

Friends of the Jock River

Annual Report
2004

Box 764
Richmond, Ontario,
K0A 2Z0

Table of Contents

*See Editor's note below

Item	Page
1.0 Agenda	4
2.0 Membership List	6
3.0 Leadership List	7
4.0 President's Report	7
4.1 Incorporation	9
4.2 Update of FJR Constitution and By-Laws	9
5.0 Financial Reports	10
5.1 Treasurer's Report	10
5.2 Financial Statements	10
6.0 Committee Reports	11
6.1 Publicity Committee	11
6.1.1 Website	11
6.1.2 Publicity Strategic Plan	12
6.1.3 Newsletter	13
7.0 Project Reports	13
7.1 Restoration and Environmental Enhancement Projects	13
7.1.1 Cedarview Spring Tree Plant	13
7.1.2 Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration	15
7.1.3 Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp	16
7.1.4 Greenbank Clean-up	17
7.1.5 Hearts Desire/Stonebridge Clean-up	17
7.1.6 Richmond Shoreline Garbage Clean-up	18
7.1.7 Summary of Previous Tree Planting Sites	19
7.1.8 Cedar Logs	21
7.2 Monitoring, Assessment and Planning Projects	22
7.2.1 Jock River Stream Assessment	22
7.2.2 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions	24
7.2.3 Trail Road Dump Leachate	29
7.2.4 Ashton Station Wetland	31
7.2.5 Applications for Permits to Take Water/Wetlands Issues	32
7.2.6 Richmond Conservation Area Membership, Management and Sewage Storage Issues	34
7.2.7 Jock River Reach 2 Watershed Plan	43
7.2.8 Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study	44
7.2.9 South Nepean Collector Sanitary Sewer	45
7.2.10 Alternative Sewage Treatment Solutions for Outlying Communities	46
7.2.11 MOE White Paper on Watershed-Based Source Protection	48

7.2.12 Jock River Flood Risk Mapping	49
7.3 Education Projects	50
7.3.1 Richmond Fair	50
8.0 Fundraising Report	50
8.1 T-Shirts	50
9.0 Plans for 2005	50
9.1 Work Plan for 2005	50
9.2 Budget for 2005	52
10.0 Nomination Committee Report	54

*Editor's note: A significant number of projects approved at February, 2003 AGM lacked resources (either funds or leaders) and were not performed. These projects have not been included in project reports.

For errors, omissions and comments, please call (825-8029) or e-mail (trodrigu@magma.ca).
 Brian Finch

1.0 AGENDA

FRIENDS OF THE JOCK RIVER ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING AGENDA

THURSDAY, February 17, 2005 7:00 PM
 Barrhaven Loblaws Meeting Room

Item

- 0.0 Introduction
- 1.0 Agenda
- 2.0 Keynote speaker- Ottawa Riverkeeper, Meredith Brown - 30 minutes
- 3.0 Nature artist Aleta Karstad, Bishops Mills Natural History Centre - 10 minutes
- 4.0 Minutes of Annual General Meeting, February 19, 2004
 - 4.1 Action items arising from minutes
- 5.0 Report on Membership List
- 6.0 Report on Leadership List
- 7.0 President's Report
 - 7.1 Incorporation
 - 7.2 Update of FJR Constitution and By-Laws
- 8.0 Financial Reports
 - 8.1 Treasurer's Report
 - 8.2 Financial Statements
- 9.0 Committee Reports
 - 9.1 Publicity Committee
 - 9.1.1 Website
 - 9.1.2 Publicity Strategic Plan
 - 9.1.3 Newsletter

- 10.0 Project Reports
 - 10.1 Restoration and Environmental Enhancement Projects
 - 10.1.1 Cedarview Spring Tree Plant
 - 10.1.2 Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration
 - 10.1.3 Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp
 - 10.1.4 Greenbank Clean-up
 - 10.1.5 Hearts Desire/Stonebridge Clean-up
 - 10.1.6 Richmond Shoreline Garbage Clean-up
 - 10.1.7 Maintenance of Previous Tree Planting Sites
 - 10.1.8 Cedar Logs
 - 10.2 Monitoring, Assessment and Planning Projects
 - 10.2.1 Jock River Stream Assessment
 - 10.2.2 Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions
 - 10.2.3 Trail Road Dump Leachate
 - 10.2.4 Ashton Station Wetland
 - 10.2.5 Applications for Permits to Take Water/Wetlands Issues
 - 10.2.6 Richmond Conservation Area Membership, Management and Sewage Storage Issues
 - 10.2.7 Jock River Reach 2 Watershed Plan
 - 10.2.8 Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study
 - 10.2.9 South Nepean Collector Sanitary Sewer
 - 10.2.10 Alternative Sewage Treatment Solutions for Outlying Communities
 - 10.3 Education Projects
 - 10.3.1 Richmond Fair
- 11.0 Fundraising Report
 - 11.1 T-Shirts
- 12.0 Plans for 2005
 - 12.1 Work Plan for 2005
 - 12.2 Budget for 2005
- 13.0 Nomination Committee Report
 - 13.1 Elections
 - 13.1.1 Election of President
 - 13.1.2 Election of Vice-President
 - 13.1.3 Election of Treasure
 - 13.1.4 Election of Secretary
 - 13.1.5 Election of Director for Water Conservation and Usage
 - 13.1.6 Election of Director for Membership Roster and Management
 - 13.1.7 Election of Director for Projects and Actions
 - 13.1.8 Election of Director for Fundraising
 - 13.1.9 Election of Director for Publicity and Public Relations
 - 13.1.10 Election of Directors at Large
 - 13.2 Appointments
 - 13.2.1 Appointment of Editorial Board for FJR Newsletter

13.2.2 Appointment of Management Board for FJR Website

13.2.3 Appointment of Internal Auditor

14.0 Nomination and Election of Members of Nominating Committee for 2005

15.0 Other Business

16.0 Adjournment

2.0 Membership List

The following were members in good standing as of December 31, 2004:

Volunteers

Doug Arnold

Niel Barrington

Chantelle Dooley

Zoltan Fabian

Angèle Leduc

Ronald Maybury

Irwin McCaffrey

George Morris

John Palmer

Eric Snyder

Bruce Webster

Supporter

Frances Little

J. Eric Moore

George Morris

Charles Morton

Doug Watson

Tom O. Wright

Corporate

Muskies Canada - Ottawa Valley Chapter

Family

Richard Bendall

Jim Bendall

Jean Brown

Lewis Cardin & Family

Brian Finch

Lucia/Tibor Horbasz

Charles & Margaret Pelton

Doug / Pat Vaughn

David/Laurie Weymouth

Marla Williams

3.0 Leadership List

Officers of the Executive

President	Brian Finch	825-8029
Vice-President	Eric Snyder	258-9122
Treasurer	Brian Finch	825-8029
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	Chantelle Dooley	258-9122
Director at Large	John Palmer	843-9733

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
Jock River Stream Survey	Eric Snyder	838-3572
Richmond conservation Area	Eric Snyder	258-9122
Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp	Doug Watson	828-5461

Other

Website	Doug Watson, Chantelle Dooley, Eric Snyder	
Editor of 2004 Annual Report	Brian Finch	825-8029

4.0 President's Report

Year 2004 marked the eighth year for the Friends of the Jock River. Our ability to influence environmental issues continues to grow at both the local and provincial levels. Many people and organizations in the environmental area know about us and seek us out for comment or action on environmental issues.

In April 2004, the Ottawa Field Naturalists' Club presented the Friends of the Jock River with its Conservation Award in recognition of "outstanding achievement in natural history conservation" for the work we did in 2003. Our website continues to bring in a small but constant number of inquiries.

Niel Barrington explains in his report our continued stronger emphasis on protecting our newly-planted trees at the time of planting. Starting in 2002 we applied a spiral tree wrap to all new trees, with the exception of sumacs and softwoods, to protect against mouse damage. Also, we mulched all small trees and shrubs with the application of a carpet square around the base of to retain moisture and to control tall grasses. Consequently, our trees planted in recent years have done well. It has also helped that our new trees have not had to contend with a severe drought (as in 3 of the past 7 years).

The Munster sewage issue continues to be a major disappointment. Major initiatives by the Richmond Village Association (principally) and FJR to influence City councillors and the Ontario Ministry of the Environment to halt the construction of the forcemain sewage pipe have not been successful. There is more information in my 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 current inactivity of the City to implement the advisory team (no longer an advisory group reporting to Council).

In another report, Eric describes the noteworthy work of the shoreline survey group.

Ken McRae, is a very active (but past) member who has kept us informed of the wetlands and "permits to take water" issues in the Jock River watershed. FJR does not have the expertise or manpower to monitor these important watershed issues so we have relied almost solely on Ken's vigilance and his willingness to keep us up to date. I have listed some of the more important issues in a separate report.

In recognition of Ken's hard work on many of the wetlands and "permits to take water" issues in the Jock River watershed, the executive nominated Ken McRae for the annual Rideau Valley Conservation Foundation Conservation Award for 2003. It is of note that Ken's constant stream of letters to various governmental agencies (municipal, provincial, federal and conservation authorities) resulted in the establishment of an interagency Wetlands Working Group with representation from the City's Planning & Growth Management Department, the Ministry of Natural Resources, Ministry of Housing and Municipal Affairs, the Rideau Valley, and Mississippi Valley and South Nation Conservation Authorities. I thought that the documentation I compiled in support of the award nomination was pretty convincing but the Foundation chose the Friends of the Tay River for the award. Congratulations to the Friends of the Tay River. (Perhaps another year Ken.) When I told Ken about the nomination he asked that we also acknowledge in the annual report the work of Selena Walker on wetlands issues. She has worked both independently and with Ken and other members of the Goulbourn Wetland Group on many of the wetlands issues listed in the separate wetlands in section 7.2.5. Thanks Selena.

I have been collecting the new trees that pop up unwanted in my and my neighbours' gardens, planting them in an unused area in my back yard and then replanting them in our tree plant locations when they got bigger. The walnut trees have been the most challenging as squirrels tend to uproot them within hours or days. I tried something new - a fenced enclosure with a chicken wire cover. In the fall of 2003 I pushed 100 or so walnuts (nuts from the tree in Fran Little's yard) into the ground and in the spring and summer, most of them sprouted and thrived in the enclosure. In November 2004, I removed about 50 of the largest (some waist height) and planted them in the Heart's Desire Forest and in some of our previous tree plant locations. Since none of our tree plants included black walnuts, the odd one or two walnuts planted here and there should improve the diversity.

Because Richmond is more or less the geographical centre of the Jock River watershed, our business address has been in Richmond. However, there is no affordable venue in Richmond for our monthly, annual and occasional meetings. The Ottawa Library (Richmond Branch) where we met until mid 2003 started charging us \$25 per meeting, which quickly ate into our meagre funds. Many thanks to the Loblaws store in Barrhaven for providing us with a bright, comfortable meeting room, without charge.

One heads up for the future: the Jock River watershed plan was completed in 2001 and is due for review in 2006.

On the down side, some of our executive positions went unfilled in 2004 and I doubled up with both president and treasurer positions. The active, working core group continues to shrink. One consequence for 2004 was the reduction in number or scope of activities we were involved in. In simple terms, we did not have enough coordinators to organize and manage many projects that we felt were important to the environment and people in the Jock River watershed. Another consequence is the burn-out of the executive. If new members do not step in to assist and the core shrinks further, the organization risks eventual collapse.

Brian Finch

4.1 Incorporation
and
4.2 Update of FJR Constitution and By-Laws

No progress was made on either of these two issues. 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 and mostly manpower has prevented this review.

Brian Finch

5.0 Financial Reports
5.1 Treasurer's Report

Our Cedarview Tree Plant 2003 and 2004 projects were funded by a single grant from the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources under its CFWIP program. Our expenses were incurred over both 2003 and 2004 fiscal year but the income (the grant) was recorded in our 2004 fiscal year as CFWIP grants are paid after the fact on submission of the bills.

The three clean-up projects, Greenbank, Hearts Desire/Stonebridge, and Richmond were funded by the Ottawa City Environmental Projects Grant Program (CEPGP). The expenses appear in our 2004 financial year but we will be reimbursed by the City in 2005.

The Friends of the Jock River has another revenue source: T-shirts. Sales are close to their break-even point, as mentioned a separate report.

