

Richmond
Village Association



P.O. Box 4
Richmond, ON
K0A 2Z0

February 27, 2003

Mayor and Members of Council
City of Ottawa
110 Laurier Ave. West
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Mr. Mayor, Councillors

Subject: Richmond Village Association Observations Upon and Position With Respect to the Munster
Wastewater Facilities Re-evaluation

Reference: Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Re-evaluation of Alternatives Final Report
dated December 16, 2002

Find enclosed herewith a document entitled "Review and Assessment of The R.V. Anderson Associates Limited Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Re-Evaluation of Alternatives Final Report" prepared by the Richmond Village Association (RVA). This document, along with our letter to Councillor Stavinga dated January 22, 2003 (which was copied to you all) constitutes the RVA position on the matter of Munster Hamlet wastewater treatment and the proposed alternative treatment approaches.

I trust you will give serious consideration to our concerns, and be guided accordingly.

Sincerely,

(Original signed by)

Ted Brown
President, RVA

**REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT
OF THE**

**R.V. ANDERSON ASSOCIATES LIMITED
MUNSTER HAMLET WASTEWATER TREATMENT FACILITY
RE-EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES FINAL REPORT**

dated December 16, 2002

February 24, 2003

**Prepared by
The Richmond Village Association**

RECORD OF APPROVAL

(Approved for release at a meeting of the RVA February 24, 2003. Original signed accordingly)

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Signature</u>	<u>Date</u>
Ted Brown	President	_____	_____
Harvey Snyder, P.Eng.	Vice-president	_____	_____
Josh Seabrook	Secretary	_____	_____
Judy Wagdin	Treasurer	_____	_____
Doug Longmire	Director	_____	_____
Michel Dubord	Director	_____	_____
Bernie McMullen	Director	_____	_____
Glen Trebble	Director	_____	_____

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS	1
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	2
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	3
DOCUMENT REVIEW	4
CONCLUSIONS.....	13

APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS

- **Annex A to Request for Proposal Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Project Information and General Terms of Reference** – City of Ottawa.
- **WORKPLAN - City of Ottawa Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Action Plan** dated February 11, 2003 - R.V. Anderson Associates Limited
- **Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Re-evaluation of Alternatives Final Report** dated December 16, 2002 – Prepared for the City of Ottawa by R.V. Anderson Associates Limited.
- **Jock River Watershed Management Plan November 2001** – Issued by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Review of the R.V. Anderson report and other available documentation revealed that the work called up by the City made neither explicit nor implied allowance for inclusion in the study of the potential impacts of treatment alternatives on areas outside the bounds of Munster Hamlet. No consideration was given to public health, environmental or water supply concerns for residents along any potential pipeline route. These residents draw water from a shallow aquifer in the Jock River watershed between Munster Hamlet and Richmond and in the village of Richmond. Yet a study in progress, contracted by the City,¹ identifies this corridor as a Wellhead Protection Area, to be protected from any source of contamination.

Had the City adopted a more holistic view, it would have treated the Ontario Municipal Board intervention as unique opportunity to improve its understanding of the situation. The broader issues introduced by the consideration of a forcemain pipeline option should have been addressed. Had they been, there is no doubt that the outcome of the R.V. Anderson report would have been significantly different. The City would not now be faced with the hypothetical problem of deciding whether or not to accept pipeline tenders based on artificially minimized differences in the environmental impact of the three treatment alternatives.

The Richmond Village Association (RVA) concludes that had R.V. Anderson been directed to consider public health, environmental and threat to water supply issues for rural and Richmond residents, the forcemain option would have been rejected unequivocally. Furthermore, this rejection would have been based on these factors as well as cost factors, including the high risk of significant cost over run, which was known as early as the time of the OMB hearing.

The Richmond Village Association further concludes that, given R.V. Anderson's rejection of the forcemain option despite a restricted scope of work, the City would be derelict in its responsibility to the citizens of Ottawa were it to open the tendering process in this matter to include other than the onsite treatment alternatives set out in its Statement of Work.

