communications and correspondence policy written by Treasurer Norm Siemens was a significant undertaking - many thanks to Norm for a great job. The policy is an excellent administrative tool that will provide the needed control over the FJR's communications.

Norm tendered his resignation in the summer and is now working in Africa. His departure from the executive and core of the FJR was felt immediately. His enthusiasm for our work and his knowledge of our finances will be sorely missed. Although he will remain a member, he will be limited to cheering and providing encouragement from a distance. We wish him well in his new endeavor.

The release in December 2002 of the RV Anderson Report on preferred options for treatment of Munster Hamlet's sewage was good news as it came out in favour of on-site treatment. However, for reasons known only to City staff (and perhaps some elected officials) City staff twisted the facts into a recommendation for pipe. Sadly, Council voted to proceed with the pipeline option. There are more aspects to the issue and there is considerably more information in the separate report elsewhere in the Annual Report.

We continue to monitor the operation of the Richmond Conservation Area (RCA) near Richmond and of the RAC Management Team. Eric Snyder details in his report the goings on with the City and MOE in the granting of the Certificate of Approval for the Richmond lagoons and the permit to take water required for the maintenance of the lagoons as a bird sanctuary. With the change in status of the management team (no longer an advisory group reporting to Council), perhaps there will be a change in our status from outsiders to members on the management team.

Ken McRae, a very active member in past years in the area of wetlands and permits to take water, decided to take 2003 off to work on some pet projects of his own. Consequently, FJR did not have the expertise or manpower to do much work in these areas. While we continue to monitor many of the wetlands and "permits to take water" issues in the Jock River watershed, regrettably, our efforts in these two areas have fallen to practically zero.

Because Richmond is more or less the geographical centre of the Jock River watershed, we have always held our meetings in Richmond. Even our business address is in Richmond. However, the Ottawa Library (Richmond Branch) started charging us \$25 per meeting in 2003. It does not sound like much but, through the year, our monthly meetings, annual meeting and the occasional other meetings added up to an amount that the group could no longer afford. We looked around for other sites in Richmond but found nothing we could have on a regular basis. The Loblaws in Barrhaven gives us a bright airy meeting room, without charge (for registered charities) so, for the foreseeable future, we will be having our regular meetings in Barrhaven.

Brian Finch
President

7.0 Financial Reports

7.1 Treasurer's Report

Our Cedarview Tree Plant project was funded by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources under its CFWIP program. CFWIP project expenses are reimbursed after the fact by MNR. Our accounting was submitted to MNR in early 2004 and payment for the project costs is expected in 2004.

Respectfully submitted
Brian Finch

7.2 Financial Statements

Balance Sheet 2003

| | | 2003 | 2002 | Variance |
|---|----|----------|----------|----------|
| <u>ASSETS</u> | | | | |
| Chequing in TD- Canada Trust Account | \$ | 4,522.50 | 5,900.39 | -1377.89 |
| Petty Cash | \$ | 101.15 | 34.37 | 66.78 |
| 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 | \$ | 4,623.65 | 5,934.76 | 1311.11 |
| | | ===== | ===== | ===== |
| <u>LIABILITIES</u> | | | | |
| Accounts Payable (GST) | \$ | -96.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Other Liabilities | \$ | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| | | | | |
|---|----|-----------|----------|----------|
| Total Liabilities | \$ | -96.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Equity - Beginning | \$ | 5,934.76 | 3,696.67 | 2238.09 |
| Receipts Plus Dispersements for Year | \$ | -1,214.77 | 2,238.09 | -3452.86 |
| Total Equities | \$ | 4,719.99 | 5,934.76 | -1214.77 |
| | | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| <u>EQUITY plus LIABILITIES</u> | \$ | 4,623.65 | 5,934.76 | 1311.11 |
| | | ===== | ===== | ===== |

Cash Flow Report 2003

INFLOWS

| | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------|
| Donations- Undirected | \$ | 55.00 |
| Donations-Nowlen | \$ | 100.00 |
| Memberships-Corporate | \$ | 200.00 |
| Memberships-Family | \$ | 250.00 |
| Memberships-Supporter | \$ | 105.00 |
| Memberships-Volunteer | \$ | 80.00 |
| Misc. income | \$ | 21.15 |
| TOTAL INFLOWS | \$ | 811.15 |

OUTFLOWS

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|----|---------|
| Administration | \$ | 475.61 |
| Membership External Org'n. | \$ | 10.00 |
| Proj. Munster Sewage | \$ | 83.00 |
| Proj34 Riverbend Water Permit | \$ | 13.86 |
| Proj37Hepworth Memorial Tree | \$ | 269.10 |
| Proj38 Shoreline Restoration-Twin Elm | \$ | 50.04 |
| Proj40 Carlingwood Wildlife Fest. | \$ | 28.90 |
| Proj41 Cedarview Tree Plant | \$ | 638.42 |
| Proj42 Incorporation | \$ | 221.60 |
| Proj44 Open House | \$ | 33.66 |
| Proj49 Shoreline Cleanup Richmond | \$ | 41.36 |
| Proj50 Richmond Fair | \$ | 75.00 |
| TOTAL OUTFLOWS | \$ | 1940.55 |

OVERALL \$ -1129.40

TOTAL

Respectfully submitted
Brian Finch

7.3 Communications and Correspondence Policy

In the April, Norm Siemens wrote a comprehensive communications and correspondence policy that a committee of Norm, Brian Finch, Frances Little and Eric Snyder discussed and edited. The policy has been adopted by the Board. The extensive, well thought out, 10 page policy deals with the approval and review process required for FJR communications with outside individuals and organizations, and will serve the Friends of the Jock River very well in the future.

Respectfully submitted
Brian Finch

7.4 Report on Incorporation and Liability Insurance

The documents for federal incorporation were prepared and filed in January 2003. There were some deficiencies in the application requiring a review of our constitution. A lack of time has prevented this review.

Insurance is an extremely expensive proposition for all volunteer agencies and is currently beyond the capability of the FJR to pay for. Quotes continue to be several times the amount of money the FJR collects in membership dues. We have been fortunate with our MNR grant as it comes with insurance for all participants. Incorporation may allow some savings but not by a significant amount.

Respectfully submitted
Brian Finch

8.0 Committee Reports

8.1 Publicity Committee Report

8.1.1 Website

Our website is located at www.geocities.com/jockriver.

The site presents information and activities related to our organization. It 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 the website committee -Doug, Eric Snyder and Chantelle Dooley for a great web site.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Finch

8.1.2 Newsletter

Several attempts were made to put together newsletter(s) this year but we lacked the manpower. It sounds like a minor undertaking but those who have done it in the past know it takes some effort. Unfortunately, a newsletter is a major way to keep our membership up to date on activities and we must make an effort to resurrect it in 2004.

Respectfully submitted
Brian Finch

9.0 Project Reports

9.1 Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring Projects

9.1.1 Cedarview Tree-plant Report

I am very pleased to report that our tree-plant last spring was our most successful ever, with seedling survival rates exceeding 95%. This is due to favourable weather conditions throughout last spring and summer, well as the newly instituted practice of tree wraps and grass suppression carpet squares (mulching) put on seedlings immediately after planting. Though I had originally believed this might cause problems in other logistical considerations of carrying out a successful plant, it turns out things went well. Another important factor in our success was the fact we ordered fewer trees. This meant we were able to do a better job with 1250 seedlings than rushing to try and put 4000 seedlings in on one weekend. With the number of FJR volunteers and Scouts we get out on planting day, it is impossible to plant, wrap and carpet-square 3 or 4 thousand trees. As was clearly demonstrated last spring, we do a better job with fewer trees. It turns out that those professional foresters who had been telling me this for years were right! Imagine that. I will try to remember this when I order the trees for this spring! I guess sometimes in the past, I got carried away ordering too many trees; it's easy to do, just like somebody at a well-laid out, tempting buffet who ends up putting more food on their plate than they can possibly eat...

As usual, planting day was scheduled for the first Saturday in May, utilizing the combined forces of the Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts of the Western District (Ottawa). We also had some high school students out (working on their community service hours), as well as a good contingent of FJR members including President Finch, Secretary Barrington, Irwin McCaffrey, Doug Watson, Gaye Ansell, Ryan Rattey and Ron Maybury. Many scouts and high school students brought their parents like members Selena Walker & son Alan Blair. It was a beautiful day for planting, Doug Watson arriving with the seedlings, Niel and the scout leaders organizing the actual planting with Brian and Irwin coordinating the production and placement of trees wraps and carpet squares, and working at a feverish pace to keep up with the scouts.

The location for the plant was on city-owned land on the north-west corner of Cedarview Rd. and the River. I had walked the cut-over grassed field with Tracey Schwetts from the City's Forestry Dept., earlier in the season. We had marked out boundaries for the plant area, basically taking in the riparian zone running parallel to the river for a distance of about 230 metres. This strip is about 15 metres (slightly wider in a few parts), thus allowing for a variety of species. Along the low ground in the shoreline area, we planted tamarack. On mid-ground we planted white cedar and further up we planted oak, a few maples and sumac.

The day flew by quickly with most of the work completed. However, Brian, Irwin, Niel, Ryan and Doug returned to the site four or five times over the next few weeks, completing the tending required for all seedlings which had not been done on plant day.