Brian Finch

5.2 Financial Statements

Balance Sheet 2004

		2004	2003	Variance
ASSETS				
	Chequing - TD-Canada Trust Account	\$ 4631.52	4522.5	109.02
	Petty Cash	\$ 107.4	101.15	6.25
	Accounts Receivable (GST)	\$ 240.93	96.34	144.59
	Other assets	\$ 0	0	0
	Advances/Loans	\$ 0	0	0
	Prepaid Expenses (Dequin)	\$ 8.99	0	8.99
	T-shirts (46 @ 8.5675 ea)	\$ 394.11	0	394.11
		-----	-----	-----
	Total assets	\$ 4988.84	4623.65	365.19
		=====	=====	=====
LIABILITIES				
	Accounts Payable	\$ 0	0	0
	Other Liabilities	\$ 0	0	0
	Total Liabilities	\$ 0	0	0
	Equity - Beginning	\$ 4623.65	5838.42	-1214.77
	Receipts Plus Dispersements for Year	\$ 365.19	-1214.77	1579.96
	Total Equities	\$ 4988.84	4623.65	365.19
		-----	-----	-----
EQUITY plus LIABILITIES		\$ 4988.84	4623.65	365.19
		=====	=====	=====

Cash Flow 2004

INFLOWS

Donations	\$142.80
Grants - CFWIP	\$1,799.53
Membership-Corporate	\$50.00
Membership-Family	\$250.00
Membership-Supporter	\$90.00
Membership-Volunteer	\$100.00
Miscellaneous Income	\$2.40
T-shirt sales	\$810.00
TOTAL INFLOWS	\$3,244.73

OUTFLOWS

Bank Service Charges	\$60.00
Total Licenses and Permits	\$25.00
Office Supplies	\$128.54
Postage and Delivery	\$8.49
Professional Fees	\$250.00
T-Shirt	\$752.82
2003-TreePlantGreenbank-CFWIP	\$976.50
HeartsDesire/Stonebridge Cleanup	\$153.40
Richmond Clean-up	\$74.78
Munster Sewage	\$300.00
PST Expenses	\$164.55
GST Expenses	\$240.93
Rent	\$75.00
Marketing	\$15.79
TOTAL OUTFLOWS	\$3,225.80

OVERALL

TOTAL

\$18.93

Brian Finch

6.0 Committee Reports

6.1 Publicity Committee Report

6.1.1 Website

Our website is located at www.geocities.com/jockriver. Early in the year, John Palmer suggested that FJR purchase a website name that better reflected the group. John proposed several names and we chose www.jockriver.org. Until we decide on an alternate location, we will retain the geocities site and use the new site to transfer individuals to it.

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.

Brian Finch

6.1.2 Publicity Strategic Plan

In June, our Director for Publicity and Public Relations, Chantelle Dooley, submitted a draft strategic plan for public relations in which she suggested roles for the Public Relations Committee and the PR Director with respect to publicity, corporate communications, projects/special events, community support and fundraising. The draft plan also proposed a PR mission statement. Chantelle presented an analysis of FJR's strengths and weaknesses, external opportunities, and external threats, and she then proposed objectives and strategies to deal with them.

The impressive 29 page proposal has significant potential, which, unfortunately, the executive has failed to capitalize on because of the mobility and geographical separation of our executive members (Kemptville and Nepean) and the difficulties of getting the executive in one spot to discuss the draft. The incoming executive must make a better attempt to work on and implement Chantelle's proposal.

Brian Finch

6.1.3 Newsletter

We wanted to put together newsletters this year but, again, we lacked the manpower. It sounds like a minor undertaking but those who have done it in the past know it takes some effort. 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 2005.

Brian Finch

7.0 Project Reports

7.1 Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring Projects

7.1.1 Cedarview Spring Tree Plant

This spring's plant was the second in a two -year work scheme to create riparian zone forests along the Jock River just north and west of the Cedarview Road Bridge. The funds needed for this plant came from the Ministry of Natural Resources Community Fish and Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program and Ikea. The land is owned by the City of Ottawa. We spread the project over two years in order to match funds with manpower realities. In 2003, we planted a 15 m by 230 m strip along the river bank upstream of the Cedarview Rd. Bridge on the northerly bank.

This year we continued planting in the same field but just a little further upstream. The shoreline strip was 15 m by 400 m and therefore larger than the site of the previous year's plant.

The Friends of the Jock River supplied over 1000 bare root seedlings consisting of green ash, tamarack, silver maple, white cedar, bur oak and black elderberry. Ikea supplied larger potted trees and shrubs, consisting of silver maple, nannyberry, silky dogwood, red osier dogwood, tamarack, speckled alder, and balsam fir. An additional few black walnut, oak and ash trees were supplied by Brian Finch. The planting was spread over several dates and involved FJR members, Boy Scouts, Girl Guides and Ikea staff. With some exceptions, the trees were protected with spiral tree wraps; all were mulched with carpet squares. Trees not needing wraps were: elderberry, tamarack, cedar and fir. For the Scouts' and Guides' tree plants, the protective/mulching measures were installed by FJR members to provide quality control over the planting process.

May 1st. Boy Scout Annual Spring Tree Plant

On Saturday, May 1st, the Boy Scouts of the Western District of the Ottawa Region, showed up in force. It was a beautiful spring day and there must have been over 100 people on site around 11 a.m. FJR members Brian Finch, Doug Watson, Irwin McCaffrey, Ron Maybury, Frank Stokes and Niel Barrington led the charge to get the seedlings in. Brian gave a few quick tree-planting demos and then concentrated on getting the tending started on the freshly planted trees. Doug, Ron and Irwin took to the shovels, while Niel worked with the Scouts, simultaneously getting water supply organized, handing out trees, planting, instructing, and shoveling. Scout leader Bruce McCracken was a big help in

this regard, as the many different troops or packs arriving on site over the course of the morning lead to some slight confusion. While the tree-planting demo had to be repeated, it was a real advantage having the kids coming on site in a continuous stream rather than all at once. It made it easier for me to work with each group for a bit and get them all sorted out and up and running, so to speak. I was really impressed at how well the kids took to tree-planting! Carrying buckets of water, working the shovel, everybody pitched in. The heavy rain on Sunday gave the little trees a great start.

May 13th and May 26th Girl Guide Plants

Two plants were organized for two separate troops of the Girl Guides. The Guides also brought additional family members to pitch in. We had saved a hundred and twenty seedlings from the previous plant for each troop to plant. These two plants were held in the evenings on May 13th and May 26th, both weekdays. Not only did the Guides work diligently to plant the seedlings correctly, one group even contributed its dues to FJR!

The FJR crew installing the wraps and the carpet squares could not keep up to the Scouts and the Guides so some of the original crew spent an additional few sessions to complete the quality control/wrapping/mulching operation.

June 8th IKEA Plant

Earlier in the spring, Mike Rosen from Trees Canada contacted FJR president Brian Finch to ask if FJR could provide a tree planting site and the supervising expertise for an IKEA-sponsored tree plant. Ikea was to provide labour by way of employee volunteers and funding (from its retail Christmas tree sales) to Trees Canada to buy trees. We immediately accepted the offer for a date in June. We decided to continue planting at the Cedarview site, but the IKEA tree stock was used to fill in "holes" in the area we planted in 2003. There had been some predation of the young seedlings planted in May 2003 and the gaps needed to be filled. Besides, the area we planted earlier in the spring was already well (possibly over-) stocked. The IKEA group proved to be a highly spirited, enthusiastic bunch who doggedly worked hard until all stock was planted. Also, most were veterans of previous IKEA tree plants so they knew what they were doing. Afterwards, we bopped over to the Barley Mow for a hearty lunch and a well-deserved cool one! We congratulate IKEA on providing the trees and manpower for the benefit of our natural world.

Evaluation

All of the plants went very well.

The Cedarview site had great access as the City provided us with a combination to the lock on the gate. Cars could be driven in, making it easier to deliver all the needed supplies right to the sites. We had to work fast on the two weekday evening plants to get as many trees planted as possible before darkness fell. The fresh planted seedlings were monitored throughout summer and into the

fall. Unfortunately, some of the little white cedar trees didn't make it. It was difficult to determine the cause but we speculate they may have been improperly planted or the roots dried out. Also, some trees expire simply from the shock of handling and replanting. There was also a small amount of predation occurring, possibly by voles or rabbits. The little trunks of the seedlings are wrapped to protect them from rodents, but the wrap really works better on whip size stock. The voles can work their way in and find exposed wood. Brian believes if we can keep the grass and weeds low in the planted area, those little rodents would have nowhere to hide.

Final Numbers for 2004

Bare Root Seedlings	
Oak.	202
Ash	202
White Cedar.	300
Tamarack	300
Silver Maple	110
Black Walnut	3
Black Elderberry	150
Potted Plants (Mostly Whip-Size)	
Silver Maple	20
Nannyberry	12
Silky Dogwood	60
Red Osier Dogwood	20
Tamarack	20
Speckled Alder	10
Balsam Fir	10
Grand total.....	1419

Niel Barrington

7.1.2 Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration

There is little to report. The runoff in spring 2004 was low and there was no damage to the fence. I spent a few hours in the spring to tighten a few loose strands.

The landowner, Mary and Alastair Munro, replaced the fence and gate along Cambrian Road. Alastair installs the nose pump in the spring and remove it in the fall.

The spruce trees planted at least 7 years ago in the grazed portion of the field are still doing well, despite being abused and trimmed by the cattle. At least 100 are alive and well but none is over waist height. Trees planted in the shoreline area have virtually gone; I counted 5. These few trees out of hundreds planted in past years have survived in the riparian zone against considerable odds: beavers, droughts (3 in the last 6 years), cattle breaking through the fence, spring floods and ice. These are very difficult conditions indeed. A few shoots of black willow branch I pushed into the river mud two years ago appear to have taken root. The success rate was low but planting is easy - it takes only a few seconds to break off a twig and jam it into the shoreline mud. A few of the older trees along the shore, including the largest old burr oak, came down this year so the shore area continues to degrade. Since there is no apparent natural reseeding, with the exception of the hawthorns, we must plant more trees.

In November, a small work party planted about 25 - 30 trees in the higher areas along the shore side of the fence. Spiral tree wraps and carpet square mulch were used. All of the trees came from my small back yard tree nursery and were 2 -3 year old black walnuts (all but about 4), oaks and ashes.

Brian Finch

9.1.3 Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp

The Wildlife Ramp Project is designed to solve a problem that was created when the dam was constructed on the Jock River in the hamlet of Ashton, Ontario. The dam is an eight foot high structure which is impossible for wildlife to climb over. Unfortunately there is a bridge located directly above the dam; hence, animals that attempt to go around the dam are forced to cross a busy roadway. A river otter was killed attempting to cross the roadway and a local resident reported that he watched a beaver for 20 minutes attempting to cross the road but could not because of the traffic.

The FJR has proposed to install a log which will act as a ramp for wildlife to safely climb over the dam. The Rideau Valley Conservation Authority was asked to approve the project in cooperation with the City of Ottawa and Township of Beckwith who are joint owners of the property. The log will be secured by a chain which will connect the upper end of the log to an anchor 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.

This project was scheduled for completion in 2004 but the approval process was not completed until October 18, 2004, when a letter of approval was received from the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority. Considering the approaching cold weather, it was felt that the project should be rescheduled for 2005.

The cost of this project is quite minimal; hence government financing will not likely be needed. 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.

Doug Watson

7.1.4 Greenbank Clean-up

I had secured a grant of \$100 from the Ottawa City Environmental Projects Grant Program for a community clean-up for the area along Greenbank Road between Jockvale Road and Half Moon Bay (area downstream of the Greenbank Bridge). Soon after securing the grant, I was contacted by Tom Wright, an area resident (and FJR member), who was in the midst of organizing a clean-up of a Jockvale Road and Greenbank Road. He had brought together a broad range of school and community groups. The City was supplying Tom's group from a City-wide clean-up program. I hooked into the planning process and offered the supplies I had purchased for the project. However, on the day of the clean-up, April 29th, not one group had spoken for the supplies. No other FJR members were present (but it was a weekday). I spent several hours cleaning up the Half Moon Bay area just after several dozen students had collected many bags full and I still collected 1 ½ bags of garbage.

Sadly, the area is popular with many motorists who park, sip their Tim Horton coffees, nibble their Big Mac hamburgers and leave a mess. The area was well littered within a few days.

On May 4, 2004, the Nepean 27th Scout troop and Jockvale residents cleaned Half Moon Bay and Cambrian Rd (a larger area) and were able to collect an additional 13 garbage bags.

Tom Wright reported that 183 bags of litter and garbage were collected weighing in excess of 1080 kg.

The supplies I had purchased were used for the Heart's Desire/Stonebridge Clean-Up project.

Respectfully submitted,
Brian Finch

7.1.5 Hearts Desire/Stonebridge Clean-up

I had secured a grant of \$200 from the Ottawa City Environmental Projects Grant Program (CEPGP) for a community clean-up for the two communities of Hearts Desire and Stonebridge along the Jock River. The shoreline areas near Stonebridge were in particular need of a clean-up. A strong wind storm in the preceding fall had spread a considerable amount of construction material around the area.

Both the Hearts Desire and Stonebridge Community Associations were enthusiastic about the project and chose the morning of Saturday, May 22, 2004. The Barrhaven Lions Club represented by George Kennedy kindly agreed to organize a BBQ at Levesque Park for 12:00 noon. The Stonebridge Community Association supplied the food for both groups and Monarch provided transport and other

support. The FJR contributed garbage bags, gloves and funds for paper/photocopying for a community bulletin.