¹ Wellhead Protection Study – currently delivered in draft – final report expected in the Spring of 2003. It is to be noted that this study is restricted in scope to communal (City owned) wells. The aquifer recharge source estimate applies only to the deep aquifer in Munster and is not based on a full hydrogeological study. The study does not address threat/vulnerability/risk to shallow wells around Munster, between Munster and Richmond, and in Richmond. To properly address concerns regarding the impact of a forcemain to and through Richmond from a public health and water supply perspective, another study would be required by the City of Ottawa.
City contact: Brian Stratton, 580-2424 loc. 22791

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Richmond Village Association recommends that the City accept the outcome of the R.V. Anderson Report and issue a directed RFP to the proponents of the onsite treatment alternatives set out in the R.V. Anderson Statement of Work. In our opinion, this RFP should seek a technology update including the most current performance data, and current competitive design-build price commitments.

The RVA further recommends that the City move post-haste in this initiative, seeking provincial co-operation for fast tracking environmental approvals with the objective of fielding an operational on-site plant by December 2003.

DOCUMENT REVIEW

Annex A To Request For Proposal Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Project Information And General Terms Of Reference – City Of Ottawa.

It has been verified by City staff that in essence, this part of the RFP document flowed forward and served as the R.V. Anderson contract Statement of Work (SOW).² This Annex to the RFP may, therefore, be taken as the source of work instruction and scope definition for the purposes of the above-mentioned contract.

The Introduction and Background sections comprise 4 of the 6 pages, and with one notable exception, provide a relatively comprehensive history of the Munster Hamlet wastewater treatment situation. The document was silent on the issue of the unconventional practices surrounding the public solicitation for the treatment facility that included the acceptance of bids that were not compliant with the RFP released in 1998. This RFP called for new and innovative technologies to be proposed as design-build submissions, i.e. at a firm fixed price.³

Two statements in this document's 'Scope of Work' are particularly relevant to RVA concerns. These are as follows:

“Review of three alternatives to ensure compliance with all requirements of the original RFP.” and

“Soliciting input from interested parties, proponents and CRA for information gathering purposes and to seek clarifications.”

The first requirement relates to the questionable public solicitation practices. It is not known whether this review ever actually took place, but if it did, the results were not recorded in the R.V. Anderson final report main body. There are, however, references to the situation in two report annexes, but the treatment is at best oblique and apologetic, with no conclusions drawn.

With respect to the second noted requirement, R.V. Anderson was left to its own devices to determine who were the interested parties. Certainly none of the CRA work included impact assessments as they might pertain to rural and Richmond residents, and it has been confirmed that City staff gave no instructions to R.V. Anderson to include impacted individuals or areas beyond the scope of Munster Hamlet⁴. This is all the more surprising considering the OMB held an open session that allowed presentations from the public. Public participation included a representative from the Richmond Village

2 Telephone conversation H. Snyder/B. Alting-Mees 1300 hrs, February 11, 2003

3 An RVA representative publically observed on this irregularity and predicted litigation at a public meeting held at Munster Hamlet in late 1998.

4 Telephone conversation H. Snyder/B. Alting-Mees 1300 hrs, February 11, 2003

Association. The bottom line is that as a result, the R.V. Anderson report provided no consideration of impacts outside of the bounds Munster Hamlet.

WORKPLAN - City of Ottawa Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Action Plan dated February 11, 2003 - R.V. Anderson Associates Limited

This document is the consultant's "Project Statement" that sets out the contractor's understanding of the City's requirements. The document also states the credentials of each of the firms comprising the R.V. Anderson team. As one might expect, the Work Plan is at a level of detail to provide a fairly clear definition of scope of work and deliverable expectations. It also identifies who is assigned responsibility for each element of the re-evaluation both corporately and individually.

