

Project: Harrington and Embro Dam EAs **Meeting No.:** PIC 2
Meeting Date: May 10, 2016
Project No.: 1505 **Meeting Time:** 7 – 9 pm
Recorder: M. Pushkar **Report date:** May 26, 2016

Location: Embro Community Centre – 355644 35th Line, Embro, ON

Attendees: Rick Goldt, Bill Mackie, (UTRCA)
Wolfgang Wolter, Mariëtte Pushkar (ERI)
Marie Keasey, Doug Matheson, Marcus Ryan, Margaret Lupton (Zorra Township)
Members of the public (2)

Purpose: Public Information Centre 2 – Embro Dam

Item	Description	Action By
1.	<p>Presentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of study findings, evaluation criteria and alternatives was made by Wolfgang Wolter (ERI) 	Info
2.	<p>Questions posed by members of the public and answers provided by team:</p> <p>1. How much effort was put into identifying salamander Species-at-Risk? Incidental observations of salamanders were made during the field assessments by UTRCA staff. A specific field investigation for the presence of salamanders was not undertaken.</p> <p>2. Can shallow wells be identified on the slide so that we can make a better informed evaluation? Where possible, based on MOE data, shallow wells will be identified on the mapping.</p> <p>Are there shallow wells? There are at least three shallow wells (2 – provincial monitoring, 1 well on the dam for monitoring)</p> <p>3. With regards to the offline pond, will it go stagnant or green with algae?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Algal growth can be a concern and is a risk. There are various aspects that would decrease the likelihood of algal growth in the study area, within the proposed alternatives: There will still be high groundwater inputs In the alternatives, there will still be a connection between pond and creek to ensure some water augmentation and/or flushing. Adaptive management could be implemented An offline pond does not have same risk of sediment concentration of nutrients: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contaminated material will be dredged There will not be as much sediment/nutrient loading as existing conditions (i.e., upstream landuse changes etc.) <p>4. What is the issue if fish species upstream and downstream are different?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat fragmentation occurs due to the dam. Diversity and health of the fish communities is affected by the dam. 	ERI

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species numbers are important factors in assessing health of community. • Removal of the dam will gain ~ 2 km of upstream habitat for the fish that now occur downstream. • Dam removal will improve water temperatures that will benefit downstream water quality and habitat. <p>5. U.S. and Canada want to decrease total phosphorous loading to the Great Lakes. Fifty percent of contaminated sediment goes through with total phosphorous, why then do we want sediment movement?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phosphorous becomes a part of the biomass (i.e. consumed by fish etc.). • Sediment movement is required for river processes (i.e., loss of sediment load increases erosion potential of flows) • Issue of total phosphorous loading involves sediment from fields (landuse management); not just the creek. <p>6. Is there any issue with silt sediment? What can be done?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The silt can be re-used on land and does not have to be landfilled. Only a small sample was taken for the sediment testing. <p>7. What was the cyanide from? Was it from Blue-green algae? What was the concentration?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sample was taken 1 m below the ground. • The origin of the cyanide is not known at this time. • The concentration levels and MOE standard will be identified before the presentation is posted on the UTRCA website. <p>8. Where does the money come from for implementing the preferred alternative? What is the risk and feasibility of finding funding source?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government funding – there is a table which indicates that more money is available for dam removal projects • Fundraising by public/friends of environment • Conservation Authority <p>9. Is the selection of the preferred alternative limited by funding?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding is considered in the alternative evaluation process but does not define the preferred alternative. Funding may impact selection of the preferred alternative. <p>10. No weather data was provided; what happens if a catastrophic even occurs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UTRCA – risk of dam overtopping is based on the 50-year IDF. <p>(Residents have had 5” of rain in 24 hours) The magnitude of the event depends on existing conditions at time of storm such as; pre-existing soil moisture, time of year, area over which storm occurs (was it local?), duration/intensity of storm etc.</p> <p>11. Once decision is made, what will be the time span for taking action (e.g. 10 years)? Action will take place as quickly as possible - although obtaining funding may take a few years. The EA process allows 5 years.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">ERI</p>
--	---	--