

Appendix B-5
Public Comments

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
4/6/2017	E-mail	I support not repairing it. The river is a much more nature friendly place now, and in a city, that is a real plus.			
7/24/2017	E-mail	I'd like to be able to canoe or boat around on the river, and be able to stop for lunch or drinks at some pubs or patios near the river maybe at Springbank or the Forks, for example. I'd also like to be able to row on the river, maybe have head races.			
7/25/2017	E-mail	<p>I have collected flow rate data was collected at multiple Thames River Flow Rate stations during a five year time from 2010 to 2014. During that time, years of summer drought, regular rain fall and high precipitation were all observed in the data. This data was collected from Canada's Water Office historical data.</p> <p>A range of acceptable flow rates for paddling was established for each section of river represented by a flow rate gauge. This range was based on the UTRCA recommended flow rates for paddling each section, as well as personal experience from the Thames River Paddling Routes Project group members, as well as from several members of the paddling community's reports for paddling certain sections of the Thames River.</p> <p>This data was used to calculate the number of days that a particular section of the Thames River can be easily paddled per month and was then expressed a percentage of days per month.</p> <p>Although data is collected for twelve months of the year and many experienced paddlers paddle the Thames River year-round, the general paddling season for most paddlers is an eight month period from April to November. From those eight months, the average percentage of paddling days per month was calculated for each section of the river.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
7/26/2017	E-mail	<p>(Continued) The following data represents the average % of paddling days per month during paddling season.</p> <p>North Branch Mitchell: 21% St.Marys: 32% Thorndale: 40% Below Fanshawe Dam: 41%</p> <p>Middle Branch Thamesford: 31%</p> <p>South Branch Ingersoll: 38% Ealing: 56%</p> <p>Main Branch Byron: 69% Past Delaware: 80-100%</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to the Byron data, because this data best represents the section of river where the Springbank Dam has an influence on water flow.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued)</p> <p>People who support repairing the Springbank Dam talk of a river that is not usable for paddling when the dam is not operating. The data I have compiled, shows that during the eight month paddling season, there is a 69% chance that the flow rate is enough to easily paddle the Main Branch of the Thames River from The Forks, to Storybook Gardens and past Byron. That numbers jumps to 81% if you narrow down the time frame to a four month period during the warmest months of the year of June to September.</p> <p>At least four outfitters and tour organizers utilize the Grand and Nith Rivers for paddling as well as several Paddling Clubs. Both of these rivers are also influenced by flow rates like the Thames River is, yet these companies flourish as profitable companies.</p> <p>I believe that if infrastructure is improved for river access (parking lots, signage for river access, docks) than the Thames River can be a valuable river for tourism for paddling down the river without a dam at Springbank. Based on the science I have seen, if the river is allowed to flow free without a dam and reservoir, the river water quality and ecosystem will improve and I think that there is great potential for ecotourism, because it will continue to allow wildlife such as Bald Eagles, Osprey, Spiny Soft Shelled Turtles, Trout, Salmon, Walleye, Gar Pike and Black Panther Muskie to make a comeback in the Thames River.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
7/27/2017	E-mail	<p>(Continued) I also have several YouTube videos showing myself and friends paddling canoes through the Spingbank Dam/reservoir area without a functioning dam and reservoir. PADDLE THROUGH DOWNTOWN LONDON - JULY 21st 2017 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h9uy3ZMwrAs&list=PLixRKYWSXR4uhBp62YrsODCRM4GEM1fs-&index=25&t=1s</p> <p>Thames River Main Branch - Storybook Gardens to Old River Rd. (near Oxford St W.) - August 15th 2016 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MNEa52aZytc&index=7&list=PLixRKYWSXR4uhBp62YrsODCRM4GEM1fs-</p> <p>Thames River Main Branch - Storybook Gardens to Delaware Speedway - November 15th 2015 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=loZwD2Lj7CQ&index=14&list=PLixRKYWSXR4uhBp62YrsODCRM4GEM1fs-&t=360s</p> <p>Please feel free to use my data and research in consideration of the "One River Environmental Assessment", or call me for a further information.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
