

## **Comment on Terms of Reference for the 3<sup>rd</sup> party review**

I'm a member of the City's Stormwater PAC and as such have been able to discuss with Darlene Conway the details of the City's ToR which I feel doesn't recognize the many issues of the past several years which have caused the turmoil the community now finds itself in. In so doing, Ms Conway showed me a revised ToR she intends to submit and I must admit it greatly improves what the City has provided the public to respond to. Therefore, I will only highlight some of Conway's points that have special meaning in my experience with the Carp River project.

### **Objectives**

Her first objective to "determine whether the CRRP, as currently envisioned, is consistent and complies with all pertinent policies, procedures, legislation and guidelines" is important in order to gain public confidence. So much of the confusion over the past 4 years has centered on MVC's seemingly selective use of the 2-zone flood plain concept (or one of its variations) that this must be reassessed. It is unfortunate that in FAQ it appears that the 2-zone approach is still recognized as a guiding principle even though most other Conservation Authorities avoid flood plain development as evidenced last week in Cooper's successful OMB appeal of Taggart's development along the Jock River.

### **Project Start-up**

I would estimate that at least half the problems associated with the CRRP has to do with failed communication, therefore, Ms Conway's suggestion to interview various parties is a good one, with one exception, the City's only two water resource engineers that have apparent experience with watershed planning and management have been left out. To not involve Cooper and Conway in a meaningful and professional role would do a disservice to the City's taxpayers and only increase the public's suspicion and resistance to just about anything that will eventually be offered as a river restoration plan.

### **Post development modelling**

I wish to emphasize the importance of correctly modelling the proposed stormwater management facilities and habitat ponds with respect to riparian storage calculations, or to put it more simply, should SWF be allowed on the flood plain? Time and again this question has been raised with never a definitive or convincing answer to the project's skeptics.

## The need for an Interim Development Plan

There have been too many suspicions on who is doing what in Kanata West. I believe it was in the summer of 2005 that Minto began moving earth around in their part of the flood plain and since then there has been an ever increasing number of concerns expressed about development even after the City supposedly stopped development in early Spring. An interim plan is essential.

Is it, or is it not a municipal drain?

This question has been around for several years and should be the first topic to be clarified since the outcome will affect everything else.

Sincerely,  
John Almstedt  
275 Kirchoffer Ave  
Ottawa, K2A 1Y1