For the areas of concern and of particular interest to the RVA, this document states:

"XCG will lead the technical review of the three alternatives, and brings to this project assessment and process design experience with many innovative small system technologies" (this work to be under the R.V. Anderson leadership of Mr. Gerald Bauer), and

"Sally McIntyre, R.P.P ... will lead the socio-economic and environmental re-evaluation alternatives with support from IndEco."

These individuals held responsibilities for areas that, for completeness of the review, begged for an interpretation, or expansion of scope to include rural and Richmond residents as stakeholders.

There are a number of other statements in the Workplan document that call for comment, in that had they been acted upon, the re-evaluation would have looked beyond the bounds of Munster and treated the 'system' rather than a 'component' thereof. These statements follow:

"Several proprietary and non-proprietary proposals were received in response to the 1998 Terms of Reference (TOR) issued by Connestoga Rovers & Associates Limited (CRA) soliciting solutions to the above noted problems. The three alternatives to be re-evaluated under the current assignment are a pipeline link to the Village of Richmond, Snowfluent, and the rotating biological contactor (RBC) system of CMS."

Surely the words "... pipeline link to the Village of Richmond" should have triggered consideration of a scope change for public health and environmental issues.

"Therefore, the City is determined that all outstanding issues be identified and addressed during the course of the proposed review, and that the results of the analysis enable the implementation of a solution."

Why was the impact on Richmond and environs not considered an outstanding issue?

“As part of RVA’s (R.V. Anderson) investigation, the City has asked it to contact these⁵ and other key stakeholders to identify issues and options and to consider those in the re-evaluation process.”

R.V. Anderson should have proposed to the City that rural and Richmond residents are numbered among the other key stakeholders, and seen that they and their concerns were included.

“The evaluation of the pipeline solution will be relatively straight-forward ...”

This statement is alarming in that it suggests predisposition on the matter. The cursory treatment the pipeline receives in the Final Report bears out this concern. This statement goes on to say ...

“...however the proposed treatment technologies (Snowfluent and CMS solutions) will involve a more comprehensive and investigative review, and will be led by XCG.”

This suggests that the treatment/transport options were not scrutinized equally.

And on the subject of stakeholder consultation, the Workplan states ...

“A Communication Plan will be developed that identifies the stakeholders to be contacted, the information to be obtained, and the means of contact and consultation to be employed.” and

“Concurrent to meetings with the proponents, our team will meet with other stakeholders to the process including members of Friends of the Jock, the local community association, the advisory committee to the CRA study, and those who participated in the OMB hearing if other than those identified above.”

Surely, if these work plan statements were carried out with due diligence, the identification of rural and Richmond stakeholders would be a foregone conclusion. So why were they not consulted?

Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Re-evaluation of Alternatives Final Report dated December 16, 2002 – Prepared for the City of Ottawa by R.V. Anderson Associates Limited.

This report presents the documented findings of the re-evaluation of alternatives as carried out by R.V. Anderson.

Report – Main Body

Every requirement of the contract should be addressed in this part of the report in a manner consistent with the content of the supporting appendices. This is not always the

⁵ Proponents of particular treatment technologies (namely Delta Engineering Limited and CMS Group Inc.) and groups that monitor issues like this due to environmental concerns, such as the Friends of the Jock (River).

case. Some subjects are treated in such a cursory manner that when the appendices are removed, as is the case on the ward councillor's web site, an entirely different impression emerges in the absence of the detail.

The review of the R.V. Anderson work plan⁶ confirms that the study scope excluded key stakeholders; rural and Richmond residents.

This same page claims that *"The sites and routes affected by the three alternatives were visited by members of the consulting team..."*. That seems a little unlikely since the city insists that as yet, no forcemain route through the village of Richmond has been chosen.

Section 3.2 states that *"The requirement for consultation were met."*

In that this conclusion refers to the selection of the technology and treatment concept, the RVA cannot agree. The moment the possibility arose that the solution could extend beyond the bounds of Munster Hamlet, the proceedings should have stopped and the PLC restructured to include the new stakeholder – rural and Richmond residents. This did not happen, so it is arguable that the ESR Addendum did not meet statutory requirements.

