

Project: Harrington and Embro Dam EAs **Meeting No.:** PIC 2
Meeting Date: May 12, 2016
Project No.: 1505 **Meeting Time:** 7 – 9 pm
Recorder: M. Pushkar **Report date:** May 26, 2016

Location: Harrington Hall and Library – 539 Victoria Street, Harrington, ON

Attendees: Rick Goldt, Bill Mackie, Karen Winfield (UTRCA)
Wolfgang Wolter, Mariëtte Pushkar (ERI)
Don MacLeod, Doug Matheson, Marcus Ryan, Margaret Lupton (Zorra Township)
Members of the Public (17)

Purpose: Public Information Centre 2 – Harrington 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. What is the scale of the creek on the drawings? What would the actual width be? The creek width would be based on existing conditions/upstream characteristics.</p> <p>2. All hazards were lowest in all categories; therefore is there no real hazard? MNR focuses on life/property hazards (e.g. loss of life) and this is ranked low (although a risk still exists for loss of life). Environmental damage due to dam failure should still be considered (e.g. sediment loading, habitat loss, erosion etc.)</p> <p>3. If the amount of wells affected is not known, how can the cost be assessed? The cost to drill deeper wells would be in the order of \$6,000 to 8,000 per well ; this is considered to be a small portion of the overall costs.</p> <p>4. Has the Cultural Heritage been sufficiently considered? <u>Public input:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Village was create because of pond (170 years ago) Mill is being restored as an educational feature - there has been a historic relationship between mill and pond If pond is removed, then the purpose of the mill is less obvious and there will be a loss of connection to the past The pond may be eligible for Heritage Feature Designation as per Heritage Act – has this been explored? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No – this has not been explored by UTRCA A lot of background information on Harrington has been assembled by the public – they will pass it on to the study team <p><u>Team Clarification</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> UTRCA/ERI are not working with the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. We are following the process of a Class EA. The archaeological report is posted and available. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Our point of contact person at the Ministry of Culture and Tourism will be provided:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Penny Young: 416.212.7420 <p>5. How will dredging of sediment/monitoring be implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The pond has not been dredged for many years• Sediment would be tested for disposal options. <p>6. The existing sediment is very mushy/smelly; how would it be dealt with it when creating the creeks?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The existing sediment would be removed, where required, the creek would be constructed and the sediment would be stabilized (vegetated). <p>7. Archaeological study was well done. What would be done if there is an archaeological finding?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment would need to be done prior to construction• If any findings, the work would stop immediately and the findings would need to be reclaimed. <p>8. Can panels stay for review?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes <p>9. For the option of building a new dam structure downstream of the existing dam, how far downstream would it be constructed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The structure would be constructed as close as possible to the existing location, with consideration given to the design needs. <p>10. At previous PIC, residents came up with a bird inventory. Water birds mentioned in report but none identified as nesting. Residents indicated there were ducklings (not included in report). Why does habitat for fish take precedence over water fowl?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Water fowl are included in consideration of diversity (e.g. habitat diversity) <p>11. Is the pond beneficial to Wildwood because it traps sediment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The pond does trap some sediment but is only a small portion of Wildwood contributing area. <p>12. Discussion about 1962 event in which the pond was drained and strong odors occurred</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The odor is likely due to nutrients being exposed and the decomposition of algae within the pond. <p>Some of the alternatives do not require sediment removal. If there is an odour, from the sediment then this may cause residents to relocate. With any of the alternatives, sediment seems to be an issue, why not just dredge?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The issue is not the pond sediment, but the safety of the dam. <p>If there is a low ranking of risk based on dam failure, why the urgency to mitigate issues?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The low ranking is for risk to the public (loss of life or property). There is a risk of failure and associated environmental effects as well as risk to the public. Therefore, action was recommended in the dam assessment reports; UTRCA is following recommendations from those reports. <p>When did the dam last fail? 1940s?</p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The dam came close to failure in June 2000 due to intense rain storms. Remediation work was carried out over the course of a week and was at risk of failure; thankfully predicted precipitation events did not occur. The dam does not have adequate capacity for design storms <p>13. The biggest issue with the remediation is cost. Is it possible to estimate the cost of the options, so that they can better evaluate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Only relative cost estimates have been provided. There are different options and enhancements that can be incorporated that would add additional costs (costs are being developed). <p>14. How do you naturalize an area made into a park?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A landscape architect would complete the design and take into consideration; public interests, natural connectivity, natural resources (park, etc.). The overall objective would be to have the design be maintenance free. The design work recognizes the existing park use and would focus primarily on the footprint of the pond and dam. <p>15. Where will the funding come from?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are various funding sources available for restoration and removals such as; government, community funds and infrastructure funding. <p>What would occur if the preferred alternative was selected however, no funding was available?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continued management of the dam would occur until the preferred alternative is implemented to reduce risk of failure (i.e., remove the logs, work step by step) <p>The fire department uses the water from the pond. How does fire safety factor into everything?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The fire department is looking into implementing a cistern. <p>16. What is the Oxford Natural Heritage System?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This refers to the area that is considered to be an important terrestrial and aquatic resource within the county. This includes woodlands and natural areas feature in the natural landscape. <p>17. Do any alternatives provide opportunity to generate electricity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The option for implementing micro hydro (using turbines) is expensive and would require a business plan. This could be incorporated into any “dam retention” option. <p>18. If new dam option was chosen, would the sediment be removed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sediment would be removed to optimize function of the pond and dam. <p>Can you utilize a forebay to collect sediment?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes, a forebay area could be provided; the volume of sediment loading could decrease in the future based on changing landuse – this would reduce the amount of dredging required for future maintenance. <p>19. Does the rocky ramp lower the pond elevation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes it does, because of the footprint of the ramp and the need to connect to the pond below the crest of the embankment	
--	---	--

	<p>20. If preferred alternative is chosen, what is the timeline for implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is difficult to estimate the timeline. UTRCA has used up most of its funding for this study. The EA process allows 5 years. <p>21. Are the drawings presented ideas/concepts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes, the boards are only ideas/concepts. Analyses to determine all parameters would occur at the detailed design stage; additional factors will then also be considered and incorporated into the design. <p>22. What are the next steps?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Address comments from the public• Develop an evaluation matrix with equal weighting for each category• Select preferred alternative and provide a more detailed concept• File the EA study and address any additional concerns communicated• An opportunity for the public to initiate an order request to the Ministry of Environment and Energy can be made. <p>23. Everyone has lived through old buildings being torn down because it is cheaper than preserving heritage. Mill is being restored but requires the pond for context. Therefore the pond is important to Mill history and context</p> <p>24. Does the report identify where embankment is unstable?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The embankment is unstable because of peat. If the soil is inundated, it loses strength and leads to failure. <p>Could interim measures be implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• MNRF process would be implemented because of repair which requires an assessment to be completed and then informs you how to proceed.	
--	---	--