8/1/2017	E-mail	<p>How does the City intend to deal with raw sewage entering the Thames River from the Greenway treatment plant?</p> <p>London dumps raw sewage into a River when there is a heavy rain.</p> <p>“In the first three months of 2016, figures reported by the city on its website show London dumped 59,473 cubic metres of raw sewage into the river from its waste water treatment plants and 91,171 cubic metres of partially treated waste. That sewage — from so-called “bypasses,” when heavy rains overwhelm the system — was enough to fill about 60 Olympic-sized swimming pools.”[1]</p>			
8/9/2017	E-mail	<p>Fix the dam and put it up. Also put to public vote now and then act now the votes results now. I voted for the mayor because of his promise to fix the dam, and he is not going to get it bacause he has no balls to stand up to you.</p>			
8/10/2017	Article - Letter to the Editor	<p>This week city council is looking for input on the Springbank Dam. They have offered three options: leave it as is, repair it or dismantle it. On Coun. Paul Hubert’s website, he states that he is “open to experimentation, and new ways of thinking and solving problems.” At Hubert’s ward meeting this past spring I proposed that the city try closing the three remaining gates in the hope this would elevate the water level enough for the boaters while maintaining enough flow for the anglers and environmentalists. A manager from the city who was in attendance said he wasn’t sure whether the remaining gates would even work. I guess they’re not really open to innovative ideas to solve problems.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
8/18/2017	E-mail	<p>The section of the Thames that now flows free is a small section; whereas, many dams already exist up and down the river elsewhere so i don't buy the bio benefits of leaving the dam inoperable., Consequently, we are depriving prospective users of the recreational aspects of boating and enjoying the Thames and rowing in particular on the former boat worthy section. Not repairing the dam is missguided . Annually high schools came to London generating enthusiasm for the sport and candidates for Westerns excellent rowing program. Regattas brought many to London that come no more to school or to visit our great facilities.</p> <p>Fix it is my vote.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
8/11/2017	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>In regards to the one River consultation process, I would like to share my feedback.</p> <p>The waterfall / Wharf is an area that is highly used by people fishing. It would be nice to have a small floating dock or some type of area for them to fish from. This could also serve as a small launching area for small watercraft if they choose to use the shallow waters. Last year, the city cut down some trees to make easy access for a new construction drainage pipe. Perhaps this area could be used as a lit walkway, encouraging people to come to the river. This would bring people to the natural environment.</p> <p>On the other side of the river, it would be nice to see Labat's do something different with their portion of Riverfront. Perhaps a small outdoor patio near the river to cater to their clientele?</p> <p>Thank you for the consideration. Please feel free to contact me for any other consultation purposes.</p>			
8/11/2017	E-mail	<p>We are not able to attend the August 12th consultation venue so instead we decided to email you our thoughts. As daily walkers in Springbank Park we truly appreciate the beauty of the Thames River. We would definitely like to see Springbank Dam fixed so that boaters and rowers can once again make full use of the river.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/5/2017	E-mail	<p>I'm strongly in favour of rebuilding the dam and bringing the river back to the one I grew up with. This may get very rambling as a whole host of experiences over many years comes in vogue.