Regardless of the quality of the study methodologies applied by the R.V. Anderson team, the results are marginalized by the exclusion of key stakeholders and the exclusive focus on Munster. Yet the study still placed the forcemain pipeline last without factoring in criteria that would be called up by a broader scope; criteria whose resulting impact could only depress the pipeline's score. Therefore the assertion that *"... the close results suggest that any one of the three alternatives could be selected"* is highly questionable, especially when taken in context with the results of the sensitivity analysis.

The report states that:

"It is the considered opinion of the consulting team, therefore, that the debate should not continue on the battleground of the evaluation matrix."

"... there is no clear answer that will likely come from more refinements of this matrix."

The RVA agrees, but only to the extent that tinkering in the context of the present study scope is pointless.

Had the matrix been applied with consideration of all stakeholders and the complete geography, the RVA contends that no amount of sensitivity jiggling would move the forcemain pipeline from a distant third place.

Furthermore, we find that the treatment of the 'lack of available data' in the report is inconsistent from one case to another. For example, although no specific hydrogeological studies were carried out, the report concludes that the impact of water transfer from local watersheds would be minimal because of the use of deep communal

wells in Munster. The extension of impact beyond the bounds of Munster Hamlet was not factored into this conclusion even though it would have considerable significance. Another example, this time with respect to on-site treatment, was the report's choice to downgrade an option because of the inherent lack of historical data regarding its discharge water quality.

We see two sets of wanting data treated in two different ways such that it reduced the disparity in environmental impact between the treatment concepts. This inconsistency seriously erodes our confidence in the study and the resulting conclusion, which seemingly opens the door to rehabilitating the rejected forcemain option, despite the risks it brings to bear.

Appendix A – OMB Decision/Order

No comments.

Appendix B - Background Documentation and Situation Analysis

For the most part, this appendix does a credible job of capturing the background and history leading to the present situation. Where this appendix loses credibility is in the situation analysis and its treatment of the public tendering practices used by CRA and RMOC in addressing the RFP noted in the following figure.

Request for Proposals

**Request for Proposals
Munster Hamlet Wastewater
Treatment Facility**

The Region of Ottawa-Carleton is seeking proposals to provide supply, design-build and operation services for a 575 m³/day municipal wastewater treatment facility for Munster Hamlet located in Coulbourn Township. Proposals identifying treatment solutions for the disposal of the treated effluent through surface application, sub-surface application (groundwater) and to a nearby water course (Jock River) will be considered.

Proposal documents are available at a cost of \$25.00, **after 12:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 2, 1998** from:

Conestoga-Rovers & Associates
179 Colonnade Road, Suite #400
Nepean, Ontario K2E 7J4
Phone: (613) 727-0510

A mandatory site tour has been scheduled for June 10, 1998, at 1:30 p.m.

Sealed proposals must be received by 2:00 p.m., June 19, 1998.

For further information contact George Godin, P. Eng. of Conestoga-Rovers & Associates at (519) 884-0510. 95242055

Figure 1 - CRA/RMOC Solicitation Notice

It is to be noted that this is a request for proposal (RFP) not a Request for Information (RFI) or a Price and Availability call. It has a bid package cost, and specifically states that the proposal is calling for “... *treatment solutions for the disposal of the treated effluent through surface application, sub-surface application (groundwater) and to a nearby water course (Jock River) will be considered.*”

In the mind of any reasonable person, this is an RFP with a basic mandatory requirement. There is a charge to receive the bid package and anyone choosing to expend bid/proposal funds responding would certainly have an expectation of winning a contract if a selection and award is made. It is also clearly understood that a *supply, design-build, and operation services* proposal is a firm fixed price bid. Furthermore, accepted standards for ethically public solicitation dictate that proposals that do not meet RFP requirements be rejected without further consideration, once non-compliance is determined.