At my suggestion, Hearts Desire concentrated on the Jock Landing Park at the confluence of the Jock River and Rideau River.

Both community groups reported smaller than expected turn-outs but claimed that having the collection on the Victoria Day long weekend was likely to blame. Both reported that good amounts of trash were collected, particularly by Stonebridge. I was unable to attend the clean-ups because of previous commitments but I took a walk through both areas afterward and found significant improvements. I commend both groups - well done.

Brian Finch

7.1.6 Richmond Shoreline Garbage Clean-up

I had secured a grant of \$100 from the Ottawa City Environmental Projects Grant Program (CEPGP) for a community clean-up in the shoreline areas of the Jock River in Richmond.

The undertaking was a joint Richmond Village Association (RVA)/FJR project and the date was set for Saturday, September 25th.

Announcements for the event were published in the local newspapers; leaflets were spread around the community and distributed at the Richmond Fair held the previous weekend. The turn-out was lower than the numbers predicted from conversations I had with apparently interested individuals; however, the number, about 25, was in line with most previous clean-ups. Participants were FJR and RVA members; local residents; and University of Ottawa students (Angèle Leduc, a FJR member, brought along three other students from her Environmental Science program).

The shoreline area in the park near Royal York Street was in fairly good condition so I decided to alter the plan of attack after failing to get good leads from residents on the "local trash". In a drive through Richmond, I mapped all trash within 5 blocks of the river. Work parties were assigned specific areas and sent off with copies of the map. I supplied a canoe to deal with the trash in the water.

The weather was great. The areas covered included:

- the river up and downstream from the McBean St. Bridge;
- the park along Royal York;
- the river bank from the bridge all the way to the Richmond Conservation Area;
- the area around South Carleton High School
- the creek area at Strachan and Fowler
- King St, including the path extending from the end of the street to the river; and

- the path extending off the end of Evelyn Dr.

We had never been near some of these areas in previous years and we were surprised how much was found. At the end of the day, the amount of trash collected filled a 4' x 6' trailer to a depth of more than 3', recyclable cans and bottles filled 5 garbage bags and the ever-present beer cans and bottles filled a 24 case. The latter were returned to the beer store. The trash (in excess of 1000 pounds) was taken to the dump and the metal taken to Cohen and Cohen. Some of the more unusual items collected included 2 bikes and a vacuum cleaner from the water under the bridge, a propane tank (1/2 full), and a smashed computer terminal.

Brian Finch

7.1.7. Summary of Previous Tree Planting Sites

Before starting to describe our previous tree plants, it is important to note that tree planting in the riparian (river edge) zone of the Jock River, the area of primary interest to FJR, is considered to be difficult for a range of reasons: rodents (including beavers, mice and voles), low water levels (droughts - 3 in the last 6 years); high flood water levels (the tree species we chose tolerate flooding but too much can be a problem); ice damage; and, in the Jock River corridor, snow mobile operators that use the river banks for thrills or transit. In addition, many of the open riverbanks in the area are populated with particularly tough, tall grasses, such as canary grass, with extensive, resilient root systems. Prior to 2003, FJR made only passing attempts to protect newly planted trees from rodent predation or from encroachment by resident vegetation. We found that young deciduous trees were particularly susceptible to rodent (mouse and vole) attack and at least 1/3 of them were lost each year. We found that almost all deciduous trees showed some signs of bark damage from rodents even before the first winter set in. In addition, during the first summer, many healthy trees became surrounded by tall grasses that blocked the sunlight and, when winter arrived, the grasses were knocked down by snow, smothering the trees.

In 2003, we adopted a policy to protect all small, newly planted trees and shrubs from encroachment from tall grasses by installing carpet squares (min. 45 cm x 45 cm) around the base of the trees. The squares are pinned in place with 1 or 2 landscaping staples. The squares also retain moisture. We do not expect the squares to pose a problem for the trees in the long term as they disintegrate over a period of time, estimated at 3 - 5 years. (We first learned of the carpet square mulching technique from the Friends of the Carp River.) In addition, we protect all trees susceptible to rodent predation with spiral tree wraps. Mice and voles like the bark of most hard wood trees but do not appear to like softwoods, such as spruce, tamarack, cedar and fir. I do not believe they touch sumac. However, in severe winters, most young trees and shrubs are still fair game.

We have since learned that the spiral tree wraps must be removed after several years as the wraps do not degrade quickly and can tighten on rough bark as the tree grows. On one of our tree plants, a few 2+m spruce trees have toppled over because the trunk under the tree wrap was restricted to about half the diameter of the rest of the trunk.

The following is a listing of tree planting sites from previous years and their status:

- **Downstream of the Eagleson Road Bridge crossing of the Jock River (both sides).** This area was one of our earliest tree plants and is covered extensively with tough, tall (shoulder height) grasses, likely canary grass. In addition, the small field adjacent to the Eagleson bridge abutment, in the SE quadrant of the crossing is used extensively by snow mobilers in the winter and fishermen at other times to access the river. None of the hundreds of trees planted in this small field has survived. Those on the same side much further down river have fared better and are up to 2m tall. All of the trees planted on this site were spruce or white pine. On the NE side of the crossing, only spruce were planted and a half dozen or so have survived.
- **Richmond Conservation Area adjacent to Eagleson Road.** Heavy grasses do not have a strong hold in the area and a significant number of the planted trees have thrived. Many of the trees are over 3m tall. The soil in the area is on the wet side (possible seepage from old sewage lagoons) and fertile (possible seepage from old sewage lagoons);
- **Twin Elm Bridge downstream (both sides) and upstream (south-east side).** This was one of our very first tree plants. The downstream areas are covered completely with tall grasses, likely canary grass. I have been unable to find any surviving trees or shrubs from the tree plant. The shoreline of the area upstream, on the south side of the river has been planted over three different years and I have described its current state under item 7.1.2 Twin Elm Shoreline Restoration;
- **Twin Elm Bridge 200m upstream (north-west side; referred to as the Foster property in previous years).** The area was planted extensively in 2002 with a wide range of softwood and hardwood trees and at least once in an earlier plant. Year 2002 was the first time we planted tamarack trees, which are doing very well in the wet areas of the property despite some damage from ice movement during run-off. The success rate of the rest of the trees is much better than some of the other tree plants and many of our trees are now visible from the Richmond Road. FJR placed a sign on the property, beside the Richmond Road, to identify the site. Watch the property over the next few years as our trees grow and start to change the character of the shoreline;
- **Jockvale Road Bridge crossing, downstream about 30m (north side) and 100m (south side).** Both of these areas showed some natural re-growth (primarily elm, ash and birch) before we started planting in the area; these trees are now well established and doing very well. The rest of the area was covered with tall grasses but only a small part near the river bank appeared to be covered with canary grass. The areas have been planted and replanted over quite a few years by FJR. Many evergreens are doing well; 40 -50 of our deciduous trees are present but multiple leaders from ground level indicate heavy predation by rodents. Our trees are starting to have an influence over the appearance and character of the area. I planted a few walnut trees from my nursery in the higher portions near the sports fields last fall. The Barrhaven trunk sewer extension was planned for installation through both areas but a landscape architect contractor recommended a route around the perimeter of the tree plant areas so the impact will be minor;
- **Greenbank Road Bridge crossing, upstream, north side.** This area was planted in 2003 and 2004, and is described in detail in section 7.1.1 Cedarview Spring Tree Plant; and
- **The park alongside Royal York in the Village of Richmond.** This park, owned by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA), has been transformed over the past decade or so from a rather

bleak, flat stretch of dry grass into an attractive, partially naturalized community park. The RVCA has added a handful of trees (generally 3+m tall) every few years and the transformation happened so slowly, most residents probably didn't notice. FJR planted the shoreline area and a portion perpendicular to the shore in 2001. This latter area was planted extensively, covered with a landscaping fabric and mulched with wood chips. The area is currently thick with vegetation. The elderberries are doing extremely well but only a few cedar are evident. The cedar seedlings were particularly small that year and barely peeked over the mulch when planted. The big surprise is that the Manitoba maples are doing so well they risk taking over -- BUT WE DIDN'T PLANT ANY MANITOBA MAPLES. The mulch was obtained from landscapers operating in the area and it is now evident that the 5+ cm of mulch we applied was a mixture of maple wood chips and many Manitoba maple keys. We will have to control the Manitoba maples. The trees in the shoreline area are doing well and were tended in 2004.

- **Half Moon Bay (Greenbank Road)**. The area near the road was planted with about a dozen caliper trees. A few were broken off by motorists. The shore area immediately to the east was planted with seedlings and many have survived. Tom Wright, a FJR member living on the opposite side of the river, has installed tree wraps on most of the trees.

Brian Finch

7.1.8 Cedar Logs

The cedar logs donated by the former Goulbourn Township in 1999 were piled in the Twin Elm field owned by Mary and Alastair Munro. Late in spring 2001, work parties peeled, cut and stacked about half the pile. This spring, the landowners made good use of the logs to rebuild the fence and gate along the northwest side of the field (against Cambrian Road). Approximately half the pile remains as a back-up in the event the fence along the shoreline of the same property needs repair.

Brian Finch

7.2 Monitoring, Assessment and Planning Projects

7.2.1. Jock River Stream Assessment

Introduction

The Jock River Stream Assessment continued for its second year in 2004. Once again 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

Those who read the account in the 2003 annual report may recall that 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 Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) is responsible for this part of the project. All observations made by volunteers in the field are entered into the RVCA's database, and this is being made available online.

Participants

The project was again organized this year by Eric Snyder of the Friends of the Jock River. He was assisted by Jennifer Lamoureux, aquatic and fish habitat biologist at the RVCA, and Mark Scott, resource technician at the RVCA. Paul Hamilton, research assistant at the Canadian Museum of Nature (CMN) specializing in phycology and water quality, assisted Jennifer and Mark in training volunteers for the project, and gave a demonstration of the CMN's hydrolab at the initial training day.

Brian Coad, research scientist in ichthyology at the CMN, and co-author of *Fishes of Canada's National Capital Region*, identified fish specimens for the project, along with CMN research assistant, Noel Alfonso. Greg Hutton, former Eastern Ontario Biodiversity Museum (EOBM) employee, and Niel Barrington of the Friends of the Jock River, contributed their extensive experience with fish species in the region.

The RVCA provided a summer student to assist stream survey volunteers from time to time, Brady Stevenson, who is currently enrolled at Sir Sanford Flemming College. Two employees of the EOBM also contributed to the surveys: Katrina Lay, who is now pursuing her teaching certificate at the University of Nipissing, and Heather Hughes, who presently works for the RVCA.

In addition to those already named, surveyors included Bev Wigney, Bill Bowman, Fred Schueler and Sandy Garland.

Field Work

A training session for volunteers was held on 2 May, led by Jennifer, and Mark Scott. Training was done at the Jock River Landing, where the Jock River flows into the Rideau River.

On 14 May a special education day was held with Lisa Hetherington's class of grade ten students from Bell High School. Eric, Bev and Mark led groups of students as they surveyed stretches of the river downstream of Munster Side Road. Tracks of *Mustela vison* (Mink) were found along the river shoreline and students frightened a specimen of *Zapus hudsonicus* (Meadow Jumping Mouse) from cover in the open meadows by the river. *Cyprinus carpio* (Carp) were observed spawning in the shallows, and shells were found of *Elliptio complanata* (Eastern Elliptio), *Lampsilis siliquoidea* (Fat Mucket) and *Anodontoides ferussacianus* (Cylindrical Floater).

Much of the surveying this year took place in this area, both upstream and downstream of the Munster Side Road bridge over the Jock River. Upstream surveys extended as far as the mouth of King's Creek. The silty stream bottom along the northern shoreline of the river in this area provides habitat for *Unionid* mussels, and a great diversity of species was recorded: *Elliptio complanata* (Eastern Elliptio), *Lampsilis siliquoidea* (Fat Mucket), *Anodontoides ferussacianus* (Cylindrical Floater), *Lasmigona costata* (Fluted-shell), *Lasmigona compressa* (Creek Heelsplitter), *Pygonadon grandis* (Giant Floater) and *Strophitus undulatus* (Squaw-foot). The introduced *Orconectes rusticus* (Rusty Crayfish) was very abundant in this area, amongst submerged rubble and on exposed underwater rock flats; nonetheless, near the mouth of King's Creek, the native *Orconectes virilis* (Northern Crayfish) was observed. Bev Wigney recorded many species of Odonates between the Munster Side Road bridge and King's Creek, including *Anax junius* (Common Green Darner), *Libellula luctuosa* (Widow Skimmer), *Libellula lydia* (Common Whitetail Skimmer), *Argia fumipennis* (Variable Dancer), *Argia moesta* (Powdered Dancer), *Calopteryx aequabilis* (River Jewelwing) and *Calopteryx maculata* (Ebony Jewelwing).