Also, Niel saved a few hundred tamaracks for a little tree plant for the local girl guides, a small request from their leaders. The trees were temporarily heeled in the floodplain area south of the Jock River near Jockvale. Doug Watson, Niel Barrington and Brian Finch from FJR were on hand on a lovely weekday evening later in the month to organize and distribute the seedlings for planting in this beautiful location. All seedlings at this location were wrapped and mulched with carpet-squares as well.

Over the summer and into the fall, I went back to both plant sites to check on the seedlings and am very pleased to report the excellent survival rate noted in the opening of this report. There is some predation, probably by deer, occurring at the Cedarview site, but there is little we can do about it, short of posting a 24 hr. guard with a rifle handy... oh well, deer gotta eat too, I guess...

In closing, I wish to thank everyone who participated in this noble undertaking. Of course, none of this would have been possible without the \$2200 grant, courtesy of the Ministry of Natural Resources under the Community Wildlife Habitat Improvements Program.

Since we lacked the manpower to utilize all of the grant money (as prudently as possible), in December we used the remaining funds to purchase trees for the spring of 2004! See you there!

Respectfully submitted,
Chair, tree-plant committee
Niel Barrington

9.1.2 Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration

The spring runoff in 2003 was low and there was only minor damage to the fence.

The cattle broke through the fence during the summer after the cattle nose pump failed and the shoreline was damaged in a few places. The landowner, Alastair Munro, repaired the pump with a new gasket. In the early fall, a work team with assistance from Alastair installed new posts for a new gate opening. Alastair completed the gate afterwards. We also replaced some broken posts and installed a few new posts to protect the fence in the north-eastern part of the field from ice pans during the spring flood. Broken wire strands were repaired and the wire strands all along the fence were re-tensioned (1 km of fence is a lot of fence!).

In addition, an assessment was made of the trees we planted some time ago. The spruce trees planted at least 5 years ago in the grazed portion of the field are still doing well, despite being trimmed by the cattle. At least 100 are alive and well. The cedars that were planted in another grazed area of the field and that had survived for about 4 years were not to be found. There were more cattle in the field this year than in past years and the cedars were in a shaded area of the field that the cattle tended to favour more so than in past years. Trees planted in the shoreline area were sparse at best. These few trees have survived in the riparian zone against considerable odds: beavers, droughts (3 in the last 5 years), cattle and spring floods. These are very difficult conditions indeed.

The trees ordered for delivery in 2004 from the remaining part of the MNR grant (see Cedarview Tree Plant Report) would be suitable for a replanting of the area between the fence and the river since the species were chosen for planting in a riparian zone.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Finch

9.1.3 Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp

On the behalf of FJR, I wrote the RVCA, City of Ottawa and Township of Beckwith asking for permission to install a wildlife ramp at the Ashton Dam to enable animals to climb over the dam.

The Ashton Dam is an eight foot high concrete structure located under the bridge in the Village of Ashton. It is impossible for animals to get past the dam unless they climb the embankment and cross the busy roadway in the town of Ashton. I had observed a river otter that was killed while

attempting to cross the roadway and I talked to a local resident who has watched a beaver for 20 minutes attempting to cross the road but could not because of the traffic.

The FJR would like to install a wildlife ramp (log) so that animals can make a safe passage over the dam. I proposed to secure the log by a chain which will connect the upper end of the log to an anchor which is embedded in the earth on the upstream side of the dam. Rocks would be placed at the lower end of the log to keep it in position and to make the log more inviting and accessible to wildlife.

The cost of this project is quite minimal; hence government financing may not be required. If we are not able to find and install suitable rocks at the lower end of the log we may request some financial help at a later date.

The installation of the log will have no effect on the water flow in the river. The log would be installed at the north end of the bridge which is not normally accessed by people so the potential safety risk to the public is minimal. The major obstacle appears to be getting approval since the bridge is owned jointly by the City of Ottawa and the Township of Beckwith. Further, the RVCA has authority over the function of the dam.

If we get approval, FJR would proceed with this project during the summer of 2004.

Respectfully submitted
Doug Watson

9.1.4 Richmond Shoreline Garbage Clean-up

The Richmond shoreline cleanup was on Saturday, September 27, 2003. The clean-up went reasonably well but the turn-out was lower than expected. I was expecting anywhere from 40 to 80 volunteers, based on favourable responses from many people I spoke to at the Richmond Fair, just one week prior. The weather forecast for rain obviously didn't help. While it threatened rain for much of the day, we had a brief 2 minute shower late in the afternoon. - that's it! We had 14 volunteers in all and about half were students working for their community volunteer service requirements. Never-the-less, we got a fair amount of work done.

We concentrated on the areas within Richmond in the morning and found that, within Richmond, there was not too much garbage - certainly not as much as we collected in past years. It is evident that residents are taking more care. Good show Richmond!

We spend the most difficult part of the day up-stream where many of the local teens and young adults have their parties. The "rock cut" is a popular party spot and we cleaned up a considerable amount of broken glass (beer bottles). The biggest challenge was the burned out car. It took an hour to chop it into three pieces (using only 2 axes and a hacksaw to cut the occasional hard bolt), and

another hour loading the top, front and back parts onto 2 trailers. Tim van der Horn's newly patented hitch-mounted hoist worked like a charm.

All of the trash was sorted for recyclables, the beer cans and bottles were returned for deposit, and the metal taken to Cohen & Cohen. I called the Citizen to pick up the 4 paper vending boxes that we retrieved from a ditch and left in the Royal York Park.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Finch

9.1.5 Hepworth Memorial Tree

Grace Louise Hepworth, a long time resident of Heart's Desire in Nepean died June 19, 2001. Her friends donated \$325 to the FJR to plant a tree in her memory. There was some difficulty in getting the approval from the City to plant an oak tree in Heart's Desire, as requested by Mrs. Hepworth's friends. Approval for the planting of a sugar maple was received in the spring of 2003 and a small group - Brian Finch, Fran Little and Niel Barrington planted a good sized calliper tree (about 3 ½ m high) on Goodwood St. on the bank of the Jock River in June. The tree has been monitored weekly and is doing extremely well. A small plaque supplied by Fran Little will be installed on a concrete base in 2004.

Brian Finch

9.1.6 Jock River Stream Assessment

Introduction

This summer, Friends of the Jock River volunteers had a chance to learn about the biodiversity of the river and its tributaries. From June until the end of September, stretches of the river were surveyed for a wide variety of organisms including, among others: birds, mammals, mussels, algae, mosses and vascular plants. Surveying was done following the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources Macro Stream Assessment Protocol. Surveyors hiked, waded and canoed stretches of the Jock River and King's Creek, recording not only organisms, but also stream morphology, bank stability and percent of shoreline vegetation cover. The presence of invasive species and possible sources of pollution were documented along with adjacent land uses and evidence of angling pressure.

Background

Planning for the Jock River Stream Assessment Project started in late 2002. In December of 2002, Friends of the Jock River board member, Eric Snyder, approached the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) to ask if there were any projects on which the two organizations might work together in the coming year. In response, Jennifer Lamoureux, fisheries biologist at the RVCA,

suggested that the Friends of the Jock River implement the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources Macro Stream Assessment Protocol. The protocol had already been implemented in the Tay River watershed, and Jennifer thought that similar data, giving some indication of the ecological health of the Jock River and its tributaries, would prove useful to both the RVCA and the Friends of the Jock River. The latter organization agreed, officially taking on the project at its annual general meeting in February 2003, and assigning Eric as project leader.

The Jock River Stream Assessment Project consists of two parts. The first is the field work, organized by the Friends of the Jock River. The second is data entry, storage and accessibility. The RVCA is responsible for this part of the project. All observations made by volunteers in the field are being entered into the RVCA's database, which in turn is being made available on CD to the Friends of the Jock River for use in planning riparian restoration projects and in pursuing environmental protection initiatives. The data will also be entered into the conservation authority's GIS system. Once this part of the project is complete, digital maps, with overlays representing various shoreline features, stream morphology and so on, will be produced online for use by individuals and interested organizations.

Participants

As the project commenced, the Friends of the Jock River convinced many more organizations and individuals to become involved. Mountain Equipment Co-op's Ottawa outlet donated a GPS unit, an essential piece of equipment for allowing the results of the field surveying to be entered into the RVCA's GIS. The Eastern Ontario Biodiversity Museum, allowed Eric, in his position as collections curator, the time needed to complete identifications of vascular plants, gastropods, mussels and various other aquatic invertebrates. Voucher specimens for rare or difficult to identify species have been accessioned at the museum. Museum summer student, Timothy Day, and Science Horizons intern, Meghan Watson, both assisted Eric with field work. Jim Pringle at the Royal Botanical Gardens supplied an identification of an unusual Lilac, discovered growing along the banks of the Jock River by stream survey participant, Fred Schueler. Jim, who is currently writing the chapter on Lilacs for the *Flora of North America*, and who is particularly interested in the naturalization and resulting distribution of non-native Lilac species, found it to be *Syringa josikaea*, Hungarian lilac. Linda Ley, a specialist in bryology at the Canadian Museum of Nature (CMN), identified mosses collected from the banks of the river, and, in the case of the aquatic *Amblystegium riparium*, from within the river. Paul Hamilton, research assistant at the CMN specializing in phycology and water quality, identified algae for the project. Paul Catling, botanist and curator of the Canadian National Collection of Vascular Plants, at Agriculture Canada, reviewed identifications of some of the more difficult vascular plant specimens collected, including *Carex* (Sedge) and *Eleocharis* (Spikerush) species. Brian Coad, research scientist in ichthyology at the CMN, and co-author of *Fishes of Canada's National Capitol Region*, identified fish specimens for the project.