To award a contract through a solicitation process to a non-compliant bidder is a stunning departure from, and corruption of standard, ethical conduct.

If CRA knowingly issued an RFP without disclosing that it was merely a request for information and that mandatory requirements didn't matter, their actions were misleading to prospective bidders and inappropriate in any context, not just for public works.

So when the R.V. Anderson report presents an analysis of the situation containing the following statements, one has to wonder what standards of practice and conduct were applied throughout the history of this project, including the re-evaluation:

“CRA was required, through a council motion, to undertake the Design-Build RFP solicitation as a specific term in the award of the project to their firm.”

This places accountability squarely in the lap of Council.

“The result was the receipt of a level of information exceeding the needs of the EA process for a Phase 2 evaluation and potentially created expectations that a solution would involve a proprietary treatment technology, not a pipeline.”

Of course there were expectations. It was an RFP with specific mandatory requirements. If all CRA wanted was information for an EA they should have approached Council and made the ethical argument that the course of action they were being forced to take was outside the bounds of acceptable practice.

“The Design-Build RFP documents were clear, in the opinion of the (R.V. Anderson) consulting team, that the Region may not, in fact, select one of the proposals nor necessarily proceed with an implementation.”

This is a specious statement. Virtually all solicitations contain the “... may not select the lowest or any bid” caveat. That is not the issue.

“The fact that a pipeline solution was allowed to be submitted in the context of what was understood as a request for specific treatment technology submissions, and then selected and accepted as the preferred solution, left the view by some ... that the RFP process was not fair ...”

One hardly knows how to frame a reaction to this statement. It succinctly captures in a few words a description of an obviously unacceptable if not unethical procedure then seems to express that ‘lack of fairness’ was a matter of individual opinion.

Further, an attempt is made to implicate an Unsolicited Proposal (UP) as a contributor to the questionable practices. Every professional knows that there is a high probability that an UP may be rejected out of hand. The risk is assessed, then taken or rejected. That is not the same as bidding in good faith on what appears to be a legitimate RFP, and being rejected in favour of a non-compliant submission. Why is that so hard to understand?

Appendix C – Evaluation of Environmental Assessment and Decision Making Process

No matter how much it may be argued that the EA and decision making process was appropriate, it still suffers a fundamental flaw. The process was being applied to the wrong entity. Without expanding the scope beyond Munster Hamlet, the results were flawed and the environmental and socio-economic differences between the treatment concepts were minimized.

Thus, in the opinion of the RVA this appendix provides no justification for the rehabilitation of the forcemain pipeline option that was rejected by the re-evaluation study.

Appendix D – Evaluation of Wastewater Treatment Technologies

The standard for evaluation appears to be different for the centralized and decentralized concepts. The centralized solution (forcemain pipeline) is evaluated on cost alone, with no consideration for social environment criteria or for historical performance criteria.

It is hard to imagine how an accurate contrast can be drawn without working from a common evaluation baseline.

Appendix E – Evaluation of Pipeline Construction Costs

See Appendix D comments.

Appendix F – Evaluation of Natural Environmental Issues

On reading this appendix, it appears that quite a number of things were unclear to the consultants, one of which went unmentioned: the route of the proposed pipeline through Richmond.

For reasons that are not clear to the reader, a review was done of the assessment by CRA of the pipeline route alternatives. The novice reader might be forgiven for concluding that for the route selection, natural environmental issues were discarded in favour of the shortest distance and the use of the Richmond pumping station.

In the final analysis, although they state that natural environmental issues are not significant contributors to a final selection, the consultants conclude:

“Based on aquatic and terrestrial habitat and surface water resources criteria, the mechanical plant alternative is the most preferred and the pipeline alternative is the least preferred.”

Appendix G – Evaluation Matrix

This appendix contains eleven sheets of the evaluation matrix, which represent the culmination of all that has been said in prose in other parts of the report.