The highlight of the summer was on 24 June, when Brian Coad and Noel Alfonsa led surveyors on a fish survey day. Brian, Noel and Katrina Lay conducted electro-shocking at four sites, and netting was done at two more. The six sites visited were the Jock River at Joy's Road, Hobb's Drain at Franktown Road, the Jock River at Franktown Road, King's Creek at Jock Trail Road, the Jock River at Heart's Desire and the mouth of the Jock River. Two large specimens of *Esox lucius* (Northern Pike) were found along Franktown Road, and what appeared to be an immature specimen of *Esox masquinongy* (Muskellunge) was retrieved from King's Creek. The location with most species recorded was the Jock River at Franktown Road, adjacent to the Riverbend Golf and Country Club. The list includes *Luxilus cornutus* (Common Shiner), *Notropis heterodon* (Blackchin Shiner), *Pimephales notatus* (Bluntnose Minnow), *Semotilus atromaculatis* (Creek Chub), *Fundulus diaphanus* (Banded Killifish), *Ambloplites rupestris* (Rock Bass), *Lepomis gibbosus* (Pumpkinseed), *Micropterus dolomieu* (Smallmouth Bass), *Etheostoma nigrum* (Johnny Darter) and *Nocomis biguttatus* (Hornyhead Chub). The last species was, as Brian Coad, put it "the big surprise of the trip." It is a new species for the national capital region,

which Brian suspects may have been introduced by bait buckets. It is native in Canada in only two rivers in Manitoba, streams of Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair, and the southern and northwestern Lake Huron drainages.

Database and GIS

Jock River Stream Assessment data for 2004 is still being recorded in preparation for entering it into the RVCA's database and GIS. Data for 2003 is now available online, in the RVCA's Watershed Information System. Visit www.rideauvalley.on.ca/watershed/index.html, and click on "Aquatic Habitat and Terrestrial Ecology" under "WIS Index." On the aquatic habitat and terrestrial ecology page, click on "Data" under "Shorelines" to download a map of the Rideau River watershed. Then zoom in on any part of the Jock River that has been surveyed, making sure that "shoreline 2003" is the active map layer, and click on the information icon to display the survey sheet for the section of the river in question.

Conclusion

The Jock River Stream Assessment Project has again been a great success. But the work is still 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 and last, 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." If you are interested in participating in this project during the summer of 2005, please contact Eric Snyder at 258-9122.

Eric Snyder

7.2.2 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. The site is updated regularly.

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. From Richmond, Munster's sewage would then be pumped through an existing 14 km pressure sewage pipeline to Glen Cairn where it enters the City's gravity sewage collector system for eventual secondary treatment at the City's sewage treatment facility at Green's Creek (ROPEC). The total trip is about 68 km.

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. This option would retain the water within the watershed and would augment the flow of the upper Jock River with water of better quality than is currently in the Jock. The added flow would be particularly important during the summer months in dry years. The major problems with the pressurized sewer pipe relate to the route through the largest provincially significant wetland in Eastern Ontario, which is also the source for Richmond's aquifer, and through the Village of Richmond which relies on the shallow aquifer for its domestic water. The individual wells average less than 30 feet.

The long process leading up to 2004 involves:

- nine appeals (including one by FJR) were made to the Ontario Minister of the Environment (MOE) to conduct a ministerial review of the project's environmental assessment; all 9 were rejected.
- four appeals (including one by FJR) were made to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) to reject the City's amendment to the City's Official Plan for a pipeline from Munster to Richmond. The OMB ruled in our favour and directed the City to perfect its case and conduct a thorough re-evaluation using the best available evidence.
- an independent consultant recommended the two on-site treatment options over the pipeline.
- one more consultant's report was commissioned and City staff recommended pipeline using questionable 90 year lifecycle costs and disputed costs for on-site options (one company is suing the City).
- upset residents of Richmond who had not been consulted on the pipeline route presented a petition with 680 signatures to have the pipeline dropped. Their councillor, Janet Stavinga dismissed the petition out of hand.
- a "request for investigation" with the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario was jointly filed by Ted Brown, for the Richmond Village Association (RVA), and I, for the FJR, asking for an investigation into the City's conduct in the environmental assessment.

Year 2004:

In January, a complaint about the danger of a forcemain sewer to the wells and health of Richmond residents was sent to Dr. Cushman, the City's Medical Officer of Health, by Doug Arnold, a Richmond resident. He received a reply that was crafted with engineering rationale, avoiding the health aspects.

On February 16, 2004, MOE rejected the "request for investigation". Much of the reply did not relate to the issues raised in the request. MOE has ignored our requests for reconsideration.

In March, the City started construction of the sewer line using horizontal directional drilling. Some aspects of the installation have been questioned by the RVA and FJR:

- while the pipe was supposed to be put under the Jock River, it was installed in the sediment, on top of the bedrock river bottom. Further, the single-walled pipe was not protected against possible ice or other damage with a second external shielding pipe.
- within Richmond, the pipe was installed in the roadway closer to many existing wells than permitted by the building code. Complaints to the City's building inspectors were ignored. Some residents are continuing to pursue this aspect.
- the installation of the pipe by pulling the pipe through a horizontally, directionally drilled hole contaminated at least one well (first hand information) and contaminated or affected the taste of the water in another two (second hand information). In the first instance, complaints have been ignored. A pipe rupture near these wells would contaminate them permanently.
- specifications for the pipe require an appropriate pipe bedding (e.g., sand). Directionally drilled sections of the pipe (from Richmond pump house to western edge of Richmond Fen Wetland) are all in the roadway (road shoulder for the entire route except within Richmond), meaning the pipe would have a base of mixed broken rock. The remaining pipe was laid in blasted ditches and the pipe bed is blasted stone rubble. Observers report that no sand or gravel was installed as pipe bedding.
- lead portions of the pipe pulled through the directionally drilled hole were scored (some heavily scored) by the rock in the road bed confirming: first, the pipe bed contains sharp rock, which may be problematic when pumping starts; and, second, the pulled pipe is already in less than pristine condition.
- there is no evidence of the installation of mitigation measures the City engineers had promised would be used to prevent the flow of sub-surface ground water along the ditch and the horizontally drilled hole.
- City engineers stated emphatically at meetings prior to the installation of the pipe that the pipe would be continuously welded high density polyethylene with no joints. (Pressurized pipelines fail most often at joints.) However, their own detailed plans indicated two mechanical couplings at each valve or vent (planned every kilometer or about 11 in all); upon installation, observers noted 4 couplings per valve or vent. The 11 km of pipe is not continuous and has an estimated minimum of 44 joints.

In March a delegation comprising primarily of Richmond Village Association executives and two from FJR met with staff from the office the Minister of the Environment (senior advisor and legislative assistant) in Toronto, making them fully aware of the problem. The Minister's staff understood the problem and appeared supportive. We also met with staff of Ontario's Environmental Commissioner.

In March, Doug Arnold, a Richmond resident submitted an extensive complaint to the Professional Engineers of Ontario against four City engineers involved in the Munster project. An investigation is expected to take some time, likely well into 2005.

On June 11, the Minister's senior policy advisor and another staff member came to Richmond to meet with a larger group to obtain an update. John Baird, MPP for the area, was in attendance along with a member of his staff. One glaring problem identified by the policy advisor is the legislated inability of the Minister to interfere with or countermand certain decisions made by her directors. The approval of the Munster pipeline appears to be one such decision.

Some time in June, the RVA entered into discussions with Rodney Northey, a well known environmental lawyer, to have him research the legality of the Munster EA and lobby the Minister and officials of MOE. At the same time, the RVA conducted a funding drive that brought in donations not only from Richmond residents but from other interested individuals. FJR contributed \$300 to the RVA to support the effort.

On the afternoon of October 26, as city engineers and their consultants were preparing for the third open house of the Class Environmental Assessment for the Trail Road Leachate Management project, the Richmond - Glen Cairn sewage forcemain failed yet another time. Two FJR members returning to Richmond from the open house got a whiff of the sewage and we found the source the next morning. A crew was excavating in the ditch along the Eagleson Road, beside the Richmond Nursery and there was a grey trail of sewage in the ditch from Richmond Road, right down to the Jock River; it was evident that sewage had entered the river but it was not possible to speculate on the amount. A MOE technician was on site photographing and sampling. This rupture was the sixth rupture of the sewer in its relatively short 20 year lifetime. Further, three of the most recent ruptures occurred in the last three years and all three were within 75 m of the Jock River. An investigation by an engineering consultant of ruptures 4 and 5 indicated that the pipes had leaked for "weeks or months" before the pipes failed completely. The consultant recommended that the City repair the failed components and operate the pipeline carefully. The 6th failure blew out the side of a straight section of pipe, not at a joint. Was the pipe operated without sufficient care or has it reached the end of its useful life? It is important to note that this pipeline is the same pipeline that will be carrying the additional sewage from 450 homes in Munster once the Munster-Richmond sewage forcemain is commissioned some time in early or mid 2005. The already stressed Richmond-Glen Cairn forcemain will be required to handle 1/3 more sewage than it carried when it failed on 6 previous occasions.

About three weeks after the rupture, a City official sitting beside me at the City's Environmental Advisory Committee reported to the Committee that no sewage had entered the river and was caught off guard when I contradicted her. She had been briefed by Richard Hewitt, Director of Infrastructure Services. I e-mailed her a photograph of the ditch, taken on October 27th. In the e-mail, I also speculated that as much as 62,000L to 124,000L of sewage had flowed into the river. My speculation was based on an e-mail by Richard Hewitt reporting briefly on the process the City crew had used to divert the sewage flow to the Richmond lagoons.

The City has promised that a report on the October 26th rupture will be out soon (I suspect some time in February or March 2005).

At a town hall meeting on December 7 at the Richmond Legion (in the middle of a terrible freezing rainstorm) environmental lawyer, Rod Northey, met with about 100 Richmond residents to provide his opinions on why the Environmental Assessment (EA) conducted by the City was illegal. He gave four or five reasons, the most glaring being the problem statement in Phase 1 of the EA, which dealt only with an on-site problem and made no mention of an off-site problem or solution. The consequence was that many individuals (specifically, Richmond residents and residents along the pipe route) affected or potentially affected by the solution were not properly involved in subsequent phases of the "Class" EA

process. Another of his reasons related to the division of the project into parts, which is specifically mentioned as "piecemealing", a prohibited practice in the "Class" EA process. In the Munster case, the upgrading of the Richmond sewer pumping station was needed to handle the increased sewage levels from Munster and, therefore, a necessary part of the Munster project. Interestingly, neither the Munster EA nor the pumping station EA cross-referenced one another, despite their obvious interdependence. Mr. Northey was encouraged and amazed by the incredible community involvement, and suggested the next steps for Richmond residents.

Through 2004, I made several presentations to the City's Environmental Advisory Committee on the progress of the Munster issue and on the rupture of the Richmond - Glen Cairn wastewater forcemain. The Committee has been very supportive but as an advisory, not a lobby group, its effect has been limited.

Through 2004, the RVA executive continued to make very strong representations to City councillors to re-open the issue. Despite the support of some councillors, the deciding political factor appears to be the needed support of Richmond's councillor. Throughout the whole process, Janet Stavinga has strongly supported the pipe option, strongly supported the route through Richmond and strongly opposed a cheaper on-site option that would not pose a risk to Richmond's aquifer and the health of its residents.

At the end of 2004 and into 2005, the RVA is conducting a drive to fund Mr. Northey's lobbying efforts. In addition, the RVA is conducting an on-line petition at <http://www.ottawastart.com/story/1191.php> . FJR members are encouraged to have a look at the petition and to sign it.

Lastly, the RVA, with MPP Baird's assistance, is still pursuing a meeting with Minister Dombrowsky to present the RVA's position directly. Without the Minister's intervention, the pipeline is expected to be commissioned some time early or mid-2005.

Brian Finch

7.2.3 Trail Road Dump Leachate

Last year, I reported that the City had decided to conduct yet another - the third - environmental assessment (EA) on the Trail Road Dumpsite leachate problem after Stonebridge residents learned that the City intended to route a pipeline carrying the dumpsite leachate through the community. The Stonebridge Community Association and Monarch Construction had threatened legal action against the City. For years, groups in Barrhaven, FJR and the Citizen Review Committee for Waste Management of Ottawa-Carleton had fought against the concept of piping dumpsite leachate into the City's sewer collection system, regardless of the route. All favoured an on-site treatment option.

The new EA was started in early 2004; many residents were displeased with the City's choice of consultant, Connestoga Rovers and Associates, because of the company's prior involvement in the Munster EA. The public liaison committee (PLC) for the leachate EA was a particularly capable group of individuals (two professional engineers - one knowledgeable in waste treatment systems and the other knowledgeable in the EA process; a PhD chemist; a PhD working in biotechnology applications; several informed residents living not far from the dump; a councillor with a broad knowledge of the history of the leachate issue; and several other intelligent, well-grounded individuals). Several Richmond residents and I monitored the PLC meetings because we knew that City engineering staff favoured a pipe solution and we were concerned there might be a repeat of the Munster issue.