In addition to those already named, surveyors included Bev Wigney, Bill Bowman, Niel Barrington, Philip Martin, Jean Sunter, Ron Maybury and Ryan Rattey.

Field Work

Interesting discoveries came with the first day on the river. A training session for volunteers was held on 7 June, led by Jennifer, and Mark Scott, who also works for the RVCA. Training was done just upstream from the Jock River Landing, where the Jock River flows into the Rideau River. Fred, herpetologist and research associate with the CMN, showed participants where to find *Eurycea bislineata*, the Two-lined Salamander. He first discovered the species at this location in August 1975; previously, no occurrences were known from off the Canadian Shield inland from the St. Lawrence or Ottawa rivers. According to Fred, the occurrence of this species at the Jock River Landing makes it an important and distinctive site.

On 9 July, while canoeing to a remote survey location in the Richmond Fen Wetland, Eric and Bev observed a juvenile or first year *Nycticorax nycticorax*, the Black-crowned Night-heron. According to the Ottawa Field-Naturalists Club's *A Birders Checklist of Ottawa*, this is a species that occurs in the Ottawa area either sporadically or in small numbers. Eric and Bev's observation was of great interest to the Ontario Breeding Bird Atlas.

Bev and Eric were surveying at a much more disturbed location, on 16 September, when they found one of the more interesting vascular plant species of the summer. Downstream from the Cedarview Road Bridge, in Nepean, *Teucrium canadense*, also known as American Germander or Wood Sage, was discovered. This very attractive wildflower, a member of the Mint family, grows in moist meadows along rivers, and along the edges of bottomland forests and marshes. It can also be found in more developed areas, such as abandoned fields, partially shaded vacant lots, poorly drained waste areas, and along ditches near roads and railroads. It is listed as sparse in Gillett and White's *Checklist of Vascular Plants of the Ottawa-Hull Region*, and as rare within the Ottawa-St. Lawrence Lowland Physiographic Region in D. Cuddy's unpublished *Vascular Plants of Eastern Ontario*.

Additional sightings of interest included various aquatic plants, aquatic mammals, and birds of rivers and wetlands. *Zizania palustris*, or Northern Wild Rice, was found to be abundant both upstream of Richmond and downstream of the Cedarview Road Bridge. A large colony of *Lobelia cardinalis*, the beautiful crimson Cardinal-flower, was documented near Richmond. This is a species which both Cuddy, and Gillett and White agree is uncommon in the Ottawa region. *Lontra canadensis*, the River Otter, was one of the many species recorded in the Richmond Fen Wetland. Birds observed at various places on the Jock River include Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*), Northern Harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), Belted Kingfisher (*Ceryle alcyon*), Spotted Sandpiper (*Actitis macularia*) and Solitary Sandpiper (*Tringa solitaria*). Most invasive species, which were found in the river, were ubiquitous; with *Lithrum salicaria*, or Purple Loosestrife, and *Hydrocharis morsus-ranae*, European Frog-bit, occurring in almost all stretches of the river that were surveyed. The introduced *Orconectes rusticus*, or Rusty Crayfish, was similarly widespread; only in the Richmond Fen Wetland was the native *Orconectes virilis*, or Northern Crayfish, observed.

The last day of surveying for 2003 was 29 September, and it was done as a special education day. Eric, Bev and Mark organized the day with Bell High School teachers, Rod Moors and Lisa Hetherington. Groups of students from their grade 10 classes surveyed stretches of the river upstream and downstream of the Jockvale Road Bridge. Low temperatures did not inhibit these enthusiastic students from wading into the river to collect fish, crayfish and mussels.

Database and GIS

Jock River Stream Assessment data is still being entered into the RVCA's database and GIS. The RVCA will be launching its online Watershed Management Information System this December, at www.rideauvalley.on.ca. Once the Jock River data has all been entered into the GIS, this information will become available through the online Information System. Site visitors will be able to click on any 500m stretch of the Jock River and King's Creek, which was surveyed over the summer, and read about what was observed there.

Conclusion

All said, the Jock River Stream Assessment Project has been a great success. But the work is not finished. As long as volunteers are available, the project will continue over the coming summers until the entire river and its tributaries have been surveyed. Bev, without whom much less of the river would have been covered this summer, has been the project's unofficial photographer. Her pictures can be accessed through the Friends of the Jock River website, www.geocities.com/jockriver. On the links page, look under "Exploring the Jock River," and click on "Jock River Stream Survey 2003." If you are interested in participating in this project during the summer of 2004, please contact Eric Snyder at 258-3415 or curator@eobm.ca.

Respectfully submitted
Eric Snyder

9.1.7 Richmond Conservation Area Membership, Management and Sewage Storage Issues

Introduction

Issues relating to the Richmond Conservation Area (RCA) were pursued under the heading "Advocacy Projects" in the FJR's 2003 Work Plan. Given the City of Ottawa's refusal to appoint an FJR member to the RCA Management Team (RCAMT), the FJR did not undertake ecological monitoring projects or restoration and enhancement projects within the RCA during 2003. As a result, monitoring and enhancement projects initiated by the FJR in 2002 have not been continued by the RCAMT. Advocacy has included lobbying efforts directed towards the Ministry of Environment (MOE) and the City of Ottawa. The MOE was asked to ensure that commitments made during the Class Environmental

Assessment (EA) for the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade, which was intended to mitigate against impacts on the RCA from the storage of sewage in Richmond Lagoon Cell C, would be respected by the City of Ottawa. Alternatively, it was asked to give answers to explain why those commitments cannot be respected, if that is the case. The City of Ottawa was asked to do the same. It was also asked to ensure that water taking at the RCA be undertaken in accordance with City Motion 40/7 and to resolve the RCAMT membership issue. In addition, it was asked to make the process of revising the RCA Management Plan (RCAMP) more inclusive, to include those with the necessary background and knowledge, and to acknowledge the work of the authors of the original RCAMP. The FJR has had some undeniable successes working with the office of the Minister of the Environment, and with the recent change in the provincial government, there are signs that even more success is achievable. Minister Leona Dombrowsky has shown a willingness to listen to environmental organizations such as the FJR. On the other hand, the City, represented by Councillor Janet Stavinga and the RCAMT, has remained stubbornly unwilling to work with the FJR to address outstanding problems concerning the RCA. With the transfer of responsibility for the RCA to the City's Development Services Department, in particular to Ms. Cynthia Levesque in the Environmental Management Branch, there is some promise that the situation will improve.

Correspondence with the Minister of the Environment

The FJR mailed a letter to Minister Chris Stockwell in January 2003 expressing concern that amended Certificate of Approval (C of A) Number 3-0834-83-006 retained Richmond Lagoon Cells A and B as part of Richmond's sanitary sewer system despite their failure to satisfy MOE standards for such a use. A response was received in early February from Mr. James O'mara, Director of the Environmental Assessment and Approvals Branch (EAAB) of the MOE. He stated - incorrectly, as subsequent questioning revealed - that the designation of the lagoon cells under the C of A was necessary to allow water to be pumped into the cells for conservation purposes. His response did not address FJR concerns relating to the fact that the cells do not satisfy MOE standards. Hence, another letter was sent in early March restating the unresolved concerns. A reminder was emailed to Minister Stockwell on 28 April, the anniversary of the Walkerton disaster. The minister responded in early May with a letter suggesting that the matter had been adequately dealt with during the Class EA for the Richmond Pumping Station upgrade. His letter indicated that the minister was unaware that the amended C of A issued by MOE did not agree with the recommendations of the Class EA, which included the statement that Cells A and B not be used to store sewage even temporarily. A final letter to the minister was mailed on 29 May 2003. Following this letter, the FJR received an invitation to participate in a telephone conference call between it, the City of Ottawa and the MOE in June. An account of the teleconference is given below.

Correspondence with the Ministry of Environment, Assessment and Approvals Branch

In 2003, the FJR sent numerous emails to Mr. Paul Heeney, Senior Project Coordinator, Client Services Section, EAAB asking the following questions:

1. Is the MOE involved in reviewing the cause of the two ruptures that have occurred in the newly installed twin 500mm diameter forcemain under the Jock River at Eagleson Rd? If so, in what way is it involved, and at what time can stakeholders expect an explanation of what happened?
2. Given the results of the July 2002 survey of Richmond residents, developed with input from the FJR and the Richmond Village Association (RVA) (82% of respondents indicated that they do not want the RCA to become a part of the City of Ottawa's sewage facilities), what confidence does your ministry place on the conclusion drawn in the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain Study concerning the general public's views on this issue?
3. In issuing C of A Number 3-0834-83-006, is it the intent of the MOE, that either Cell A or B of the Richmond Lagoons should be used to store municipal sewage (a) during scheduled maintenance on either the Richmond Pumping Station or the Richmond Forcemain or (b) as a result of a forcemain break or rupture or (c) in any other circumstances?
4. Please explain, with reference to the relevant provincial Acts, policies and regulations, why you believe that cells used to store river water, *i.e.*, Cells A and B, must be designated as part of a municipal sewage works. Is the water to be pumped into Cells A and B through the 200 mm diameter forcemain considered municipal sewage?
5. With reference to Table 4.1 in the Environmental Study Report [for the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade], we ask that you answer the following question: What reasoning has led your ministry to the conclusion that there has not been a change to the original undertaking that would have implications for the assessment of alternatives by the City of Ottawa?