</p> <p>What really prompted this was the news clip on releasing the turtles. No environmentalist in their right mind would release an endangered species into a situation that could be potentially compromised. This was done to help enhance an argument for not repairing the dam that they know is nonexistent.</p> <p>I was the assistant park naturalist in the Pinery Provincial Park (non qualified) and am totally in support of all ecologically significant issues. They could have released the turtles a kilometre southwest of the Byron bridge into the exact same ecological environment. I know this as I have fished the Thames from one end to the other growing up.</p> <p>Now let's examine the global aspects of this issue. To satisfy the environmentalists and First Nations spokespersons (ask the latter about their pickerel netting at Kent Bridge) should we decommission Wildwood and Fanshawe so the river can flow freely. So the ten kilometres from Fanshawe to Springbank is of critical concern in the overall flow of the Thames to Lake Sinclair. It is not!</p> <p>Fishing the Thames started as a child. My uncles took me to the main places. We went to the blind fourth (Windermere),the forks, north of Thorndale,Thamesford and Dorchester.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/5/2017	E-mail	<p>(Continued) My question of the don't restore advocates are as follows: Are we catching pickerel below Fanshawe Dam, black bass on Commissioners at Dorchester Increased varieties any where in the specific watershed or has nothing changed in species specific catches since the dam at Springbank broke down. I believe the reduced water levels have negatively impacted on the quality of fishing as recreation on the Thames. As a youngster not too bright we had a swim hole under the Highbury St. Bridge we rode ice flows down the South Branch at Meadowlilley. I think the higher river levels we grew up with allowed better overall river experiences. Any where you went there was water in our river. We moved to Quinella just off Springbank Park and we are tired of watching the waterfowl having to wade to find water. I think development of the south branch from Highbury to Labatts and to the forks has huge economic benefits to the city. We may catch bass again as they obviously flourished while the dam worked. Maybe we could do better fish ladders or level controls in spring at a restored dam.</p> <p>It's time for a council to abandon the parochial mentality that has cursed this city in my lifetime and use a natural asset to enhance our future. I think the economic benefits totally out weigh any and all environmental concerns as poorly as they have been presented</p>			

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/22/2017	E-mail	As stated previously I am totally against rebuilding the Springbank dam for a myriad of reasons . The river has never been in better shape and the environment other species in the Thames require should be protected. To build a dam for the incredibly small % of the populace who would paddle once every decade or so is stupid. By the way I have pleaded with you to do something about the absurd amount of grown men riding their bikes on the sidewalk has garnered neither response or action. It is very unsafe to the pedestrians and the riders and is against the LAW. Please do something about this. Thank you .			
9/17/2017	E-mail	LFP reporter Randy Richmond's article has finally clarified an important point in the Springbank Dam debate. Namely, that a working dam is NOT required to canoe and kayak on the river in London: Paddlers find flow fine on Thames: There is one factual error in the above article. The Springbank Dam was damaged by a surging Thames River in July 2000, not 2006. "The dam was damaged by flooding in 2006. During tests of the refurbished dam in 2008, a new steel gate broke. The dam has been inoperable, with the river flowing through it, since."			