The problem at the Trail Road Dumpsite was three-fold. Initially there were only two problems: the contaminated groundwater moving north from the now-closed, unlined Nepean dumpsite; and the leachate contained in the current, lined dumpsite. The leachate was being trucked to the City's sewage treatment site (ROPEC) in the City's east end. In May 2004, the City learned of a different kind of groundwater contamination moving south from the old Nepean dumpsite. This groundwater was contaminated with volatile organic compounds (VOC), specifically chlorinated hydrocarbons. The City engineers wanted to deal with the VOC contaminated groundwater under a modification of the existing operating license for the dump. This would have been a separate process outside the EA, but MOE ordered the City to include it in the ongoing leachate EA. Concurrently, the City found that the original contaminated groundwater had "self-remediated" to the point that it was no longer of environmental concern. Thus, the EA was back to two problems.

About 16 possible solutions (depending on how they were counted) were boiled down to 8 alternatives involving single options or mixes of options, namely: trucking; on-site treatment of leachate with discharge to Jock River; on-site treatment of contaminated groundwater with discharge to ground or surface water; piping of leachate; and piping of contaminated groundwater.

After the first few PLC meetings it became apparent that the PLC member representing the City's Environmental Advisory Committee (EAC) was dissatisfied with the conduct of the EA and was not prepared to continue to sit on the PLC. I approached the president of EAC to emphasize the importance of EAC's presence on the PLC and, based on my familiarity with the PLC, he asked me to sit in as the EAC representative. The PLC and City accepted the replacement.

Most members of the PLC felt that the City engineers involved in the study were biased towards a pipe solution and many were displeased with the engineers' responses to questions. The consultant used the same evaluation matrix that was so heavily criticized by residents and the OMB in the Munster issue. Similar concerns were expressed:

- In the lifecycle costing of the on-site alternative, all of the possible on-site treatment methodologies (e.g., constructed wet land, mechanical plant such as activated sludge or rotating biological contactor) were lumped together and the most expensive capital and operating costs were chosen to be representative of the on-site option. The projected annual operating cost of on-site was based on an activated sludge process, one of the most energy intensive techniques in current use today. By comparison, a system based on rotating biological contactors (RBC) operates on a quarter of the power, with a cost saving over the 60 year lifecycle of \$5M. This factor alone obliterates the lifecycle cost advantage of pipeline over a RBC-based on-site system.
- The lifecycle costing over 60 years for the treatment of the contaminated groundwater ignored the fact that the need for treatment would disappear in 10-20 years. Correction of the figures favours the on-site option.
- The City's consultant recommended a pipeline option because it came out numerically higher than the on-site option in the matrix (9.34 vs 8.99) but the representation of the results with 3 figures of accuracy is logically and scientifically inappropriate. Considering the statistical aspects of the public consultation process and the subjective nature of many of the evaluated criteria, the final numerical values are identical. Both are 9 out of 10.
- The City's engineers in their report to Council recommended pipe. When questioned, they admitted that the preference was based on price alone and that on-site was acceptable. When making the recommendation, the engineers failed to consider safety concerns over possible pipe ruptures. Despite being asked by the public and the PLC, they had specifically avoided doing a risk analysis. They also avoided environmental considerations such as the fact that a tertiary treatment, on-site plant would remove a significantly greater proportion of the leachate pollutants than would the secondary treatment at ROPEC. To consider just one of the main pollutants, phosphorous (P), ROPEC would discharge 30 times more P to the environment than would an on-site facility treating the same amount of leachate. The other leachate components that are partially or not treated by ROPEC (such as many heavy metals) would end up in the sludge and distributed on fields, or would be discharged to the Ottawa River. Note that some downstream communities (e.g., Montreal) use the Ottawa River water for their drinking water.
- ROPEC is a sewage treatment plant not designed to treat leachate. An on-site plant would be purpose-built to treat leachate.

My arguments and points on the evaluation and the PLC could go on for several pages but are too complex and detailed for a summary. The PLC involvement ended with the public open house on October 26, 2004, the same day as the rupture in the Richmond - Glen Cairn sewer forcemain pipeline. The rupture highlighted all of the safety concerns for pressurized pipes that opponents had harped on for years. In November, prior to the issue going to the Planning and Environmental Services Committee of Council, I made a presentation to EAC to report on the leachate issue and on the forcemain rupture. EAC passed a strong motion recommending that Council vote for an on-site

solution. Also in November, I wrote a strong letter to councillors outlining FJR's opposition to pipe and support for on-site.

Planning and Environmental Services Committee voted unanimously in favour of on-site. Full Council voted for the on-site solution with only two councillors opposed, one of whom was no surprise -- Janet Stavinga. However, were it not for a combination of factors, Council could very well have gone with the pipeline option since they often rely heavily on staff reports on technical issues. The contributing factors for Council's endorsement of on-site treatment were: strong representation and support from Councillor Jan Harder, the local representative on Council (thanks Jan); a strong, informed PLC; and a properly involved community. Had Council voted for pipe, it would have initiated yet another long cycle of appeals and court cases, thereby delaying a solution for a few more years.

The City now has to get on with the task of building a world class leachate treatment plant.

Brian Finch

7.2.4 Ashton Station Wetland

The issue relates to an application for a new nine hole golf course at the intersection of Ashton Station Road and Highway 7, in the former Township of Goulbourn. The property is part of the Jock River watershed. The wetland on the property is known as the Ashton Station Wetland and the water from the wetland flows into the Jock River not far from Ashton. The wetland was never evaluated or classified by MNR, because the owner prevented MNR from accessing the property in 1994.

The issue was brought our attention by Ken McRae, our former Director for Water Conservation and Usage. His and our concern about the property is that a golf course requires water so the approval for a golf course brings with it water taking issues. Removal of water from the wetland or from shallow subsurface water sources would have a significant, negative impact on the wetland and on its contribution to the Jock River. Ken McRae's research indicated that the wetland was hydraulically connected to (and therefore "complexed" with) the Mannion Corners Long Swamp Wetland, a large, provincially significant wetland, immediately to the east. Note that complexing the two wetlands would have extended the provincially significant status to the Ashton Station Wetland and would have prevented the rezoning application. The City approved the application in spite of Ken's protests. Ken appealed the decision to the OMB but, in September, 2004, the OMB rejected the appeal at the pre-hearing stage even though Ken had hired a consultant to prove the "complexed" status of the wetland. The OMB cited the lack of scientific evidence to support Ken's opinion on the wetland. (Note: The OMB makes a big deal about the accessibility of the OMB process to the common folk and about the value of the common person's observations. However, in several recent OMB decisions the OMB has proven otherwise when it disregarded entirely the creditable evidence of experienced witnesses lacking only professional accreditation.)

The application related to only part of the Ashton Station Wetland, so Ken still retained the consultant to prove the "complexed" status of the wetland before even more development can be

approved for the remaining part of the wetland. In the end Ken will have spent a fair amount of his own money (over \$1,000) so we took the \$250 we had approved for the OMB and turned it over to Ken to assist in paying for the additional study. Ken will provide a copy of the study some time in 2005.

Brian Finch

7.2.5 Applications for Permits to Take Water/Wetlands Issues

Ken McRae, our former Director for Water Conservation and Usage, keeps us informed of water taking and other wetland issues even though Ken is no longer a FJR member. The following are summaries abstracted from some of his communications.

Proposal to change drainage part of the site plan for the Henderson Quarry.

The new quarry is owned and operated by Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd., and is located in the former Township of Goulbourn, now part of the new City of Ottawa.

A large part of the Provincially Significant Huntley Wetlands Complex is adjacent to the Henderson Quarry's westerly side, between Highway 7, on the north, and the Trans Canada Trail, on the south. There is a divide in this part of the wetland, which causes the northerly part of it to drain into the Carp River Watershed, while the larger southerly part drains into the Jock River Watershed.

The proposed change would divert the presently approved southerly quarry dewatering discharge from going directly into the wetland, roughly halfway between Highway 7 and the Trans Canada Trail, to going directly south within the quarry site to the ditch along the Trans Canada Trail, then westerly into the Jinkinson Municipal Drain. This would result in very little or none of the water being pumped back into the wetland. This would result in this part of the wetland being drained, dried out, and destroyed.

A wellhead protection study by RVCA identified the Huntley Wetlands Complex as the surface water recharge area for Munster's communal well, a communal well in Richmond and other wells.

Both Ken and FJR dropped their objections at an earlier OMB pre-hearing to the issuance of a quarry license for this quarry after 1. the original drainage layout part of the site plan was amended to its present configuration, and 2. conditions added to the license so as to protect the wetland. This proposed site plan amendment would reverse the result of the work Ken and FJR put into getting the present site plan and conditions.

Country Club Village and Canadian Golf & Country Club Service Road Environmental Assessment Study

Ken is a public representative on the Public Advisory Committee (PAC) on the City of Ottawa's and Ministry of Transportation's Country Club Village (CCV) and Canadian Golf & Country Club (CG&CC)

Service Road Environmental Assessment (EA) Study. Ken represented the Friends of the Jock River on that committee while he was still a FJR member and we asked him to stay on as our representative.

The main issue is regarding the Provincially Significant Huntley Wetlands Complex. The golf club and a number of local residents are urging the committee to put a service road through the wetland when Highway 7 is expanded from 2 to 4 lanes, to provide them with insignificantly shorter driving distances and driving times. Ken pointed out that this wetland is already going to be very negatively impacted by the expansion of Highway 7 through the wetland. Adding a service road through the wetland as well would increase the negative impact on the wetland.

Ken felt that the representation on the PAC was seriously flawed as the Country Club Village Community Association and the Northwest Goulbourn Community Association, combined, accounted for 6 of the 11 members on the PAC. He also had concerns with a private company's proposed donation of rock for one particular alternative.

The report for the study on June 4, 2004, recommended that no additional service road be built, besides the eastward extension of Crawford Road. This report was scheduled to be considered by the City of Ottawa Transportation Committee on September 15th, 2004; however, the study report was withdrawn for further study. Apparently there is new information regarding impacts of the decision on quarry operations. Ken is highly suspicious of the reasons for the withdrawal as the quarry operators had good access to the study.

Permit To Take Water Application (PTTW): Cedarhill Golf & Country Club.

The application appeared on the EBR shortly after stories in the local news media about alleged illegal water taking on the part of the club. The "Proposal" indicates that the golf club wants to take water from both the Miron Quarry and a beaver pond. The Miron Quarry will be used to maintain a low water level limit in the Beaver pond, which will be used to irrigate the golf course. On face value, it appears that the golf club has reached some sort of water use agreement with the new owner of that quarry.

"Decision" posting for a PTTW for Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd.'s Beagle Club Quarry

The quarry is located on the northeast side of the junction of Jinkinson Road and Fernbank Road. The company is now legally permitted to take and discharge off site up to 17,729,280 litres of water per day from this quarry excavation.

This is the quarry from which Thomas Cavanagh Construction Ltd. illegally excavated a drainage ditch for the dewatering discharge from the quarry through other private properties (without permission), through a wetland, and altered a watercourse, without any approvals. Charges were laid under the Federal Fisheries Act, the Ontario Aggregate Resources Act and the Conservation Authorities Act. Cavanagh was found guilty in Provincial Offences Court and fined a total of \$60,000 under those acts. Cavanagh appealed and the appeal was resolved by agreement on January 5, 2004, in Superior Court.

The end result is that the guilty findings are upheld and the overall amount of fines upheld, but the \$40,000 fine under the Aggregate Resources Act is reduced to \$10,000 and the fine under the Fisheries Act is increased from \$15,000 to \$45,000. The fine under the Conservation Authorities Act remains at \$5,000. Observers are puzzled.

Cavanagh was not ordered by the courts to return the altered landscape back to its former condition through appropriate rehabilitation. The company has obtained the drainage ditch illegally, which it most likely would not have been able to get legally. The penalty of the \$60,000 in fines is no inducement to this company, or any other to treat the natural environment with respect.

Abstracted and edited from Ken McRae's many communications by
Brian Finch

7.2.6 Richmond Conservation Area Membership, Management and Sewage Storage Issues

Introduction

For the second consecutive year, the FJR has been unable to undertake ecological monitoring projects or restoration and enhancement projects within the RCA. Monitoring and enhancement projects initiated by the FJR in 2002 have not been continued by the RCA Management Team (RCAMT). Our 2004 activities related to lobbying efforts directed towards the Ministry of the Environment (MOE) and the City of Ottawa. As in 2003, during 2004 the MOE was asked to ensure that commitments made during the Class Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade, which were 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. The City was also 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.