The above questions were initially posed to Ms. Catherine Doherty, Manager of the EAAB's Client Services Section, in response to her 20 September 2002 letter to the FJR. That letter came, long overdue, in answer to a November 2001 FJR letter to the MOE raising several concerns about how the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade was being implemented. The answers given by Ms. Doherty, were largely incomplete and her letter failed to address several FJR questions. The FJR repeated its questions to Ms. Doherty in a 16 October 2002 email. It received a brief response in late January 2003 from Mr. Heeney, who remained the EAAB contact from that point on, stating that the MOE had no concerns with the issues raised by the FJR and directing the FJR to address its questions to the City of Ottawa. This was not an acceptable response since the FJR's questions concerned the MOE's position on the issues, not the City's. More importantly, our organization wanted to know why the MOE had issued C of A Number 3-0834-83-006 with amendments that contradicted the recommendations of the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain Study Report. Mr. Heeney received emails in mid-February, late March, mid- and late April, and mid-May. A thorough documentation of the MOE's failure to answer questions was sent in late May. On 17 June 2003, Mr. Heeney invited the FJR to participate in a telephone conference call with the MOE and the City of Ottawa to address issues for which the MOE had responsibility. Again, more will be said on the results of the telephone conference call below.

Correspondence with City of Ottawa Staff

In 2003, the FJR corresponded with City of Ottawa Construction Services Division staff, Mr. Ryan Matthews, on only one or two issues related to the RCA. Mr. Matthews is senior project manager respectively for the implementation of the Richmond Pumping Station upgrade and the Munster Sewage Treatment Facility expansion/upgrade. Previously, Ms. Alting-Mees was project manager for the two undertakings. The FJR addressed a letter to her predecessor, Mr. Stephen Forestell, who also managed both projects, in November 2001. A response, written by Ms. Alting-Mees, was not forwarded to the FJR by the MOE EAAB until February 2003. Ms. Alting-Mees' answers to the concerns raised by the FJR appeared to have no basis either in the EA Act or in policies and regulations enacted pursuant to it, and failed to address commitments made during the Richmond Pumping Station upgrade Class EA to mitigate against impacts on the RCA. After receiving her letter, the FJR therefore determined to deal directly with the EAAB on most issues relating to the Richmond Pumping Station upgrade Class EA. Accordingly, most correspondence with Mr. Matthews in 2003 concerned the City of Ottawa's application for a permit to take water (PTTW) to allow Jock River water to be pumped into the Richmond Lagoons. This was an undertaking falling under the Ontario Water Resources Act, not the EA Act, although commitments made during the Richmond Pumping Station upgrade Class EA still had to be respected in pursuing it.

The FJR asked Mr. Matthews that the PTTW for the RCA be pursued in a manner consistent with the recommendations of City of Ottawa's Motion 40/7 and the Richmond Pumping Station upgrade Class EA. It also suggested a staged approach, which would allow the greatest flexibility for managing water levels in the Richmond Lagoons based on the results of monitoring during the initial stage of the permit.

Consistency with the recommendations of the Class EA required that water be pumped into all lagoon cells, A, B and C. However, the PTTW application from the City did not include Cell C, a matter that will be discussed in a different context below.

The City of Ottawa's Motion 40/7, which was supposedly written by Mrs. Stavinga, was passed by City council in September 2002, giving recommendations to the MOE on its PTTW program. It recommended that the MOE review its PTTW application process with a view to improving public consultation and assessing the cumulative impacts of water taking on a watershed wide basis. Accordingly, consistency with Motion 40/7 required that water taking for the RCA be assessed in the context of all water taking in the watershed, and that extensive public consultation be undertaken.

Upon reading the City's PTTW application for the RCA, drafted by Mr. Matthews together with Mrs. Stavinga and the RCAMT, the FJR found no evidence of the City's stated commitment to the improvement of water taking practices. Cumulative impacts were not addressed and only after it received a complaint from the FJR did the City post the application on the Environmental Bill of

Rights Registry for public information purposes. The detailed proposal submitted by the FJR, which would have rectified these lapses, was rejected by Mr. Matthews and the RCAMT.

Correspondence with Mrs. Stavinga

At the 27 February 2003 annual general meeting of the FJR, our membership directed us to inquire whether or not Mrs. Stavinga would do the following:

- (1) Undertake to ensure that the Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club (OFNC), the RVA and the FJR nominees are appointed to the RCAMT.
- (2) Undertake to ensure that RCAMT meetings are returned to Richmond, and that any individual interested in participating in those meetings is allowed to sit at the table with RCAMT members, and engage in discussion of the issues.
- (3) Undertake to ensure that all those interested in participating in the process to revise the 1997 RCAMP are included fully within the process.
- (4) Undertake to ensure that the respective contributions of the authors of the 1997 RCAMP are acknowledged in all copies of the plan, and revised editions of the plan, that the City of Ottawa produces.
- (5) Undertake to ensure that the joint-use agreement, which Mr. Eric Snyder produced for Goulbourn Township, and which you accepted in 2000, is reformulated as an operations protocol that will allow the use of the RCA for emergency sewage storage without preventing the habitat management in all three Richmond Lagoon cells prescribed in the 1997 RCAMP.
- (6) Undertake to ensure that the current C of A for the Richmond Lagoons is amended to exclude Cells A and B from the conditions of the certificate.
- (7) Undertake to have the outlet structures for Cells A and B upgraded.
- (8) Undertake to have City of Ottawa staff provide answers to all FJR questions, posed in correspondence over the last year, for which answers are outstanding.
- (9) Undertake to have the FJR's prairie flora planting plan, for the enhancement of the area disturbed by City of Ottawa construction in 2001, implemented.
- (10) Undertake to provide the FJR with all available information on the two ruptures that have occurred during 2001 in the recently twinned forcemain under the Jock River, adjacent to the RCA.

The FJR emailed the above requests to Mrs. Stavinga on 26 March 2003. A one-line acknowledgement was emailed from Mrs. Stavinga on 30 April stating, "Your letters have been received and a reply is forthcoming." On 9 May the FJR asked that a deadline be provided for its receiving answers. This request was repeated a number of times in May and June. A response was finally emailed on 20 June 2003 from Mrs. Stavinga.

The response was unsatisfactory. Not only did Mrs. Stavinga refuse to take the concerns of the FJR forward to be dealt with by City staff and the RCAMT, she dismissively characterized the requests from the FJR's membership as "presumptuous." In those instances that she offered some explanation of her refusal, the explanations were unconvincing and often based on claims that were false.

The FJR provided Mrs. Stavinga with a detailed accounting of this in an email dated 25 July 2003. It again asked her to satisfy the requests made by the FJR membership. It also suggested that Mrs. Stavinga demonstrate leadership and improve community relations by having the OFNC's, RVA's and FJR's nominations to the RCAMT grandfathered under the City's 2001 appointments policy. Repeated requests for answers were sent to Mrs. Stavinga in August, September and the first half of October. She did not answer, or even acknowledge, these requests.

Correspondence with the RCAMT

In 2003, the FJR sent occasional correspondence to the RCAMT, particularly to its chair, Mr. David Johnstone. The issues raised with the RCAMT included (i) acknowledgement of authorship of the 1997 RCAMP in drafts revised by the RCAMT, (ii) RCAMT support for the FJR's position on the RCA PTTW, (iii) RCAMT support for the grandfathering of FJR, RVA and OFNC nominees as RCAMT members and (iv) requests for the RCAMT's position on the planned Munster forcemain to Richmond. The RCAMT was copied on most correspondence to City staff, Mrs. Stavinga and the MOE EAAB.

Mr. Johnstone was contacted in November 2002 regarding the issue of acknowledgement. He claimed not to have ever read the 1997 RCAMP, stating that he would write a new plan without reference to it. However, the issue was raised again with statements at an RCAMT meeting to the effect that most of the 1997 plan would not be rewritten for the revised plan. Mr. Johnstone was therefore contacted again, in December 2002. At this time, he stated that, according to the City's Legal Service Department, there is no copyright in the RCAMP. Therefore he concluded that acknowledgement is not an issue. The matter was also raised with RCAMT member, Dr. Peter Blancher, who refused to pursue it. In her 20 June 2003 comments on the matter, Mrs. Stavinga repeated what had been said by Mr. Johnstone. When the revised draft was released in December 2003, it contained several pages of the 1997 RCAMP, without acknowledgement. In contradiction to Mr. Johnstone's and Mrs. Stavinga's statements that there is no copyright in the RCAMP, the draft was copyrighted to the RCAMT.

The RCAMT refused to support the FJR position on the RCA PTTW. Requests that this be placed on the agenda of a monthly RCAMT meeting were not acknowledged.

On 4 October 2003 the FJR emailed Mr. Johnstone asking if Richmond residents could rely on the RCAMT to take their concerns to the City of Ottawa regarding the addition of Munster's sewage to Richmond's sanitary sewage system, particularly as those concerns relate to increased risk of spills in the RCA. This correspondence was not acknowledged either.