9/12/2017	E-mail	London, Ontario is still wasting time and money wondering whether it wants to repair (at considerable cost) and reactivate the unnecessary Springbank Dam, which would decimate the thriving endangered Spiny Softshell Turtle population and prevent fish such as this large Tiger Muskie from being caught in the Thames River ~ fish which attract nesting raptors to the river. Time to leave 19th-Cenury thinking behind and support a healthy Thames River teeming with life.			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/22/2017	E-mail	<p>SPRINGBANK DAM: OPINION VERSUS FACT</p> <p>OPINION: "I think there is enough evidence out there to show that the very short stretch of river between the Springbank Dam and the Forks of the Thames is not a critical piece of an endangered species puzzle." ~ Simon Tanner, former president and longtime member of the London Canoe Club. LFP, Sept. 22, 2017. Mayor's not saying a dam thing after report.</p> <p>FACT: "The changes in this 8km stretch of river have been exceptional, and have greatly benefitted recovery efforts for the [endangered] Spiny Softshell Turtle in Canada." ~ Species-at-risk biologists at the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, Sept. 2017, Environmental Assessment Update, Attachment 1. http://secure-web.cisco.com/10bacEezB7MNvxD2M2ozSw6joS9cHz4c2qgy-8ktcyXZMcnS-MduBVU-UStRFjo6SEcdezaCXOwFObZ5pG4SXou__EtPg5L8Pgy_rH5nerA0evVFu1vWodfVnlPrFasIHeNp31xhh7HCoFYOCps2dQWfZuwp7Dhwd9tGi9qu8B2PkFBigLwYrRac2vMyqt dbDMYFVdla0ixXH43Phy6tPQWh2p2N4PkK3WAHTkWujcg1Ti6BCY1iT1VNmK3o50Gt_lkM5iGz7tGlCgaVhtTXQQ_PQbXUVh2VN3--BMU1r20OpBS2rePC3UxQGykv1Ud2LWTkocpW33lr4dbIXc9VaWyGp_INmFPPJsXfQeI4U9SK71bY3bNiXx_n1sRSgB3mQRbcv-PAaJ5-SN_KbAyQd1UI4HjR5P4iUf3B9mEsrqABsLjx69xax71Kt9oORkNBKQp42WUo6MwYe3RwTRJptESCQo4jjYcKq7TEiLTKcME/http%3A%2F%2Fsire.london.ca%2Fcache%2F%2Fxsq1g045purmuz45ctolgm55%2F30261409222017083641711.PDF</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/22/2017	E-mail	<p>(Continued) OPINION: "My opinion is that those species will not be impacted in any significant way by the dam being up. All the runs of fish are supposed to be over when the dam goes in every summer." ~ Simon Tanner, former president and longtime member of the London Canoe Club, LFP, Sept. 22, 2017. http://www.lfpress.com/2017/09/21/springbank-dam-london-mayor-is-not-saying-a-dam-thing-after-blunt-report</p> <p>FACT: "Timing dam operations around critical [Spiny Softshell Turtle] activities cannot be accomplished since nesting, incubation and hatching times can extend from May to October." ~ Species-at-risk biologists at the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority, Sept. 2017, Environmental Assessment Update, Attachment 1. http://secure-web.cisco.com/10bacEezB7MNvxD2M2ozSw6joS9cHz4c2qgy-8kscyXZMcnS-MduBVU-UStRFjo6SEcdezaCXOwFObZ5pG4SXou__EtPg5L8Pgy_rH5nerA0evVFu1vWodfVnlPrFasIHeNp31xhh7HCoFYOCps2dQWfZuwp7Dhwd9tGi9qu8B2PkFBigLwYrRac2vMyqt dbDMYFVdla0ixXH43Phy6tPQWh2p2N4PkK3WAHTkWujcg1Ti6BCY1iT1VNmK3o50Gt_lkM5iGz7tGlCgaVhtTXQQ_PQbXUVh2VN3--BMU1r20OpBS2rePC3UxQGykv1Ud2LWTkocpW33lr4dbIXc9VaWyGp_INmFPPJsXfQel4U9SK71bY3bNiXx_n1sRSgB3mQRbcv-PAaJ5-SN_KbAyQd1UI4HjR5P4iUf3B9mEsrqABsLjx69xax71Kt9oORkNBKQp42WUo6MwYe3RwTRJPtESCQo4jjYcKq7TEiLTKCmE/http%3A%2F%2Fsire.london.ca%2Fcache%2F2%2Fxsg1g045purmuz45ctolgm55%2F30261409222017083641711.PDF</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/25/2017	E-mail	<p>DAM-BUSTER: The damaged Springbank Dam shortly after the surging Thames River blew the dam open after heavy rains on July 9, 2000.</p> <p>UTRCA staff didn't get to the dam in time to open the old stop-log dam before the surging river hit the dam. PHOTO: Cheryl Lynn.</p> <p>This is where it all began for the journey to finally decommissioning the Springbank Dam 17-18 years later. Rivers gotta run and fish gotta swim!</p>			
9/22/2017	E-mail	<p>Giving you first crack at this.</p> <p>The dam currently has four sluice gates. Keep one as is, while a second could be raised two feet, a third four feet, and the last six feet. By closing off the first gate, the water would rise two feet, giving canoeist greater access to the river. By closing the first and second gate, the water would rise four feet to the level of the third gate, thus allowing greater activities at the forks of the Thames. After such activities the water level could easily return to a lower level. The first drop gate would be seven feet in height, while the second five feet, and the third, three feet. Each gate has a sloping ramp down stream to allow for migration of natural species to migrate upstream.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/22/2017	E-mail	<p>The knocked-out Springbank Dam has led to “one of the single most significant, measurable improvements in any stretch of the Thames River watershed,” Ian Wilcox, the Upper Thames River Conservation Authority’s general manager, said by email in response to Free Press questions.</p> <p>“By every measure it [the river] is a healthier system than existed while the dam was in operation,” Wilcox noted, adding “water quality has improved, new aquatic habitat has been created and numerous species have benefited.”</p>			