Natural environment – puts a great deal of reliance on artificial mitigation measures for the pipeline risks and does not fully address the Richmond end because no one knows where it is going. This matrix also identifies the fact that mechanical treatment returns land to alternate usage.

Surface water resources – the pipeline score would be lowered from 6 out of 10 if the impact within Richmond were considered.

Ground water resources – although it is stated that pipeline ground water impacts are nominal, no definitive study was undertaken to support that assertion.

Social environment – only considered Munster Hamlet. A broader scope would severely impact the pipeline scores.

Wastewater treatment - the table for wastewater treatment is, in the opinion of the RVA, out of place in light of the original RFP, and rigged in favour of the forcemain option. As well, based on reading in the same report about the technology options, we believe that a score as low as ‘2’ for the RBC mechanical option is a gross exaggeration.

Meets standards of reliability and safety – the pipeline is rated artificially high in the absence of consideration of the village of Richmond.

Capability to accommodate expansion – this table is totally wrong. It is not dealing in expansion, it is dealing in abnormal transient flows. A pipeline is least able to accommodate true expansion while a modular, on-site technology is the most likely candidate for expansion.

Jock River Watershed Management Plan November 2001 – Issued by the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority.

Table 2: Jock River Watershed Objectives, regarding the issue of groundwater quality and quantity. Baseflow depletion due to lowering of near surface groundwater tables and surface water withdrawals are of concern.

Removal of water from the Jock River watershed that was previously discharged to that area, regardless of its origin, is a withdrawal from the area.

Table 3B: Three Year Work Plan, regarding the issue of water quality, high levels and low flows. Assess the impact of all new ... proposals on groundwater recharge and elevation of near surface ground water table.

Table 3D: Three Year Work Plan, regarding the issue of groundwater quantity and quality. Review the hydrogeological implications of all new land use and development proposals.

This was not done for the Munster Wastewater Treatment project.

Table 3E: Three Year Work Plan, regarding the issue of Land Use and Development – Restoration, Rehabilitation and Management. Sub-watershed plans may be required to prepare more specific ...strategies for smaller portions of the watershed which are of particular local interest or concern.

For example, adequate water available to shallow wells in Richmond.

Appendix A to this document, entitled “Executive Summary – Jock River Watershed Plan – Interim Report” has the following to say about groundwater.

Groundwater is the major source of potable water in the watershed. Groundwater quality is generally good with some localized problems. Iron levels are consistently high. Groundwater quantity is good with some cones of depression in Richmond and Ashton areas. In general the upper area of the watershed is a groundwater recharge area while the lower a discharge area. Groundwater is the main contributor to streamflow in the late summer and is therefore important in maintaining the health of the aquatic system.

And Table A2-4 under Planning and Development:

Implement policies protecting baseflows, groundwater recharge/discharge areas in municipal planning documents.

Review construction plans for utilities ... for their potential impact on near surface groundwater levels and baseflows in the Jock River and its tributaries.

Why would we want to pump 165,000,000 or more litres per year of water, that could contribute as recharge to the groundwater system serving shallow wells, across the city for eventual dumping into the Ottawa River?

CONCLUSIONS

Had the evaluation matrix been applied with consideration of all stakeholders and the complete geography, the RVA concludes that no amount of sensitivity jiggling would move the forcemain pipeline from a distant third place.

We see two sets of wanting data treated in two different ways such that it reduced the disparity in environmental impact between the treatment concepts. This inconsistency seriously erodes our confidence in the study, and the resulting conclusion that seemingly opens the door to rehabilitating the rejected option despite the risk it brings to bear.

If CRA knowingly issued an RFP without disclosing that it was merely a request for information and that mandatory requirements didn't matter, their actions were misleading to prospective bidders and inappropriate in any context, not just for public works.

The different standard for evaluation for the centralized and decentralized concepts precluded an accurate contrast of the proposed solutions.