In its 2003 annual report, the FJR expressed optimism that Minister Leona Dombrowsky's office would assist in bringing about a resolution to issues involving the MOE. It also asserted that 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 was some promise that the situation will improve with the City of Ottawa. Whether such hopeful predictions were warranted remains undecided as of January 2005.

Finally, the FJR stated in its 2003 annual report: "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." Undeniably the most significant issue concerning the RCA that emerged in 2004 is the relationship between the two Class EA's, which led

respectively to the forcemain ruptures, and to the construction of the Munster to Richmond forcemain. Legal counsel retained by the Richmond Village Association (RVA) has made a compelling case based on what the FJR alleged to Minister Dombrowsky's staff early in the year, *i.e.*, that the Richmond Pumping Station Upgrade Class EA and the Munster Sewage Treatment Facility Expansion/Upgrade Class EA were piecemealed. According to environmental lawyer, Mr. Rod Northey, the two projects are in fact one project, and by pursuing them as unrelated undertakings, the City of Ottawa contravened the EA Act.

The RCA Management Plan and City of Ottawa Open House

The FJR received a copy of the RCAMT's Draft Version 1.12 of the RCAMP in late 2003. It provided detailed comments on this document to Ms. Cynthia Levesque at the City of Ottawa's 4 February 2004 open house on the RCAMP. The main criticisms elaborated upon in the FJR's written comments are as follows:

- (i) The draft clearly has no basis in any biological field investigations that have taken place since the 1997 RCAMP was completed, or that should have taken place for the purpose of revising the RCAMP.
- (ii) The draft makes almost no use of ecological management concepts, besides that imported from the 1997 RCAMP. It appears to have been written without any knowledge of the ecological management literature, including both peer reviewed publications and the "grey literature" embodied in government agency documents. (The draft in fact contains no footnotes, endnotes or bibliography.) The 1997 RCAMP could have been improved upon in its use of ecological concepts; it being strongest in this regard in its site-specific monitoring prescriptions. However, this part of the 1997 RCAMP is not included in Draft Version 1.12. Statements made in the draft that adduce the concept of a habitat linkage from landscape ecology might count against this criticism, but the statements are made without support and apparently without an understanding of the kind of support required to confirm them.
- (iii) The draft makes no reference to the Class EA documents pertaining to the use of the Richmond Lagoons for the storage of either water or sewage. Furthermore, it contradicts those documents on such important points as water management in Cell C of the Richmond Lagoons.
- (iv) The draft gives a selective and inaccurate history of the RCA. In consequence, the draft fails to document the outstanding commitments made by the City of Ottawa, during the Class EA for the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade, commitments that were supposed to mitigate against impacts on the RCA resulting from the use of Cell C to store sewage. Particular inaccuracies, and selective omissions also have the effect of further alienating a number of individuals and organizations whose past involvement with the RCA has been "written out" of the history of the conservation area.
- (v) In addition to the above substantive problems, the lack of references in Draft Version 1.12 places the City of Ottawa in contravention of the Canadian Copyright Act for infringing on the moral rights, as defined in the act, of the authors of the 1997 RCAMP. This issue has been raised with the former RCAMT, which responded that it could not acknowledge the authors of the 1997 RCAMP because the plan is not the kind of document that can be copyrighted. However, the former RCAMT has claimed copyrights on Draft Version 1.12.

The FJR's submission concluded with the following:

The last two years could have seen the composition of an improved and updated plan. There is no doubt that the Friends of the Jock River, the Richmond Village Association and the Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club could have achieved this end had the nominees of those organizations been appointed to the RCAMT. The City of Ottawa chose instead not to include those organizations, and the individuals that would have made the task of revising the RCAMP a success. It is recommended that the Development Services Department rectify this situation.

As a result of the City of Ottawa's 4 February open house, Ms. Levesque received a large number of submissions from members of the FJR and the Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club (OFNC), and from Richmond residents. The following summarize comments additional to our comments above:

- (i) Draft Version 1.12 is obviously incomplete and in need of substantial revision. It is therefore unclear why the City has incurred the cost of an open house at this time.
- (ii) Compared with the 1997 RCA Management Plan, there is almost nothing in Draft Version 1.12 about attracting birds, but a lot about social development and communications strategies to convince the public that a "prime" birding area exists in Richmond. The Richmond Lagoons used to be the most popular birding destination in Ottawa-Carleton, without the benefit of a communications strategy. The management plan for the RCA should be focussed more on ecology than on communications.
- (iii) Draft Version 1.12 makes no reference to the publicly available Class EA documents relating to the use of the Richmond Lagoons for the storage of water and municipal sewage. Furthermore, it contradicts those documents on a number of important points.

Since completion of the Class EA for the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade, the City of Ottawa has not respected commitments made during public consultations under the Class EA. Past progress towards an agreement for the combined use of the Richmond Lagoons as a sewage storage facility and conservation lands has been reversed with the City appointing RCAMT. It is time that the City of Ottawa initiate regular consultation with those individuals and organizations that are knowledgeable about what occurred during the Class EA, that have the expertise to write a proper management plan and advise on its implementation, and that represent the interests of Richmond. This includes the Richmond Village Association, the Friends of the Jock River and the Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club. It is time that the City give Richmond residents clear and complete answers regarding its intentions to respect commitments made during the Class EA, and the impact of the planned Munster pipeline on Richmond's conservation area.

At the 4 February open house, further concerns were raised by Richmond residents, living adjacent to the RCA, about the failure of the RCAMT to respect its commitments to consult with them on issues related to access points for the conservation area.

Meeting and Correspondence with City of Ottawa Staff

As a result of so many concerns expressed at the open house, Ms. Levesque agreed to meet with representatives of the FJR, the RVA and the OFNC to try to resolve outstanding problems. This meeting did not take place until 24 June 2004. The minutes of the meeting are as follows:

Meeting Date: Thursday 24 June 2004, 7pm

Meeting Location: Eastern Ontario Biodiversity Museum, 215 Sanders St. Kemptville, ON

Attendance: Cynthia Levesque (City of Ottawa, Environmental Management Planning & Growth Management Department), Harvey Snyder (Richmond Village Association), Brian Finch (FJR), Eric Snyder (FJR), Niel Barrington (FJR), Paul Koch (Ottawa Environmental Advisory Committee), Sandy Garland (Ottawa Greenspace & Forests Advisory Committee), Doug Arnold (Richmond resident)

Regrets: Susan Springthorpe (Ottawa Environmental Advisory Committee), Eve Ticknor (Ottawa Field-Naturalists' Club, Birds Committee)

1. Introductions

2. Transition from RCA Management Team to RCA Departmental Consultative Group: Overview

Cynthia explained the rationale given in the 12 November 2004 Report to Council, containing Council governance review recommendations relating to advisory committees. She recounted the report's recommendation that the RCA Management Team be restructured as the RCA Departmental Consultative Group. Eric raised the fact that, following adoption of the governance review recommendations, Cynthia had decided to allow the membership of the RCA Management Team to continue on as the RCA Consultative Group until May 2004, when most members' original appointments expired. He suggested that at the present time, Cynthia could recognize all interested parties as RCA Consultative Group members. Cynthia expressed reservations about taking this action because, she claimed, provisions had been made to extend the RCA Management Team appointments until the end of the year. Eric stated that there was no such provision in the 12 November Report to Council, and asked how Council appointments could be extended for a consultative group, the membership of which is not appointed by Council. Cynthia agreed to find documentation of the provision to extend the appointments.

2.1 Action: Cynthia will provide documentation of the decision to extend appointments of the RCA Management Team as RCA Consultative Group members. Deadline: 8 July.

3. Terms of Reference for RCA Departmental Consultative Group

Cynthia distributed draft terms of reference written by the Environmental Management Branch, the Secretariat Services Branch and the RCA Consultative Group. The terms of reference contained a statement of the consultative group's mandate and responsibilities, and a description of its organizational structure, membership criteria, selection criteria, terms of appointment and its relationship to the Environmental Management Branch. A code of conduct

was appended. There was a lengthy discussion on the proposed responsibilities, organizational structure, membership criteria and selection criteria.

The following are some of the main points raised: Paul, Doug and Brian stated that the responsibilities were not realistic for a consultative group. Harvey criticized the proposed organizational structure, selection criteria and terms of appointment as being inconsistent with the concept of a consultative group as opposed to that of an advisory committee. Doug, Paul, Brian and Harvey suggested that membership criteria have to be revised to ensure representation from the community of Richmond and expertise from local organizations with mandates consistent with that of the consultative group. Harvey, Eric and Doug maintained that adopting terms of appointment is unnecessary at the present time. Eric made the case that the proposed selection criteria are unnecessary, and suggested that the implementation of a similar selection process, used in the past, would make the adoption of the proposed process suspect to many with an interest in the RCA.

In view of the above, Paul suggested that Harvey write a revised draft terms of reference for interested organizations and individuals to review. Cynthia agreed that the process of drafting terms of reference be pursued in this way.

3.1 Action: Harvey will draft terms of reference for the RCA Consultative Group and distribute the draft to interested parties. Deadline: 30 July.

4. Revising the RCA Management Plan

Cynthia stated that no progress has been made on the RCAMP since the open house on 4 February in Richmond. She suggested that a consultant will be hired to write the plan with the RCA Consultative Group and the Environmental Management Branch.

Niel and Brian maintained that the Environmental Management Branch, or its consultant, should review the 1997 RCAMP and use it as a starting point for an updated plan. Eric agreed that this would be the most effective way to proceed, with the main objective being to revise parts of the plan as required by municipal amalgamation and the Richmond Pumping Station and Force Main Class EA. Additional revisions could be made based on updated data from field investigations, standardized classifications of ecological units and restoration/monitoring plans done by the Friends of the Jock River in 2001.

Cynthia stated that this should be done after the terms of reference are completed. The projected timeframe for hiring a consultant is late fall.

4.1 Action: Eric will try to locate an electronic copy of the 1997 RCAMP and email it to Cynthia. Deadline: 30 July.

5. - 6. Cell C: Commitments made during the Class EA, the Need to Amend the Current C of A & Managing Water Levels in Cell C

Eric explained what occurred during the Richmond Pumping Station and Force Main Class EA, the subsequent exclusion of stakeholders from the RCAMT and the resulting impacts on management options for the RCA. He maintained that there is nothing in the amended C of A for the Richmond Pumping Station, and supporting documents, that prevents the City from managing sewage in Cell C in a manner that could benefit the RCA. However, he explained that to fully realize potential benefits to the RCA, the City would have to approach the MOE to have the C of A for the Richmond Pumping Station re-amended. He suggested that the MOE Ottawa District Office might demonstrate a greater willingness to accommodate the requirements for managing the RCA if approached to do so by the Environmental Management Branch rather than non-government organizations.

Eric also discussed water levels in Cell C, noting that the current C of A refers to the Richmond Pumping Station and Force Main Study, which allows 0.8m in the cell given Richmond's 1999 population size.

In view of the above, Paul stated that there is a need to revisit the question of commitments made during the Class EA and what can be done at present to respect those commitments. Cynthia agreed.

5-6.1 Action: Eric will email to Cynthia a list of commitments made during Richmond Pumping Station and Force Main Class EA for the purpose of mitigating impacts on the RCA resulting from sewage storage in Cell C. Deadline: 8 July.

5-6.2 Action: Cynthia will review the list of commitments made during Richmond Pumping Station and Force Main Class EA and draft an action plan to address them. A draft action plan will be distributed to interested parties. Deadline: July 30.

7. Cells A & B: Decommissioning & Upgrading for Habitat Management

Eric emphasized the need to replace the lost \$9,000.00 for upgrading the outlet to Cells A & B. Otherwise, the RCAMP prescriptions for these cells cannot be implemented.

8. Adjournment

Action items 4.1 and 5-6.1 were completed by 27 June 2004. Action item 3.1 was completed by 19 July with the submission of draft terms of reference to Ms. Levesque. This draft had been reviewed and approved by Mr. Paul Koch and by the boards of the RVA and the FJR. Action items 2.1 and 5-6.2, to be completed by Ms. Levesque, have not been completed.

Ms. Levesque was e-mailed by the FJR on 7 August and 9 September asking her to provide an update on her progress toward completing the action items. She was telephoned numerous times by the RVA with the same request. She did not respond to these email and voicemail messages. On 4 November 2004, I e-mailed Mr. Koch, asking for the intervention of the Ottawa Environmental Advisory Committee with Cynthia Levesque, asking for answers from Cynthia to the following questions:

1. Is the old RCA Management Team still holding meetings? If so, are these public meetings that all interested individuals and organizations can attend? How do such organizations and individuals learn of the date, time and location of such meetings?

2. Does the Environmental Management Branch of the Planning and Development Department have a response to the draft terms of reference sent to Cynthia in July, and has there been any progress on the following action items arising from the meeting on 24 June:

(a) "Action: Cynthia will provide documentation of the decision to extend appointments of the RCA Management Team as RCA Consultative Group members."