10/17/2017	E-mail	<p>Ashley I am unable to attend either meeting for the issue before us about the dam but I am one of the people who signed and pushed the petition. I believe that it should be decommissioned at this point and allow nature to be left alone. A whole new eco-system has built up and to repair that dam or disturb it in any way wasting more funds makes no fiscal sense.</p> <p>My vote for a foot bridge that doesn't disturb nature but adds to the beauty of the area for all to enjoy would be a wonderful idea. I don't know much about the bolts and doors but I understand you might have to blast in order to remove such things? Again why waste the money. I'm not an engineer just an animal lover but a person who knows we must be practical too.</p> <p>So 1) don't disturb the current eco-system 2) decommission the dam 3) make it a foot bridge</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>			
10/17/2017	E-mail	<p>Ashley... Please decommission the Dam... if it can be repurposed as a walkway so be it but I suspect there will lots of ongoing costs... Cheers...</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/17/2017	E-mail	<p>Dear Ashley Meloo,</p> <p>Thank you for taking interest in public considerations regarding the Springbank Dam. I hope that the dam will be decommissioned and the river returned to a more natural state, allowing for the environment to flourish, and be enjoyed by humans and creatures alike without interference.</p> <p>thank you</p>			
10/17/2017	E-mail	<p>Hello Ashley and Daniel,</p> <p>I am not able to attend the upcoming public sessions on the dam, however would like to provide my feedback. I am in favour of either doing nothing or decommissioning the dam, if that is a better option for the health of the river. I am not in favour of fixing the dam to make it operational.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/17/2017	E-mail	<p>Springbank river Thames and the dam have been a part of my life and my family since September 1973 when we emigrated to Canada from England. Water has always been a draw and the sport it allows us gives great pleasure and fitness.</p> <p>We started by walking by the river watching others enjoy it to the full. We saw fishing, canoeing, water skiing and dragon boat race practicing.</p> <p>We wanted to join in on this river fun. Over the years we have fished with our kids, canoed, waterskied, jet ski and enjoyed many picnics by the water. We have taken the dinner cruises. Used the river taxi to downtown to forks of the Thames and enjoyed all the changes that years passed offered.</p> <p>Today we would love to Paddleboard but it's not possible as the water is not deep enough in Springbank Park. We have lost so much since the canoe club moved and the dragon boats are no longer here.</p> <p>A decision was made a long time ago to fix and repair the dam. Just because that upgrade went wrong that is no reason not to fix the dam. I have no idea what changed that original decision. If our trusted city politicians who I assume discussed it to the full before voting on the fix truly looked into what was involved then the best decision was made so it should be upheld. Animal rights should have been addressed back then. So let's fix it.</p> <p>I have lived in Byron for 44 years and that river and dam means a lot to me so please fix it.</p> <p>Thanks</p>			
10/17/2017	E-mail	<p>Hello</p> <p>We do not want the Springbank Dam repaired. The river is much healthier without it. When the dam was operating, the water was smelly and stagnant. It was so much so, that our family could not enjoy a walk beside it in the summer..</p> <p>There are also endangered species that are thriving in and along the river, because the river is flowing and healthier.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/18/2017	E-mail	I want the dam decommissioned if that is what is required to build a walking bridge across the existing structure. I want the river to run free. We have already wasted too much money on that dam. It is a crime. Only remove what must be removed or leave it alone if no walking bridge is to be built. Thank you			
10/17/2017	E-mail	Hi, I strongly urge the City of London to decommission the Springbank Dam. It could become a walking / bicycling bridge if trails exist on both sides of the river. If no trails exist why not build some. Let the river run free of obstacles.			
