

Harrington Community & Historical Preservation Club Inc.

Rick Goldt C.E.T.
Supervisor, Water Control Structures
Upper Thames River Conservation Authority
1424 Clark Road, London, ON N5V 5B8

RE: Class Environmental Assessment, Harrington Dam, Public Information Centre #2

In response to the Harrington Dam Public Information Centre #2 presentation of March 12, 2016, we offer the following comments for consideration:

Our organization continues to have a significant interest in the Harrington Grist Mill and making it viable for demonstrating the role of water power and the mill in establishing villages in the early history of this area. A lot of time and energy has been invested by our organization to get the mill facility where it is to date. It is now at a point where the mill equipment has been totally restored and is able to operate once again.

Our restoration plan highlights the authenticity of the mill, which includes having the running gear operate by waterpower as it has for decades when the original settlers in the area and established the village of Harrington. As the mill played an important role in the development of the surrounding community, we believe that it has significant historical value and it is our interest to maintain the facility as an original and genuine operation of this period. We see value not only for current observers but also for the benefit of future generations to experience first hand how water driven mills operated.

Without a water source, the above objective cannot be realized. Alternatives 5 (Replace dam with a new structure downstream of the existing dam location) and 7(Reconstruct existing dam in current location with new materials) are the only 2 that maintain the pond water at a level that would be adequate for the operation of the current turbine to run the mill equipment.

Alternative 4 (Natural channel with offline ponds) shows an “optional sluice bypass channel to divert flow to historical mill”. This option is also of interest as it allows an option of water to be routed into the mill turbine pit.

Our discussion regarding Alternative 4 questioned whether this would provide for an adequate head of water to operate a turbine in order to drive the mill equipment. As the mill equipment would be freewheeling and not under the load and resistance of grinding plates processing grains, much less power would be required to drive the machinery. The above 3 are the only alternatives that will meet our restoration objective of having the mill machinery run by way of water power.

Because of the continuous water flow created by the headwaters of the Harrington pond, serious consideration should be given to using this source as a micro grid project to generate hydro electrical power. Looking ahead, this important sustainable resource should not be overlooked. This forward thinking would also be conducive for Oxford County’s 2015 initiative to be 100 per cent sustainable for renewable energy by the year 2050 and be a source of income. Alternatives 4, 5 & 7 would allow for this. The possibility may exist to install a more efficient turbine that could serve the dual purpose of the occasional operation of the mill and also for generating hydro electricity.

We hope that the above will be considered in your review of the Harrington Dam alternatives. We appreciate the work that has been completed and the opportunity to participate in the process. We look forward to a continued harmonious working relationship regarding the mill with UTRCA.

Yours Truly

Tim Van de Kemp, Chair
Harrington Mill Restoration Committee
Committee Members: John Hiuser, Sam Coghlan, Doug Diplock, Tim Van de Kemp