(b) "Action: Cynthia will review the list of commitments made during the Richmond Pumping Station and Force Main Class EA and draft an action plan to address them. A draft action plan will be distributed to interested parties."?

3. Does the Environmental Management Branch still intend to hire a consultant to revise the RCA Management Plan, and if so, when will a request for proposals is to be released?

4. Since the sewage spill and bypass to Cell C of the Richmond Lagoons on 26 October, observers have reported algae blooms in Cell B, on the side adjacent to Cell C. Is the Environmental Management Branch monitoring the impacts of the ongoing storage of sewage in Cell C and of the recent bypass? Will it investigate the cause of the algae blooms in Cell B?

5. It has also been reported that the access to the outlet for Cells B and C has been cemented over. Is the Environmental Management Branch aware of this? If so, why was it done and why were interested parties not informed of this undertaking, which makes water regulation in Cell B impossible?

Mr. Koch subsequently spoke to Ms. Levesque, however, she again failed to follow up by contacting the FJR and RVA. He was informed of this on 11 December and continued his efforts to find answers from the Environmental Management Branch in January 2005. On 8 January 2005, he wrote that Ms. Levesque had informed him that she feels she has an appropriate strategy for handling the RCA situation at the community level. The FJR responded by emailing Ms. Levesque for more information. To date this email has gone without acknowledgement.

Correspondence and Meetings with the Minister of the Environment's Office

In its 2003 annual report, the FJR stated the following concerning the outcome of the 27 June, 2003, telephone conference call with the MOE and the City of Ottawa:

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.

Lobbying in late 2004 was focused on MOE staff person, Mr. Barry Burns, surface water evaluator at the Kingston regional office of the ministry. However, in response to its 10 December 2003 letter to Mr. Burns, the FJR received correspondence from the office of the Minister of the Environment on 8 January 2004. The FJR had written to Mr. Burns:

[Mr. Barry Burns wrote]: "The proposed use of Cell C as both a sewage works and wildlife management project are conflicting and incompatible land uses. . . . Accordingly, the City was advised by the Ministry that the proposed use of this facility as both a sewage works and a conservation area would not be permitted. This remains the Ministry's position."

Plans to use Cell C of the Richmond lagoons for the combined purposes of managed wildlife habitat and temporary emergency sewage storage have been developed between the proponent of the 1999 Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade and stakeholders, identified during the Municipal Class EA for the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade, since 30 March 1999. The Ministry was informed of these plans on more than one occasion, as required by the Municipal Class EA Planning and Design Process under which the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade was undertaken. At no time did the Ministry raise objections to the planned combined use of Cell C. On the contrary, during the Class EA process, the Ministry has advised the proponent and stakeholders on how the use of a lagoon cell for both temporary sewage storage and managed wildlife habitat might be implemented. Since the filing of the Notice of Completion for the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain upgrade Environmental Study Report, neither the Ministry nor the proponent has supplied stakeholders with the results of additional studies from which it can be concluded that commitments and decisions made during Phases 1 through 4 of the Class EA cannot be implemented during Phase 5. For example, no such studies were enclosed with your 30 October correspondence. In view of this, the Friends of the Jock River must again ask that you please explain the basis of the Ministry's advice that the proposed use of Cell C as both a sewage works and a conservation area would not be permitted.

The answer received from the Minister of the Environment, Ms. Leona Dombrowsky, was perplexing. She stated, "The City of Ottawa has stated that there has been no significant modification to the proposal and, therefore, no revisions or addendum [sic] are required." This was perplexing because the FJR had never suggested that a revision of Class EA, or an addendum to the study report, was

needed. Rather, our organization has merely asked that recommendations already made as part of the Class EA be followed.

Subsequent telephone calls to the minister's office led to a meeting, in Toronto, with the minister's legislative assistant and one of her policy advisors, respectively, Ms. Kelly Synnott and Ms. Lois Corbett. This meeting took place on 12 March. Both the Richmond Pumping Station Upgrade Class EA and the Munster Sewage Treatment System Expansion/Upgrade Class EA were discussed. With respect to the former, the FJR outlined commitments made during the Class EA, reviewed its 15 December 2003 letter to Mr. Burns and Minister Dombrowsky's 8 January 2004 response, and proposed ways to resolve the outstanding problems. Ms. Corbett recommended that the FJR send a letter to Mr. Steve Burns, supervisor of the Ottawa District MOE office, stating what should be included in the conditions of the amended C of A for the Richmond pumping station. Once the C of A was issued, if it did not conform to the recommendations of the study report for the Class EA, the FJR was to make a complaint to the minister's office.

A letter was sent to Mr. Steve Burns by the end of March, and the minister's office was apprised of this. When the C of A was released, and failed to satisfy commitments made to stakeholders during the Class EA, a complaint was made to the minister's office. Since that time, several emails have been sent to Ms. Corbett and another meeting took place, on 11 June, in Richmond. However, no decisive action by the minister's office has been taken to date.

The FJR received a letter from the MOE dated 16 November 2004, assuring our organization that the ministry is carrying out a detailed investigation of the problems with the Richmond Pumping Station Class EA and the related Munster Treatment System Expansion/Upgrade Class EA. In January 2005, assurances were received from the minister's office, to the effect that answers would soon be forthcoming.

Conclusions

The City of Ottawa's Environmental Management Branch and the office of the Minister of the Environment are taking an inordinately long time to resolve what should be a straightforward matter. The FJR has offered constructive solutions, but so far nothing has been done to make them a reality. On 10 September 2004, Birchall Northey, the legal firm retained by the Richmond Village Association, released a memorandum concluding that the Richmond Pumping Station and Forcemain Upgrade Class EA and the Munster Treatment System Expansion/Upgrade Class EA had been piecemealed. This is a contravention of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, and may provide the impetus for a more rapid resolution of outstanding problems.

Eric Snyder

7.2.7 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 the tributaries: 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 was 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, I applied for membership on the PAC. While the City did not receive enough volunteers to constitute a PAC, the volunteers were invited to participate and monitor the activities of the planning group.

The two sub-watershed studies are progressing but the level of involvement by the volunteer group has been small. The major event in 2004 (mid-May) was a tour of both study regions by the technical advisory group and the volunteer "advisory" group.

The first phase of the Jock Reach 2/Mud Creek Subwatershed Study is expected to be complete by early 2005. Draft terms of reference were prepared in November for Environmental Management Plans for the Villages of Richmond and Manotick. Due to development pressures in the 2 villages, the City was anxious to get this phase of work started. The watershed study consultant likely has already been hired and the work under way by January 2005.

Brian Finch

7.2.8 Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study

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

The study is mandated by the new Official Plan for the City of Ottawa to survey 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 results will then be used by the City in future planning issues (e.g., bylaws, zoning, environmental protection, recreation, transportation). The field work, ratings and other technical work were conducted by contractors Dan Brunton and Ernie Muncaster. The PAC is comprised of a diverse range of governmental (municipal, provincial and federal), environmental and academic groups, and professional associations. The PAC met several times to assist the City and contractors in the identification of suitable sites and to advise on the conduct of the study. Early on, FJR identified or suggested expansion of several urban sites of value in areas along the lower Jock (not all were evaluated or selected for inclusion in the study because of a lack of time).

In a preliminary, mid-2004 report to the PAC, Dan Brunton indicated a higher than anticipated incidence of invasive species (e.g., buckthorne) in most sites.

Some of the following data were abstracted verbatim or summarized from a draft January 2005 report by the two contractors.

The study identified 187 natural areas covering in total approximately 2,660 hectares of the City's urban area, or 7.7 percent of total land surface area within the urban boundary (not including significant water bodies). A total of 114 sites representing about 1,497 hectares were evaluated representing four percent of the urban area. These 114 sites were assessed through the review of existing information and field visits and were rated against 9 evaluation criteria established to rate the ecological value of urban natural areas, namely: connectivity, disturbance, habitat maturity, natural communities, regeneration, representative flora, significant flora and fauna, size and shape, and wildlife habitat. The evaluation criteria were applied to each of these sites resulting in an assignment overall environmental rating of low, moderate or high.

A total of seventy-three (73) sites were not evaluated either because access to the sites was not granted by the landowner (no response or refusal on 33 sites) or because of time limitations imposed by the field season requirements (40 sites). With respect to the former, where previous studies existed, access to sites was not always necessary to conduct an assessment and such sites were considered amongst the group of "evaluated sites".

The table below from the draft report summarizes the results.

Summary of Overall Natural Area Ratings by Urban Sub-Area.								
Percent is the percent of sites evaluated to date								
Sub-Area within City of Ottawa's Urban Area	Sites High Overall		Sites Moderate Overall		Sites Low Overall		Total Sites Evaluated to Date	Sites to be Evaluated
	No.	Percent †	No.	Percent †	No.	Percent †		
West	6	26	10	44	7	30	23	12
Central	16	22	24	33	32	45	72	24
South	3	38	3	38	2	25	8	24
East	4	36	4	36	3	28	11	13
Totals	29	25	41	36	44	39	114	73

The study also singled out a few ecological gems for special mention; one of note in the Jock watershed is the Heart's Desire Forest along the lower Jock River, between the community of Heart's Desire and old Highway 16.

Another major deliverable from the study was an expansion and update to the 1998 "Significant Vascular Plants list" published by the former Region of Ottawa-Carleton. This database is the best available assessment tool for determining floristic rarity in the City of Ottawa, including both urban and rural areas. The update contains several hundred changes, such as new occurrence records, nomenclatural changes and locality clarifications, resulting from fieldwork undertaken in this and other field investigations since 1998. This updated plant list by Daniel Brunton has the additional benefit of including all vascular plants species, not just rare native species.

One minor point: at first glance, one might get the impression that the study is comprehensive. It is a voluminous and very good study that, to my knowledge, it deals with all of the major or larger sites and a substantial number of smaller sites. But there are still some lesser, overlooked sites of interest that could be the focus of a smaller follow-up study.

Brian Finch

7.2.9 South Nepean Collector Sanitary Sewer

I have been monitoring the open houses through the environmental assessment of the South Nepean Collector Sanitary Sewer. The first phase of the sewer will serve Stonebridge, new developments west of Heart's Desire, and, eventually, the new Barrhaven town centre. The route will be from the intersection of old Highway 16 (Prince of Wales Drive) and Woodroffe, under the Heart's Desire Forest to the weir on the Jock River (tunnel), across the Jock River (ditch/coffer dam), through the Stonebridge golf course (ditch), along the side of the Levesque sports fields (ditch), through the old fields/re-growth area to west of soccer fields (ditch), under the Jock River (ditch/coffer dam) to the intersection of Jockvale and Bren-Maur. The sewer is a gravity sewer with a siphon structure under the Jock River crossing at the weir.

When Monarch Construction first placed the Stonebridge forcemain sewer pipe under the Jock River at the Heart's Desire weir about 5-6 years ago I suggested at the planning stage that the siphon component of the South Nepean Collector Sanitary Sewer be installed at the same time, rather than digging up the crossing under the Jock River twice. At the time, it would have increased the cost of the forcemain marginally but would have saved money over the longer term and prevented further disruption of the river. Unfortunately, my proposal went nowhere so the river bottom near the weir will get torn up again.

Part of the project involved a hydrogeological study of the route and the portion of Heart's Desire nearest the pipe route.

One of the consultants Corush, Sunderland, Wright Ltd., the landscape architectural firm hired for the project, has been involved in projects in the immediate area for some time and it appreciates the value of natural spaces to the river and to the Heart's Desire and Stonebridge communities. In addition, the firm was well aware of the location of and our concern for the FJR tree plant locations on both sides of the river just downstream of the Jockvale Bridge. I had seen both the original

proposed and the final pipe route and it was evident that the firm played a major role in "tweaking" the route of the pipeline through the area. By doing so, it made significant reductions in the damage to natural areas on the south side of the Jock River near the weir and the area near our previous tree plants. The final route skirts most of the tree plant area and VERY few of our planted trees will be affected. I was assured early on that affected areas would be re-naturalized upon completion of the construction of the pipe.

My personal thanks to Jerry Corush.

Brian Finch

7.2.10 Alternative Sewage Treatment Solutions for Outlying Communities

A tertiary sewage wastewater treatment plant was recently commissioned in the fall to service a small, new development of about 77 homes in Manotick. The treatment plant has since undergone tests and was fully approved by MOE mid-January, 2005. This was the identical plant that had been considered as an on-site treatment option in Munster, except that the Munster situation would have required three of the same modules used in Manotick.

The Seprotech wastewater plant has successfully achieved a MOE-mandated discharge requirement to the Rideau River of 0.03mg/L of phosphorous. It is of note that this is the first time that the Ontario MOE has issued a permit for sewage phosphorous discharge as low and as stringent as 0.03mg/L. During the last three months, the plant was not only meeting MOE's requirements, it bettered them by a considerable margin. Discharge levels are consistently approaching 0.01mg/L of phosphorous. The discharge is clear, colourless, odourless and of swimming pool quality.