9/27/2017	E-mail	KEY QUESTION: What would be the City of London's justification ("net benefit") for destroying essential habitat of protected species-at-risk (by repairing and reinstating the Springbank Dam) since paddling already occurs on the river without the Springbank Dam? Perceived "esthetics" don't cut it with the federal and provincial regulatory agencies with a mandate to protect our natural resources, nor should they.			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/17/2017	E-mail	<p>Dear Friends:</p> <p>Please consider my feelings in relation to the One River Master Plan. I feel very strongly that there is no need or advantage to rebuilding the Springbank Dam. The Thames River is naturalizing and revitalizing. The Thames River is becoming much cleaner and healthier since the dam has been out of service. We need more vantage points to visually experience the river and appreciate the naturalizing landscape. We need more access points to facilitate fishing, boating and interacting with the river. These amenities should be available all along the river and it's tributaries, not exclusively focused in the downtown. The master plan should highlight ways and means to accelerate the on-going naturalization process.</p> <p>London's relationship via untreated sewage etc. to the toxic algae bloom in Lake Erie is also of grave concern to me. This crisis must be addressed in the Master Plan.</p> <p>Thank You</p>			
10/17/2017	E-mail	<p>Dear Ashley, Tom & Daniel;</p> <p>As I am unable to attend the 2 consultation sessions, I would like to submit my input in this email. Unless the remains of the dam structure further impedes & interferes with the river I see no reason to remove it & spend money on removal. I think the gates & hydraulics should be removed & sold to recoup some of the expense, as they are no longer needed. If feasible & affordable it would be lovely to create a walking trail across the dam. I am so delighted with the way the river has recovered without the dam, and living near the river I see the positive effect it has had on the wildlife.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/19/2017	E-mail	<p>A few small fish recently scoop-netted at random from the Thames River near downtown London.</p> <p>The hardened silt that used to smother the natural cobble bottom has been washed away due to the year-round, free-flowing river. The river now has a beautiful cobble bottom with nice gravel bars throughout the previously dammed section of the river. The riffle and pool formations keep getting better each year as well. Basically, cobble is habitat and structure for periphyton to grow on. Crayfish and insect larvae feed on the periphyton and pass the energy up the food chain to an incredibly diverse community of fish.</p>			
10/18/2017	E-mail	<p>I am unable to attend either of the meetings regarding "One River", but I am definitely in favour of having the Springbank dam decommissioned.</p> <p>As a longtime resident living on Riverside Dr with the river in my back yard I have witnessed many changes over the years. When the dam was in, the river was like a stagnant dead pool. In the summer it was so polluted and smelly I didn't even like sitting out in my back yard.</p> <p>Since the dam has been broken and the river is running free I've noticed a huge improvement in the quality of the water including the wildlife that use it. I frequently see Great Blue Herons along the shore as well as Spiny Softshell turtles and even Egrets. It lovely to see some of these rare wildlife creatures enjoying a much cleaner river.</p> <p>So please, please consider decommissioning the Springbank dam for the sake of humans and wildlife alike.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/18/2017	E-mail	<p>Ashley,</p> <p>I am unable to attend the public consultation meeting but do wish to share my feeling about what should be done with the springbank dam.</p> <p>My thought is that the dam should be decommissioned and repurposed as an observation platform. Plaques could be placed on the damn providing information about the types of wildlife and fish that live in the river. An area of the damn could possibly be made available for fishing.</p> <p>It has been so much more pleasant to spend time near the river with the water free flowing than it ever was with an elevated level of stagnant water trapped by the old dam.</p> <p>Please consider my ideas and add them to the others submitted for consideration.</p> <p>Best regards,</p>			
10/18/2017	E-mail	<p>Good day</p> <p>I cannot attend the meting, but would like to comment.</p> <p>As I told Mayor Brown personally a few weeks ago, I am in favor of leaving the dam open at springback. Removing the dam hares and create a walking bridge with the structure would be ideal.</p> <p>Damming up the river would create another cesspool. The canoe club can continue at Fanshawe.</p> <p>To many species are at risk if the dam is closed</p>			