Despite being ignored by Mrs. Stavinga on the question of grandfathering its nominee, on 20 October 2003 the FJR offered to meet with RCAMT members to address this issue. The FJR stated its position in a draft agenda for the proposed meeting. It asked that the RCAMT request that the City pursue the grandfathering option proposed by the FJR and submit a revised RCAMP that acknowledged past contributors. In turn, the FJR offered to assist with revisions to the RCAMP, to work with the RCAMT to find answers on how to manage Cell C and to work with the RCAMT on options for implementing the FJR position on a PTTW for the RCA. The FJR has not received a response to this offer.

27 June Telephone Conference Call and Press Release on Amended C of A 3-0834-83-006

The objective of the teleconference was to address questions raised by the FJR concerning the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade. The FJR was represented by Mr. Brian Finch, Mr. Eric Snyder and Mr. Richard Bendall. Mr. Barry Burns, Ms. Vicki Mitchell, Mr. Steve Burns and Mr. Paul Heeney attended for the MOE, and Mr. Ryan Matthews, Mr. Dave McCartney and Ms. Alting-Mees were present for the City. Mrs. Stavinga's assistant, Mr. Gabriel Miller, was also in attendance. The agenda of the meeting consisted of the questions previously posed to Mr. Heeney, which are reproduced above.

The FJR learned at this meeting that its lobbying efforts with Mr. Heeney and the Minister of Environment's office had been worthwhile. Mr. Heeney announced that the C of A for the Richmond Lagoons would be amended to exclude the two sub-standard cells, A and B. The change in the C of A would not only reduce environmental health risks, it would also make it possible to achieve the habitat management objectives prescribed for the two cells in the 1997 RCAMP. This information was publicly distributed by means of an FJR press release published in the Stittsville News.

The FJR still had concerns, however, about mitigation for the conservation area, particularly Cell C. At the meeting it asked City staff and Mrs. Stavinga's assistant to work with it to deal with these concerns. So far this has not taken place, and the FJR has had to go back to the MOE to continue lobbying for mitigation to protect Cell C. This is an important issue, relating to the integrity of the Class EA process, and it may not be unrelated to the addition of Munster's sewage to Richmond's sanitary sewer system since it concerns capacity for sewage storage in Cell C. The FJR will continue to pursue this in 2004.

The FJR was also promised a full reporting on the evaluation of the twin forcemain that ruptured twice under the Jock River at the RCA. Mr. Matthews provided this information in August 2003. It turned out to be extremely important for assessing the potential impact of Munster's planned forcemain to Richmond on the natural environment of the RCA. This is explained below.

Press Release on the Ruptures of the Twinned Forcemain at the RCA

Perhaps the most significant issue that emerged in 2003 concerning the RCA was that of the relationship between the recent forcemain ruptures in the RCA and the planned Munster forcemain to Richmond. The following excerpt from an October 2003 FJR press release explains:

"The twinning of the Richmond forcemain was done in 2001, at an estimated cost of approximately a quarter of a million dollars. Within six weeks the fitting for the secondary pipe on the upstream side of the forcemain failed. Six months later the fitting on the downstream side also failed, reportedly spilling sewage into the Jock River. To date the twinned pipe has still not been repaired. Repairs have been delayed pending the results of a City of Ottawa contracted study to find the cause of the forcemain failures. The results were made available in August 2003, just over a year following the last rupture, and they are not reassuring."

"A number of variables were identified as possible causes of the ruptures, but the definite cause could not be confirmed. It has proven very difficult to assess why the pipe ruptured, as evidenced by disagreements amongst the engineering companies that worked on the project. It is known that somehow, possibly in part because of operator error, the downstream fitting formed cracks. Erosion on the broken pipe confirms that sewage was leaking from it 'likely over the span of several weeks or months.' Environmental Hydraulics Group Inc., after a detailed investigation, recommends that once the broken pipe is replaced, certain regular operations of the pumping station and forcemain be undertaken 'very carefully' so as not to stress the system. It further suggests that there are still uncertainties involved in redesigning the Jock River crossing so the pipe won't be predisposed to cracking."

"The City has said that forcemain or pipeline technology is 'a robust and capable technology' and 'a viable and effective solution [for Munster].' Councillor Stavinga, in her public statements supporting the planned pipeline from Munster to Richmond, has said that forcemain technology is: 'an established, effective and timely solution,' 'a secure and reliable solution' and 'safe, effective and well-established.' Given the past operation of the Richmond to Glen Cairn forcemain and the results of the most recent study, the FJR is seriously concerned about whether the safe, effective and reliable design and operation of the Richmond forcemain can be achieved. It appears from the latest study that this will be decided by experimentation, following replacement of the broken twinned pipe. In view of this, the FJR is likewise seriously concerned that a forcemain to Richmond will not be a safe, effective and reliable solution for treating Munster's sewage."

Conclusions

What has taken place in 2003 raises serious questions about Mrs. Stavinga's and the RCAMT's commitment to finding the best solutions for managing the RCA. It is sincerely hoped that Minister Leona Dombrowsky and Ms. Cynthia Levesque, in the City's Environmental Management Branch, will show a willingness to listen that others have not shown.

Events in 2003 also raise deep concerns about how the Class EA process is regulated in Ontario. It seems that a proponent can make commitments to stakeholders during the initial phases of a Class EA but if it fails to respect those commitments in later phases, the MOE will not readily enforce the EA Act. The MOE has repeatedly told the FJR that problems must be addressed to the proponent of the project, *i.e.*, the City of Ottawa. But the City repeatedly claims that since the MOE has identified no concerns, it has nothing to address. Who is really responsible for regulating Class EA's in this province?

For a full account of issues and correspondence see:
www.geocities.com/jockriver/RCA_issues_ecological.htm,
www.geocities.com/jockriver/RCA_issues_membership.htm and
<http://www.ottawasewergatefiasco.com/rca-sewergate.htm>.

Respectfully submitted,
Eric Snyder

9.1.8 Jock River Reach 2 Watershed Plan

In June 2003, the City approached the FJR with an invitation to participate in the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) for the Jock River Reach 2 Watershed Plan. The area of study is the part of the Jock watershed above Moodie Drive, below the Richmond Fen Wetland and comprising Flowing Creek (rising in wetlands just south of Stittsville), Monahan Drain (near Glen Cairn) and Leamy Creek (south of the Jock near Twin Elm). The study is to be paired with the Mud Creek Watershed Plan, which relates to an adjacent watershed with similar characteristics but flowing into the Rideau at Manotick.

On behalf of the FJR, Brian Finch applied for membership on the PAC. However, the City did not receive enough volunteers to constitute a PAC. All of the volunteers were invited to participate and monitor the activities of the planning group. There has been one public meeting to solicit ideas.

One of the private consultants hired by the City to conduct the study has already approached FJR (Brian Finch) requesting our future involvement and access to our knowledge of the watershed.

Respectfully submitted.
Brian Finch

9.1.9 Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study

Early in 2003, the City approached the FJR with an invitation to participate in the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) for Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study. Brian Finch agreed to serve on the committee.

The study is mandated by the new Official Plan for the City of Ottawa and it is to survey of all natural spaces, both private and public (municipal, provincial and federal) within the urban area to determine their ecological value and their "naturalness". The study will eventually assist the City in future planning issues. The field work is being conducted by contractors Dan Brunton and Ernie Muncaster. The PAC is comprised of a diverse range of governmental (City and federal), environmental and academic groups and professional associations. The PAC has met several times to assist the City and contractors in the identification of suitable sites and to advise on the conduct of the study. So far 186 sites within the urban area have been identified; field assessments have been completed on 110 sites; field assessments have to be completed on 43; and access has been denied to 33 sites. Where previous studies exist, access to sites is not always necessary to conduct an assessment.

The FJR has assisted in the identification or expansion of several urban sites of value in areas along the lower Jock.

In his latest report to the PAC, Dan Brunton indicated a higher than anticipated incidence of invasive species (e.g., buckthorne) in most sites. He has also identified a few ecological gems; one of note in the Jock watershed is Heart's Desire Forest along the lower Jock, beside old Highway 16.

Respectfully submitted
Brian Finch

9.1.10 Maintenance of Previous Tree Planting Sites

Half-Moon Bay:

Member Tom Wright wrote me in December to say that he completed the application of spiral tree wraps on the trees planted much earlier by the FJR around Half-Moon Bay. The tree wraps had been supplied by the FJR. He has also arranged for the City to trim the trees.

Richmond Road Site (also known as the Foster's Farm Site):

After the spring flood subsided, a small work party applied spiral tree wraps and cardboard mulching squares on the trees planted in the previous spring (2002) by the FJR. In many instances, we were able to identify where trees had been planted but all that remained was a hole in the ground. The

mouse damage on previously planted deciduous trees was extensive, which was a deciding factor in our decision to protect 100% of the deciduous trees and to apply carpet squares to control the grasses in our 2003 Cedarview tree plant.

The site should be revisited in 2004 to apply carpet squares and spiral tree wraps on trees in need.