The efficacy of the process is now proven and should be considered the new baseline for tertiary sewage treatment in Canada. The City should be showing off this new plant, built by an Ottawa company, with pride to all of Ontario and the rest of Canada.

The City of Ottawa must also appreciate that the technology has incredible potential within the City, for example:

- The technology would remove increased demand on the City's central sewage treatment plant (ROPEC) that is arising from increased development around the City's margins. Recent announcements indicate that ROPEC must soon undergo a costly expansion and all reasonable attempts to remove future load on the plant should/must be taken;
- It would reduce the need for the constant upgrading of the major trunk portions of the City's sewage system. Ottawa citizens may recall the cost of the South Ottawa collector and the even greater costs associated with its failure. Tertiary treatment plants situated within new and existing outlying communities would substantially rein in the need to grow the core of the sewage collection system;

- It could be used to reduce the amount of pollutants discharged to the Ottawa River. ROPEC is a secondary treatment plant that is currently the second largest point source of water pollution in the province. The Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) has recently raised concern about the levels of Ottawa's unhealthy contribution to the Ottawa River. DFO will soon start to play "hard ball" if Ottawa does not mitigate the discharge. DFO's concerns would be allayed if the Seprotech technology were used at the end of the current treatment process at ROPEC to further treat ("polish") the discharge to tertiary level; and
- It could be used to solve the problem the City has been having with the recurring breaks (6 in 20 years) of the Richmond - Glen Cairn sewer forcemain pipe. The installation of the technology in Richmond would be cheaper than replacing the pipe with another one. (Note: the replacement of a pipe with another may reduce the risk of further ruptures but it does not eliminate them; on-site treatment eliminates all risks of failure associated with the transportation of sewage.)

While it may be difficult to get excited about sewage treatment, believe me when I say that, within the sewage treatment and environmental fraternities, the new Seprotech plant in Manotick is a show-stopper. (This report may sound like an advertisement for Seprotech so I should point out that neither FJR nor I have a financial interest in the firm.)

Brian Finch

7.2.11 MOE White Paper on Watershed-Based Source Protection

In February 2004, Ontario's Ministry of the Environment published a White Paper on Water Source Protection requesting comments on its response to the recommendations of the Walkerton Inquiry. As most will recall, the Liberal government promised to implement all recommendations from the inquiry. The MOE's document can be viewed at <http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/programs/3585e01.htm>.

Our reply of May 11, 2004, was written primarily by me, with important inputs from past and present FJR executive members. It dealt with our collective experiences (and frustrations) gathered over many years to do with water issues in the Ottawa area. We thanked the Minister for the white paper as we felt it was a substantial advance in protections for our natural systems and our water. Our letter of 15 pages made comments on the following:

- our dissatisfaction with current sewage treatment practices and the low levels of compliance of some sewage plant operations. The province needs to move to tertiary treatment;
- municipalities need to move away from the transportation of sewage by long forcemain pipes;
- the province needs to upgrade water quality discharge requirements of stormwater management facilities;
- we disliked the proposed heavy involvement prescribed for municipalities (elected officials and staff) on the boards, planning committees and working groups tasked with developing source protection plans. We commented that municipalities may often be in conflict since they are often proponents in endeavors that can negatively impact water sources;
- we asked MOE to recognize the importance of including wellhead protection and mapping of ALL wells, not just communal wells, which are much deeper and less susceptible to contamination risks;
- we pointed out that many wetlands are still not properly mapped and classified and that many landowners can compromise the process by preventing access to properties;
- a constant complaint has been that current and planned postings on the EBR have time limits that are overly stringent;
- we asked for improved funding of conservation authorities, MOE and MNR so they may fulfill their mandates appropriately;
- we asked for stricter monitoring and reporting on water taking. Our experience indicates there has been poor or non-existent record keeping by some permit holders and poor monitoring of permit holders by provincial authorities;
- requests for water taking and water discharge permits must be dealt with at the same time, and evaluated on a precautionary and watershed (and/or aquifer) basis.
- the requirement that planning issues "must follow" the *Planning Act* must be reinstated; the previous wording allowed municipalities to consider and then ignore these planning provisions. There is also a need for clarification and strengthening of the Provincial Policy Statement to ensure the primacy of drinking water source protection and of other health related environmental issues over other planning issues;
- our belief is that the Class EA Process is broken and must be fixed, and that it must be changed to stipulate how the project is to be assessed in natural environmental terms (not solely by "process" as is the current situation). It must require the environmental assessment be based on the

precautionary principle, including plausible worst case scenarios, failure analysis and the primacy of health and environmental issues; and
- we asked for a much more robust provincial legal and regulatory framework to deal with damage to wetlands and alteration of watercourses. Currently, only Federal DFO legislation has any teeth.

I hope you found our response thoughtful and constructive.

Brian Finch

7.2.12 Jock River Flood Risk Mapping

In November, the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority (RVCA) concluded its Jock River Flood Risk Mapping study to update previous flood data. New 100 year flood risk maps were created by independent consultants for the RVCA using recent data and advanced, more reliable engineering methods. When finalized, these flood risk maps will be used by planners to determine where development should and should not be located.

The new maps showed the updated flood risk areas from the Rideau River up to and including the Village of Richmond, and new flood risk mapping from the west side of the Richmond Fen upstream to Ashton. At two open houses in Richmond and Barrhaven in November, the RVCA placed the maps on display and asked for input from residents on the historical behaviour of the Jock, and anecdotal or documented information on past high water events, in order to substantiate or adjust the new flood plain data.

I attended the open house in Richmond and presented information and possible concern about possible effects on flooding of the southern abutment of the old rail road bridge beside the current Twin Elm Bridge, and the rock crossing of the river immediately downstream of the confluence of the Monahan Drain (near Bow of the Jock Park). The latter rock crossing spans the entire river and could, therefore, increase flood water levels upstream. It also forms a barrier to the movement of fish up and down the river at all times of the year except briefly during high water events. (This latter aspect will be discussed with the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans.)

(With excerpts from a RVCA press release)

Brian Finch

7.3 Education Projects

7.3.1 Richmond Fair

The Richmond Fair was held September 15 to 19, 2004. FJR shared a booth with the Richmond Community Association and covered each other off. Niel Barrington, Irwin McCaffrey and I manned the booth for FJR.

Brian Finch

8.0 Fundraising Report

8.1 T-Shirts

In 2003, Niel Barrington put forward a proposal to buy T-shirts with the FJR logo (main component is the heron drawn by Eric Snyder) and to sell them to fund Friends of the Jock River projects.

In January 2004, Daquin was chosen to supply the shirts and its design staff helped adjust the logo for best effect. The T-shirts are well-made shirts in a natural sand colour in various sizes, with the FJR logo printed in deep forest green over the left breast. We ordered 100 shirts in a range of shirt sizes from small to extra large (numbers of each recommended by Dequin) and we picked them up only a few business days later. Total cost after taxes was \$856.75. We decided to sell the shirts for fifteen dollars for a potential profit of \$6.43 each.

The shirts have been sold at the monthly meetings, the 2004 AGM, through the mail, at the Richmond Fair, at a booth one weekend at the Barrhaven Loblaws and at the Heart's Desire community barbeque. Purchasers have been a mix of members and non-members. As of the end of 2004, 54 shirts have been sold so we are close to the break-even point of 58 shirts. We have sold out of the extra large size leaving about 25 large and only small numbers of small and medium. The executive should decide soon whether to purchase more shirts to round out the size range. It may also review the price.

Brian Finch

9.0 Plans for 2005

9.1 Work Plan for 2005

(not listed in order of priority)

1.0 Presidential Projects

- 1.1 Update Constitution and By-laws to deal with the requirements for incorporation: In view of various amendments over the past years, the president will update the FJR constitution and by-laws. This may be done as part of a broader strategic planning exercise for the FJR.

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 Public Relations Strategic Plan: The Publicity Committee will review and implement the strategic plan tabled in 2004.
- 5.1.2 Website: 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.

5.2 Fundraising Committee

- 5.2.1 Ecological Restoration and Enhancement Funding: The Committee will pursue various funding sources to cover the costs of restoration and enhancement projects in 2005.
- 5.2.2 T-Shirt Sales: The Fundraising Committee will promote T-shirt sales 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 Riparian Planting at Cedarview Road - Greenbank Road Site: Maintenance of the trees planted in 2004 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.
- 6.1.2 Shoreline Restoration at Twin Elm Site: Additional planting and maintenance will be done at this site. Fence repair will be conducted, as needed.
- 6.1.3 Tree Planting Maintenance at Jockvale (both sides of Jock), Half-Moon Bay, Richmond Road Sites: Additional planting and/or maintenance will be done at these sites.

- 6.1.4 RVCA Stream Survey: The FJR will continue to work with the RVCA on this project.
- 6.1.5 Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp: The FJR will proceed to construct a wildlife ramp at this site in 2005.
- 6.1.6 Shoreline Garbage Clean-ups: The FJR will continue to seek opportunities to organize or participate in shoreline clean-ups throughout the watershed.

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 Applications on the EBR Registry: The FJR will continue to monitor the EBR registry and comment on applications of concern.
- 7.4 Jock River Reach 2 Subwatershed Study: The FJR will continue to work with the Subwatershed Study group and to strive for an ecosystem approach.
- 7.5 Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study: The FJR will continue to participate on the public liaison committee work.
- 7.6 Marlborough Forest Management: The FJR will continue to monitor progress towards establishing a Marlborough Forest Departmental Consultative Group, and will ask to participate in the group if it is established.
- 7.7 Greenbank Road Corridor Crossing and Transitway Extension: The FJR will act as a stakeholder in this planning process.
- 7.8 South Nepean Collector Sanitary Sewer: The FJR will continue to monitor the project.
- 7.9 Alternative Sewage Treatment Solutions for Outlying Communities: The FJR will continue to advocate for the appropriate use of high tech, tertiary sewage treatment throughout the region.

Eric Snyder and Brian Finch

11.2 Budget for 2005

1.0	Presidential Projects	Projected income (\$)	Projected cost (\$)
1.1	Update Constitution and By-laws	1,500	1,500
2.0	Secretarial Projects	-	-
3.0	Membership Projects		
3.1	Human Resources Database	-	-
3.2	Membership Database	-	-
3.3	Ottawa Volunteer Network	-	40
4.0	Treasury Projects		
4.1	Incorporation	-	-
4.2	Liability Insurance	-	500

5.0	Committee Projects		
5.1	Publicity Committee		
5.1.1	Public Relations Strategic Plan	-	-
5.1.2	Website	-	25
5.2	Fundraising Committee		
5.2.1	Pursue Ecological Restoration and Enhancement Funding	-	-
5.2.2	T-Shirt Sales	1,440	400
6.0	Projects		
6.1	Ecological Restoration, Enhancement and Monitoring		
6.1.1	Riparian Planting at Cedarview Road - Greenbank Road Site	9,500	9500
6.1.2	Shoreline Restoration at Twin Elm Site	-	200
6.1.3	Tree Planting Maintenance at Previous Planting Sites	-	200
6.1.4	RVCA Stream Survey	2,500	2,500
6.1.5	Ashton Dam Wildlife Ramp	-	250
6.1.6	Shoreline Garbage Clean-ups	200	200
7.0	Water and Environmental Protection		
7.1	Richmond Conservation Area Membership, Management and Sewage Storage Issues	-	-
7.2	Munster Sewage Treatment Solutions	-	-
7.3	Applications on the EBR Registry	-	-
7.4	Jock River Reach 2 Subwatershed Study	-	-
7.5	Urban Natural Areas Environmental Evaluation Study	-	-
7.6	Marlborough Forest Management	-	-
7.7	Greenbank Road Corridor Crossing and Transitway Extension	-	-
7.8	South Nepean Collector Sanitary Sewer	-	-
7.9	Alternative Sewage Treatment Solutions for Outlying Communities	-	-
General	Income		
	Anonymous Donations	50	
	Receipted Donations	300	
	GST Rebates	300	

	Corporate Membership	100	
	Family Membership	500	
	Supporter Membership	225	
	Volunteer Membership	200	
	Expenditures		
	Advertising		100
	Bank Charges		60
	Books and Subscriptions		50
	Office Supplies		200
	Photocopy Costs		200
	Photographic Supplies		10
	Photographic Development		10
	Postage		100
	Memberships in other organizations		10
	Total Income	16,815	
	Total Expenditures		16,055
	Income minus Expenditures	760	

Brian Finch

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 Niel Barrington at 823-3643). Nominations will also be accepted 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	Vice-President
Treasurer	Director for Water Conservation and Usage
Secretary	Director for Membership Roster and Management
Director for Projects and Actions	Director of Fund-Raising
Director for Publicity and Public Relations	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.

Niel Barrington
Nomination Committee Chair