Removal of water from the Jock River watershed that was previously discharged to that area, regardless of its origin is a withdrawal from the area.

We do not want to pump 165,000,000 or more litres per year of water, that could contribute as recharge to the groundwater system serving shallow wells, across the city for eventual dumping into the Ottawa River.

Regardless of the quality of the study methodologies applied by the R.V. Anderson team, the results are marginalized by the exclusion of key stakeholders and the exclusive focus on Munster.

The RVA concludes that, given R.V. Anderson's rejection of the forcemain option despite a restricted scope of work, the City would be derelict in its responsibility to the citizens of Ottawa were it to open the tendering process in this matter to include other than the onsite treatment alternatives set out in its Statement of Work.

Richmond
Village Association



P.O. Box 4
Richmond, ON
K0A 2Z0

Jan 22, 2003

Janet Stavinga,
Councillor Goulbourn Ward
City of Ottawa
110 Laurier Ave. West
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1

Dear Janet:

Subject: Richmond Village Association Observations Upon and Position With Respect to the
Munster Wastewater Facilities Re-evaluation

Reference: Munster Hamlet Wastewater Treatment Facility Re-evaluation of Alternatives Final
Report dated December 16, 2002

If the recommendations of the referenced report are adhered to as presented, then there is no need for further concern on the part of the residents of Richmond. However, a recent editorial in the Stittsville News, a newsletter from the Munster Community Association, and the detail of the report itself create concerns that a forcemain pipeline through Richmond is potentially still under consideration for tendering.

The referenced report notwithstanding, the RVA believes that there is a credible health and environmental threat that would result from a forcemain option. The majority of the wells in Richmond are shallow in nature and thus susceptible to contamination, and loss of water in the aquifer which could result from the transfer of water from the Jock River watershed to that of the Ottawa. In addition there is the threat of physical disruption and contamination resulting from excavation and blasting.

R.V. Anderson took no cognizance of concerns for Richmond in conducting the re-evaluation, and we find that their treatment of the lack of available data is inconsistent from one case to another. For example, although no specific hydro-geological studies were carried out, the report concludes that the impact of water transfer from local watersheds would be minimal because of the use of deep communal wells in Munster. The extension of impact beyond the bounds of

Munster Hamlet was not factored. Another example, this time with respect to on site treatment, was the report's choice to downgrade an option because of the inherent lack of historical data regarding its discharge water quality. We see two sets of wanting data treated in two different ways such that it reduced the disparity in environmental impact between the treatment concepts.

Thus the RVA does not share the MCA's confidence that the only real difference between local and regional treatment is potentially cost, as the report concluded.

As previously stated, if the forcemain is eliminated from consideration, the RVA has no further concern. Given the current situation however, the RVA wishes to be provided timely reports on the deliberations and conclusions of city staff on this matter. Should the city choose to open the tendering process to include proposals for a regional (forcemain) solution as well as for local treatment, the RVA offers the following recommendations. In order to mitigate a politically charged and extraordinarily contentious situation, it is recommended that prior to public release, the Request for Proposal be reviewed by a committee that comprises city staff and one representative each, named by the following groups: the RVA, the MCA and the OMB appellants. The purpose of this would be to assure all interested parties that despite the disparate technology, all bidders will be responding to a common costing and contracting baseline. It is further recommended that the same committee, comprised of the same named people sit as the bid evaluation team.

In the interest of transparency of process, fairness and good community relations, we urge you to give serious consideration to these recommendations, should the circumstances warrant.

The foregoing is in no way an endorsement of the inclusion of a pipeline bid, nor is it an acceptance of a course of action contrary to the recommendations of the referenced report. However, if the city chooses to reject the report's recommendations, the RVA feels very strongly about active participation in the resulting process.

Sincerely,

(original signed by)

Ted Brown
President, RVA

CC. - Mayor Bob Chiarelli
Peter Hume, Chair Environmental Committee
Ottawa City Council
Bruce Thom, City Manager