9.2 Education Projects

9.2.1 National Capital Wildlife Festival

The Friends of the Jock River participated in the National Capital Wildlife Festival held at the Carlingwood Shopping Centre. Niel Barrington took the lead in organizing the FJR booth. The RVCA lent us its portable backdrop on which FJR issues, events and history were displayed. Doug Watson and Selena Walker were two of the volunteers manning our booth over the course of the three-day event. The Wildlife Festival did not seem to work as well for us as it has in past years. That is, we did not seem to be able to sign up volunteers or new members as in previous years. The public seemed to be less interested, or capable of understanding the real, hard-core environmental issues we are involved in. Though we will not participate in the upcoming 2004 Festival, I would be willing to try again in 2005. Perhaps by then, we can develop a new project that will capture the public's interest.

Respectfully submitted,
Niel Barrington, Secretary

9.2.2 Richmond Fair

On September 18 & 19, the Friends of the Jock River shared a booth display at the Richmond Fair with the Richmond Village Association (RVA). Members Irwin McCaffrey and Brian Finch manned the FJR part of the booth. The small fish netted from the Jock River by Erwin and displayed in an aquarium were quite a hit with the younger visitors. One of the hot topics was our literature on the break in the Richmond - Glen Cairn sewer line and the RVA display dealing with the Munster sewer forcemain planned to go through Richmond. We also advertised our Richmond garbage clean-up (the following weekend) that at least 100 people agreed to come out. (Note: no more than 3 showed up.)

Thanks to the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority for the loan of its display backing, and to the Eastern Ontario Biodiversity Museum for providing us with the aquarium and some monster mussel shells.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Finch

9.2.3 Signs for Significant Wetlands, Jock River Tributaries and FJR Project Sites

The City installed signs at each road crossing of the Jock River. We had made the suggestion to both the City and to Councillor Stavinga to have identification signs erected at all road crossings of the Jock River, significant wetlands in the watershed and Jock River tributaries. The signs identifying the Jock River at bridge crossings may have been planned independently by the City or may have been installed at our suggestion. Regardless -- thanks to the City of Ottawa.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Finch

9.3 Water Protection Projects

9.3.1 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions

Background:

A web site www.OttawaSewergateFiasco.com was launched in 2002 by concerned citizens to provide information on the Munster sewage issue. The web site contains a huge volume of facts and commentary on the Munster sewage problem, plus links to related information. It is worth the time to visit the site. The site is updated regularly as events unfold.

The issue relates to a decision in 1999 by the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton (now the City of Ottawa) to proceed with the installation of an 11 km pressure sewage pipeline from Munster Hamlet to Richmond. Munster's sewage would then be pumped into the City sewage collector system for eventual secondary treatment at the City's sewage treatment facility at Green's Creek (ROPEC), an additional 50 km away.

The option favoured by the FJR was (and still is) tertiary on-site treatment of the sewage with discharge of a high quality effluent to the Jock River. The option proposed by CMS (now owned by Seprotech) would retain the water within the watershed and would augment the flow of the upper Jock River with water of better quality than is currently in the Jock. The added flow would be particularly important during the summer months in dry years. We were also concerned about the acceptance of non-compliant tenders in the request for proposals process, and the faulty evaluation of the proposals and pipeline route by the City's consultant, Connestoga Rovers and Associates (CRA).

In 1999, the FJR and 8 others appealed to the Ontario Minister of the Environment (MOE) to conduct a "bump-up" (ministerial) environmental review of the project's environmental assessment. The Minister rejected all 9 requests. Also in 1999, the FJR appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board to reject the City's amendment to the City's Official Plan for a pipeline from Munster to Richmond. The OMB appeal was made on the behalf of the FJR and argued by Brian Finch. Three other parties also appealed the City's decision: Gordon Sample, Richard Bendall and the Citizen's Review Committee for Waste Management of Ottawa-Carleton.

The Ontario Municipal Board's decision of June 8, 2001, directed the City to perfect its case and conduct a thorough reevaluation using the best available evidence. The City started the process to follow the Board's instructions but it also sought leave to appeal the OMB decision to the Ontario Superior Court. The motion was rejected.

RV Anderson was selected by the City to conduct the re-evaluation of the three options.

Year 2003:

Year 2003 started very positively. RV Anderson presented its report in a public meeting December 16, 2002 and concluded that the two on-site treatment options were equivalent (Snowfluent - the snow making option - ahead of Seprotech in some evaluations), and that "the pipeline is considered to be the most costly alternative with significantly large cost margin and risk as to screen it out of the process." RV Anderson recommended that the City tender the two on-site treatment options and that the City consider:

- the conditions MOE would require for the Certificate of Approvals (C of A) for the two systems;
- the need for and availability of land for the two options;
- the best means of securing performance guarantees; and
- decide who will operate the selected system.

The City hired RV Anderson to conduct yet another study in 2003. On the basis of the two reports, and a questionable interpretation of the environmental assessment process, City staff recommended in a May 2003 report that the pipeline option be chosen. In the following, I have challenged some of the major statements (staff comments summarized in italics; my comments in brackets):

- *the ability of the SEPROTECH alternative to meet the discharge criterion of less than 0.03 mg phosphorous/L has not been demonstrated. (Incorrect: Seprotech has provided the City with information on a system that has provided 0.01mg P/L. Further, a Seprotech plant in Manotick identical to the proposed Munster plant and requiring the same discharge conditions was granted a C of A by the Ontario Government in 1998.)*
- *the anticipated time period for all alternatives to complete the design and preparation of tender documents and/or preparation of design/build documents was approximately 10 months, and the construction and commissioning was anticipated to be completed in an additional 12 months. (Incorrect: both of the on-site treatment options had already been designed as part of the request for proposal process in 1999. Also, both proponents of the on-site options indicated completion dates of 12 months maximum - 8 months minimum from the go-ahead on a design-build basis, including approvals and implementation.)*

- *the estimated 12 - 18 month periods to obtain EA approvals for the on-site alternatives (if they were chosen) would require additional sewage hauling costs to be added to the cost of on-site alternatives. (Incorrect: the premise is based on the City's statement that a full environmental assessment (EA) of all alternatives would be required if either of the on-site options were chosen. Only a review of the intended option is required. It is difficult to believe that City staff do not understand the EA process as it relates to this point, but since we would not want to attribute questionable motives to explain their actions, that would seem to be the case.)*

- *the anticipated life-cycle costs for all three alternatives are comparable at the 60 year point. (Incorrect: 1. Both of the on-site proponents claim that the City's evaluations have inappropriately increased the costs from their design-build submissions, with the resultant increase of lifecycle costs. 2. The City has not included some costs in the pipeline option, for example, the proportionate costs of the Richmond pumping station upgrade, and has misrepresented other costs, for example the costs to transport sewage to ROPEC and treat the sewage. 3. Some of the City's lifecycle costs for pipe are suspect. The City's lifecycle cost estimate is reduced from \$9.2 - \$10.0M at 60 years to \$8.9 - \$9.7M at 90 years. If this were true, the pipe would have to become less costly to maintain, more valuable or generate income in its old age - all unlikely events. Actually, past 60 years, the pipe will start to show its age with increased breakdowns and ruptures. Lifecycle costs should certainly rise through the 60-90 year period. 4. The lifecycle costs do not deal with the costs of ruptures. The engineers have claimed the pipe is safe but all admit that the pipe will fail. Ruptures would be costly to clean up. One failure in particular - a failure that pollutes the aquifer used by Richmond residents - would be very costly as the City would have to install piped water to all of Richmond. 5. The City's ROPEC sewage treatment plant is now the 2nd largest point source of water pollution in the province. Within the lifetime of the pipe, it is reasonable to expect that the plant will have to be upgraded from secondary treatment to tertiary treatment. The lifecycle cost of the pipeline option should include the proportionate cost of this upgrade. Note: since the on-site options are tertiary plants and would not be connected to ROPEC, they would actually reduce the City's cost in a future upgrade of ROPEC.)*

In its staff report of May 2003, the City concluded with a statement that the pipeline is a viable and effective solution that can be implemented in the shortest time period, at a reasonable cost and minimizes the overall risk to the City. My comments are:

1. viable - Strange choice of word since long sewer forcemains are considered to be problematic, particularly for small volumes of sewage which have a tendency to become septic and to settle out solids.

2. effective - How effective can it be to transport raw sewage over 60 km to be treated to the secondary level quality, compared to an option involving no transport of sewage and treatment to the tertiary level (swimming pool quality)?

3. shortest implementation period - Actually, pipe is the longest. A temporary Seprotech option could be put in place in months. Both permanent on-site solutions are comparable at 8-12 months and pipe is closer to 22 months.
4. cost - The City's consultant Totten Simms Hubicki determined in 1998 the cost of pipe would be as high as \$16.5M. The Seprotech on-site option fixed cost bid was less than \$4M.
5. risk to the City - The City has discussed the risk of possible fines levied by MOE but there has been no mention of costs to settle the outstanding legal suits against the City. The City is being sued by Seprotech (court date: August 2004) and Northern Watertek-Snowfluent (filing in progress). It is important to point out that no risk analysis of the pipeline option has been performed by any of the City staff or its consultants. Indeed, City staff told RV Anderson not to do a risk analysis when RV Anderson suggested it. There has been no consideration of the risk to the health of the residents of Richmond if there were slow leaks from the sewer forcemain. Slow leaks are not detectable by the City's SCADA system and could persist for weeks, months or longer. The average well in Richmond is 27 ft deep. The City risks another Walkerton and the City will be fiscally and morally liable. If the aquifer becomes contaminated, the City will be required to provide clean water to Richmond. Risk: millions! The risks to the health of Richmond residents cannot and should not be reconciled in any way.

