

Mr. Chairman, Members of Committee,

It is our hope that you have had an opportunity to reflect on the Open Letter sent to you last Thursday by the Carp River Coalition.

The Coalition comprises members of four environmental groups: the Greenspace Alliance of Canada's Capital, the Friends of the Carp River, Ottawa Riverkeeper, and the Ottawa Group of the Sierra Club of Canada.

These Terms of Reference should not be accepted:

- they don't include the requirements set out in the Ministry of Environment's letter of June 13;
- the alternative Terms of Reference put forward by Darlene Conway are in all respects superior to those proposed by senior management, and are responsive to all of MOE's requirements to boot; and
- it is simply not acceptable to put the fox in charge of the henhouse. Both these Terms and the subsequent oversight of the review should be made the responsibility of an authority that is independent of senior management.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake: You have your two most experienced water resources engineers taking out vacation time to appear before you in opposition to what is proposed. If either or both of these professionals are not involved in oversight of the review, this process will have no credibility in the eyes of the public.

The response to the public input on the draft Terms of Reference is, frankly, insulting. Not a single point was given validity and the Terms before you are unchanged save for the addition of six non-essential words. Having staff just go through the motions of consulting was not, I believe, what you had in mind when you directed that consultations be held.

The core of the issue is that neither senior management nor Kanata West's landowners are yet ready to concede that with Kanata West

they have a fiasco on their hands. The basis for development – ANY development – in Kanata West has been fatally undermined. Field surveys were conducted to capture the changed topography after all the development that has taken place since 1983. But the models that translate this topography in a determination of the 100-year flood plain have been demonstrated to be deficient in about a dozen ways. So no-one knows at present where the 100-year flood plain is. Nor is there a basis for determining how stormwater should be managed.

The quiet change from no requirements for quantity controls as set out in the Class EA studies to plans requiring quantity controls for the Mattamy Fairwinds Subdivision just illustrates the muddle that development in Kanata West is in right now.

The best that can be hoped for is that, after the models have been patched up as much as possible in the absence of sufficient data for calibration, perhaps conservative conditions can be identified which could allow development to proceed in the interim.

Since we sent out the Open Letter we received a copy of Darlene Conway's rebuttal of a memo by John Price of Mississippi Valley Conservation who had argued that the flood plain policy practiced by MVC is in line with that of other Conservation Authorities in the Province.

Again Ms. Conway shows she is a clear thinker and knows her stuff. In contrast, Mr. Price offers muddled language and examples that bear no comparison to the Carp River situation. There's definitely something wrong with this picture.

We urge you to take the prudent course of action and pry this file away from the people who've messed it up in the first place.

Thank you,

for the Carp River Coalition,

Erwin Dreessen