Understandably, the residents of Richmond are upset. When the issue went to Council in June 2003, the City had still not decided on the pipe route through the Village of Richmond. The residents presented a petition with 680 signatures to have the pipeline dropped. To the ire of Richmond residents, Councillor Stavinga dismissed the petition by stating that she would sign the petition herself if it was true. Both the Richmond Village Association and the FJR wrote to ask her to state what in the petition was untrue but the requests have gone unanswered.

Despite requirements in the province's Environmental Assessment process to consider all aspects of a project at the same time, by the end of December 2003 the City still had not decided on the pipe route through the Village of Richmond. (The EA on the other part of the pipe route was concluded in 1999.) The City has held two open houses in Richmond in late 2003 on the route. Both were heavily and hotly attended.

In June, I made a presentation to the City's Environmental Advisory Committee on the Munster sewer pipe issue. Most members were displeased to know that the City had not consulted its own Environmental Advisory Committee on a project that had obvious environmental implications. A sub-committee of EAC looked into the matter and presented its findings in October. EAC concluded by expressing its frustration at not being consulted by the City and its lack of satisfaction with the May 2003 Staff report on the Munster pipe. However, it was generally agreed that, since EAC was an advisory group to Council, its role was not to lobby to get the Munster decision overturned. However, they have made it clear to FJR, Councillor Stavinga and others that EAC was in favor of on-site

solutions wherever possible and, should the Munster decision come back for reevaluation, that the EAC would be on the side of "Seprotech-like" solutions. EAC representatives also met with the City's engineering officials in December to express EAC's concerns that City staff consult with EAC on projects of this type having a significant environmental impact.

In September, representatives of the Richmond Village Association and the FJR met with Gordon Miller, the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario, in a meeting that Ontario Energy Minister John Baird had arranged for the RVA. The group summarized its dissatisfaction with the EA process in the City's selection of the pipeline solution for Munster. Also included was a discussion of MOE's failings in the EA process. Mr. Miller advised the group on the requirements for a "request for investigation" and the possible outcomes. One surprise was that the MOE does not have to agree to an investigation. Collectively, the group was very pleased with the meeting. I was most appreciative of Mr. Miller's knowledge of the Munster file and his understanding of the positions of the FJR and RVA.

On December 12, 2003, Ted Brown, for the Richmond Village Association (RVA), and I, for the FJR, jointly filed a "request for investigation" with the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario (ECO) asking for an investigation into the City's conduct in the environmental assessment. Eric Snyder, our Vice President, was the principal author of the request and did a terrific job. A copy of the request is on the website noted above; please follow the link <http://www.ottawasewergatefiasco.com/rchmd/MunsterECO-031215.htm>. The request was forwarded by the ECO to MOE, which has until February 16, 2004 to decide whether to conduct the investigation.

It is important to note that the City has 5 years following the Environmental Study Report written by Totten-Simms Hubicki to start the project before being required to conduct another full environmental assessment. The 5 years runs out in May 2004 but the City does not yet have the required Certificate of Approval (C of A) to start the project. If the Ministry agrees to investigate the City, MOE may find it difficult to grant a C of A for the project.

The RVA and FJR are considering whether to file an additional "request for investigation" to the ECO on other aspects of the City's conduct.

As part of the City's consultations on methods to reduce the City's huge budget shortfall, there have been quite a few representations, primarily from Richmond residents, to Council members to cancel the pipeline and to implement an on-site option for a saving of \$8-12.5M. The effect of these representations will not be known until the budget deliberations are concluded.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Finch,

9.3.2 Permanent Water Gauge - Franktown Road

In 1999, Ken McRae put together a proposal to three municipalities to provide one time funding to the Friends of the Jock River to install water flow gauges on the Jock River. These municipalities, the former Township of Goulbourn, former City of Nepean and the former Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton granted us \$2,000, \$5,260 \$5,260, respectively, which was given to the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA). The RVCA agreed to put in \$3,000 plus the monitoring equipment and handle the installation and operation.

The Jock River water flow gauge at Franktown Road was installed in late September of 2002.

Patrick Larsen of the RVCA reported that the gauge has been working satisfactorily through 2003. He is currently trying to install telemetry (remote reporting) for the gauge as the RVCA must visit the site every month or so to download the data.

Additional water flow gauges are needed in the Jock River Watershed to be able to build a proper water budget for the watershed. The government approval agencies and the public still need to know how much water there is in the various parts of the watershed at different times of the year to be able to deal with requests to take water such as the request by the Riverbend Golf & Country Club last year.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Finch with excerpts from Ken McRae's report from 2002

9.3.3 Trail Road Dump Leachate Pipe

In May, the Stonebridge Community Association approached the FJR for information on the Trail Road Dump leachate pipe. The new community, located on the south side of the Jock River between old Highway 16 and Jockvale Road had just discovered that the leachate forcemain was to be installed right through the community. The leachate pipe was first planned to go through Barrhaven, then to the Richmond - Glen Cairn sewer forcemain via Cambrian Road and finally through the Monarch (Stonebridge) golf course/community. The original decision by RMOC Council was made before houses were built in Stonebridge; it just took a very long time for the City to get to the installation stage because of an OMB appeal and a need to repeat the environmental assessment. The FJR had supported on-site treatment options and was against forcemain transport of the leachate to the City's sewage treatment plant because of the dangers of transporting this toxic material (under the Jock River near old Highway 16) and because the City's sewage treatment plant is an inappropriate facility to treat leachate.

In a meeting held in Councillor Jan Harder's constituency office along with about 150 upset Stonebridge residents, I asked Councillor Harder if she would support a motion to kill the leachate forcemain pipeline and support on-site treatment. Initially, she said that she would not support such a

motion. The Stonebridge Community Association and Monarch Construction threatened legal action against the City. After several weeks of lobbying of Councillors by Stonebridge residents, FJR and Seprotech (an Ottawa-based leachate treatment plant manufacturer), the City's Environmental Services Committee decided to conduct another Environmental Assessment (EA) to take into consideration on-site options.

The possibility that the City will eventually decide on on-site treatment looks very good for several reasons:

- the City has already conducted a study of on-site technologies and 4 or 5 met MOE's requirements;
- all possible pipeline routes are strongly opposed by residents;
- several Councillors have been convinced of the value of on-site treatment by at least one local on-site treatment manufacturer;
- the City's Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) favours on-site solutions and has made its position known to City staff and Councillors; and
- a member of EAC will sit on the advisory committee for the EA. This member is an expert on wastewater treatment technologies.

Respectfully submitted
Brian Finch

10 Fundraising

10.1 T-Shirts

During the year I proposed that the FJR sell T-shirts with the FJR logo. I contacted several local manufacturers and the Board settled on a well-made, high quality Canadian T-shirt in a natural sand colour with a slightly modified logo of the Friends of the Jock River printed over the left breast in a striking hue of deep forest green. The main component of this logo is the heron drawn by Eric Snyder (see the logo on the front cover of the Annual Report). Shirts are to be ordered in 2004, will be available in sizes small through x-large and will be sold for fifteen dollars each.

All proceeds from T-shirt sales go to fund Friends of the Jock River projects.

Niel Barrington

11.0 Plans for 2004

11.1 Work Plan for 2004 (not listed in order of priority)

1.0 Presidential Projects

- 1.1 Updated Constitution and By-laws to deal with the requirements for incorporation: In view of various amendments over the last two years, the president will update the FJR constitution and by-laws.

2.0 Secretarial Projects - none anticipated

3.0 Membership Projects

- 3.1 Human Resources Database: The director of membership will enter all human resource information, currently in possession of the FJR, into a database.
- 3.2 Membership Database: As part of the above project, the membership director will upgrade the existing membership database.
- 3.3 Ottawa Volunteer Network: Once the FJR has obtained liability insurance, the membership director will pursue FJR membership in the Ottawa Volunteer Network.

4.0 Treasury Projects

- 4.1 Incorporation: In addition to regular duties, the treasurer will complete the process of having the FJR incorporated.
- 4.2 Liability Insurance: The treasurer will undertake to obtain liability insurance for the FJR.

5.0 Committee Projects

5.1 Publicity Committee

- 5.1.1 Website: The FJR website has been recently upgraded. The Website Management Board will maintain the website with updated project descriptions, minutes, agendas and reports. The links page will continue to function as a community resource for those needing ecological and regulatory information relating to the environment.
 - 5.1.2 Newsletter: The Newsletter Editorial Board will be responsible for publishing three or four issues in 2004. The Board will seek funding the production of the FJR newsletter.
 - 5.1.3 Richmond Fair: The FJR Publicity Committee will approach the Richmond Village Association, the Rideau Trail Association, the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) and the Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club to partner on a display at the Richmond Fair.
- ### **5.2 Fundraising Committee**
- 5.2.1 Blues Festival: The Fundraising Committee will approach the Blues Festival organization to offer to run a can collection drive at the festival in 2004, provided FJR has the manpower.
 - 5.2.2 Ecological Restoration and Enhancement Funding: The Committee will pursue various funding sources to cover the costs of restoration and enhancement projects in 2004.
 - 5.2.3 T-Shirt Sales: The Fundraising Committee will complete the design and purchase of the T-shirts and design a marketing strategy for the T-shirts to promote the FJR.

6.0 Projects

6.1 Ecological Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring

- 6.1.1 Project Plans for Future Restoration and Enhancement Projects: The Restoration and Enhancement Team will try to produce project plan outlines for planting projects intended to satisfy various objectives: erosion control, buffering run-off, enhanced biodiversity, historical restoration and so on. A planting plan, or planting plans, for 2004 will be completed, with budgets and necessary approvals.
- 6.1.2 Riparian Planting at Cedarview Road - Greenbank Road Site: Maintenance of the trees planted in 2003 will be done at this site. Restoration and Enhancement Team will begin preliminary planting at adjacent sites with trees purchased with the \$9,500 grant from the Nepean Legacy Fund. This will be done in partnership with Scout groups and community organizations.
- 6.1.3 Shoreline Restoration at Twin Elm Site: Additional planting and maintenance will be done at this site. Fence repair will be conducted, as needed.
- 6.1.4 Tree Planting Maintenance at Jockvale (both sides of Jock), Half-Moon Bay, Richmond Road Site: Additional planting and/or maintenance will be done at these sites.
- 6.1.5 RVCA Water Quality Monitoring with Chemical and Macro-Invertebrate Indicators: The FJR will approach the RVCA to assess how it can contribute to this project.
- 6.1.6 Hepworth memorial tree: Maintenance will be done and a concrete base for the commemorative plaque installed.
- 6.1.7 RVCA Stream Corridor Riparian Vegetation Survey: The FJR will continue to work with the RVCA on this project.
- 6.1.8 Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp: The FJR will ask the RVCA, City of Ottawa and the Municipality of for permission to construct a wildlife ramp and oversee its construction.
- 6.2 Education
 - 6.2.1 Information Board Project: The FJR will try to complete the planning, and initiate the implementation of this project. The Information Board Project Team will approach the Living By Water Project for partnership on this project.
 - 6.2.2 Signs for Significant Wetlands, Jock River Tributaries and FJR Project Sites: The FJR will try to form a project team involving the City of Ottawa to improve roadway signage of significant wetlands in the watershed.
- 6.3 Cedar Logs Project: Complete peeling and cutting the logs. Find a better place to store the logs.

7.0 Water and Environmental Protection

- 7.1 Richmond Conservation Area Membership, Management and Sewage Storage Issues: The FJR will continue to pursue various issues relating to the RCA.
- 7.2 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions: The FJR will continue to advocate for environmentally sound sewage treatment in Munster.
- 7.3 Alternative Sewage Treatment Solutions for Outlying Communities: This is a project relating to the above two projects, but it is more broadly based. The FJR intends to work with Ottawa Citizens Against Pollution by Sewage, and perhaps other organizations, to have the City of Ottawa consider alternative methods for sewage treatment in outlying communities.

- 7.4 Water Taking Permits
 - 7.4.1 City of Ottawa Motion 40/7: The FJR will work to ensure that the motion passed by the City is implemented appropriately.
 - 7.4.2 Applications posted on the EBR Registry: The FJR will continue to monitor the EBR registry and comment on applications of concern.
- 7.5 Wetland Protection: Wetlands are the main source of water retention in the watershed. The FJR will continue to become involved in any issues that involve threats to wetlands and wetland functions.
- 7.6 Environmental Planning Issues
 - 7.6.1 Jock River Reach 2 Subwatershed Study: The FJR will continue to work with the Subwatershed Study group and to strive for an ecosystem approach.
 - 7.6.2 Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study: The FJR will continue to participate on the public liaison committee work.
 - 7.6.3 Marlborough Forest Management Plan: Participate in the development of the management plan for the forest.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian Finch, Eric Snyder and Niel Barrington

11.2 Budget for 2004

| Projects and Work Items | Projected income | Projected cost |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| 1 Presidential Projects | | |
| 1.1 Updated Constitution and By-laws: | \$ - | \$ - |
| 2 Secretarial Projects | \$ - | \$ - |
| 3 Membership Projects | | |
| 3.1 Human Resources Database | \$ - | \$ - |
| 3.2 Membership Database: | \$ - | \$ - |
| 3.3 Ottawa Volunteer Network: | \$ - | \$ 40.00 |
| 4 Treasury Projects | | |
| 4.1 Incorporation | \$ - | \$ - |
| 4.2 Liability Insurance | \$ - | \$ 800.00 |
| 5 Committee Projects | | |
| 5.1 Publicity Committee | | |
| 5.1.1 Website | \$ - | \$ - |
| 5.1.2 Newsletter | \$ 250.00 | \$ 250.00 |
| 5.1.3 Richmond Fair | \$ - | \$ 50.00 |
| 5.2 Fundraising Committee | | |
| 5.2.1 Blues Festival | \$ 3,000.00 | \$ 300.00 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------|-------------|
| | 5.2.2 Ecological Restoration and Enhancement Funding | \$ 3,500.00 | \$ - |
| | 5.2.3 T-Shirt Sales | \$ 1,500.00 | \$ 1,000.00 |
| 6 | Projects | | |
| | 6.1 Ecological Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring | | |
| | 6.1.1 Project Plans for Future Restoration and Enhancement Projects. | \$ - | \$ - |
| | 6.1.2 Riparian Planting at Cedarview Road - Greenbank Road Site | \$ 9,500 | \$ 9,500 |
| | 6.1.3 Shoreline Restoration at Twin Elm Site | \$ - | \$ 500.00 |
| | 6.1.4 Tree Planting Maintenance at Jockvale, Half-Moon Bay, Richmond Road Site | \$ - | \$ 500.00 |
| | 6.1.5 RVCA Water Quality Monitoring w Chemical and Macro-Invertebrate Indicators | \$ - | \$ 250.00 |
| | 6.1.6 Hepworth Memorial Tree | \$ - | \$ 30.00 - |
| | 6.1.7 RVCA Stream Corridor Riparian Vegetation Survey | \$ - | \$ - |
| | 6.1.8 Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp | \$ 100.00 | \$ 100.00 |
| | 6.2 Education | | |
| | 6.2.1 Information Board Project | \$ 1,500.00 | \$ 1,500.00 |
| | 6.2.2 Signs for Significant Wetlands, Jock River Tributaries and FJR Project Sites | \$ - | \$ - |
| | 6.3 Cedar Logs Project: | \$ - | \$ 25.00 |
| 7 | Water and Environmental Protection | | |
| | 7.1 Richmond Conservation Area Membership, Management and Sewage Storage Issues | \$ - | \$ - |
| | 7.2 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions | \$ - | \$ - |
| | 7.3 Alternative Sewage Treatment Solutions for Outlying Communities | \$ - | \$ - |
| | 7.4 Water Taking Permits | | |
| | 7.4.1 City of Ottawa Motion 40/7 | \$ - | \$ - |
| | 7.4.2 Applications posted on the EBR Registry | \$ - | \$ 25.00 |
| | 7.5 Wetland Protection | \$ - | \$ - |
| | 7.6 Environmental Planning and Advisory Issues | | |
| | 7.6.1 Jock River Reach 2 Subwatershed | \$ - | \$ - |

| | | | | |
|--|----|---|----|---|
| Study | | | | |
| 7.6.2 Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study | \$ | - | \$ | - |
| 7.6.3 Marlborough Forest Management Plan | \$ | - | \$ | - |

General Income

| | | |
|----------------------|----|--------|
| Anonymous Donations | \$ | 50.00 |
| Receipted Donations | \$ | 300.00 |
| GST Rebates | \$ | 100.00 |
| Corporate Membership | \$ | 100.00 |
| Family Membership | \$ | 625.00 |
| Supporter Membership | \$ | 270.00 |
| Volunteer Membership | \$ | 100.00 |

General Expenditures

| | | |
|------------------------------------|----|--------|
| Advertising | \$ | 100.00 |
| Bank Charges | \$ | 60.00 |
| Books and Subscriptions | \$ | 50.00 |
| Office Supplies | \$ | 200.00 |
| Photocopy Costs | \$ | 100.00 |
| Photographic Supplies | \$ | 50.00 |
| Photographic Development | \$ | 50.00 |
| Postage | \$ | 100.00 |
| Taxes | \$ | 100.00 |
| Memberships in other organizations | \$ | 10.00 |

| | | | |
|---|----|--------|-----------|
| <u>Total Income</u> | \$ | 20,895 | |
| <u>Total Expenditures</u> | | | \$ 15,660 |
| | | ***** | |
| <u>Income minus Expenditures</u> | \$ | 5,235 | |

13. Nomination Committee Report

The Nomination Committee will submit nominations for the Board of Directors at the Annual General Meeting. I bring to the attention of all members that the Nomination Committee would be pleased to accept nominations for any of the positions prior to the meeting (please call). Please also note that nominations for all positions are invited from the floor during the AGM. In all instances, those nominated must be members in good standing and must agree to the nomination. The posts on the Board are:

President

Treasurer

Secretary

Director for Projects and Actions

Director for Publicity and Public Relations

Vice-President

Director for Water Conservation and Usage

Director for Membership Roster and Management

Director of Fund-Raising

Directors at Large

The Board is also seeking interested candidates for the Editorial Board for the FJR Newsletter, the Management Board for the FJR Website, and the Internal Auditor.

Respectfully submitted,

Niel Barrington 823-3643

Nomination Committee Chair