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/18/2017	E-mail	<p>Good Morning Ashley M. Rammeloo,</p> <p>In regards to the defunct dam at Springbank, I say leave it alone as is, waste no more money.</p> <p>I grew up in Oakridge Acres and played down by the river by Thames Valley Golf course and near Hutton side road now Wonderland road. The river always smelled like a cess pool. When we go for walks along the trails now the river looks and smells cleaner. There is more then enough depth for canoists in the present day river.</p> <p>If the dam must be altered (doors removed), why can not there be a gentle inverse vee shapped weir be made between the supports with a gentle fish ladder imbedded in the centre of one of the weir sections.</p> <p>This could provide oxygenation as well as a slight increase in depth to the water behind the wier without effecting the enviornment existing today. They can make a walkway on the top of the present structure as some residents have suggested and I agree to</p>			
10/18/2017	E-mail	<p>Because I am not able to attend the public meetings regarding the future of the Springbank Dam, I am writing with my comments. I believe the Dam should not be repaired but should be decommissioned. If it is possible to repurpose the structure in a way that allows for the free flow of the river, I would be in favour of this. The health of the river should be the primary concern.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/19/2017	E-mail	Hi Ashley, I would like to see the Springbank dam decomissioned and the structure repurposed, perhaps as a viewing platform. The amazing biodiversity of the Thames could be highlighted on educational panels included on the structure. Endangered species such as the eastern spiny soft shell turtle have been increasing in population since the dam has remained open. There has also been a marked increase in general species richness along the now increased banks of the river. It seems clear to me the decision that should be made is to decomission the structure. Thanks			
10/18/2017	E-mail	I favour decommissioning and possibly repurposing the dam as a walking bridge.			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/19/2017	E-mail	<p>One River Project General: I have read the detailed material as best as I could on the dam. I am entirely sympathetic to environmental issues. If you look at the current Pinery Park first web screen you will see the Bittersweet Trail featured. Ettiore Delvecchio and I designed, laid out and wrote the guide for this trail over the winter of 1971 and the spring of 1972. The theme is the struggle of one form of plant life against another for survival much akin to the issue of endangered species in the Thames. The two are not fully analogous but the results are the same. Some things live while others die. About 250 000 000 once endangered species have become extinct during the eras we have studied. This leads me to some thoughts about the current circumstances. I can find no paradigm for a scientific study in what I have been provided. There are scientific methods that gather empirical data and apply measures of reliability and validity before drawing conclusions. This has led me to a series of questions that require answers. It would likely be best if these were put to Ministry representatives by Councillors.</p> <p>Habitat</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is the distance of river affected that critical as there were many stretches of the river prior to the dam breaking that are were the same as the stretch in Springbank now? 2. ten years has been enough for this dramatic an ecological change 3. when were the species first noted in this stretch? 4. where had they been previously? 5. were they declared endangered in previous habitat? 			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued)</p> <p>6. the stretch from Fanshawe to Springbank had similar habitats to how it is now from Adelaide through to Gibbons</p> <p>7. these stretches had varied depths over the past 130 years did the endangered species exist in these areas?</p> <p>8. the exact same habitat existed for 130 years from Boler Rd. through Delaware as far as Sharon Bridge as I fished this stretch over the years</p> <p>9. were the species in question known in these stretches previously?</p> <p>10. have there been negative impacts on other species due to the dam breaking?</p> <p>11. anecdotal evidence is that way less black bass are being caught off Commissioners at Dorchester (not sure dam was causal because of dam behind Labatts)</p> <p>12. was there ever or is there now any study to give meaningful data on this issue?</p> <p>13. the current general appearance of the habitat being created is not appealing</p> <p>14. there are dams not mentioned at Woodstock, Thamesford and Carfrae that appear to have no impact on the species endangered</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/19/2017	E-mail	<p>(Continued) Species;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. when were these species first identified? 2. when and how were they declared endangered? 3. did this take place prior to 2008? where did they exist prior to 2008? 4. did this take place in this stretch of water affected prior to 2008? 5. what were the historical counts for these species every ten years since say 1960? 6. what were these counts in the stretch of river affected by the dam both before and after the dam breaking down at Springbank? 7. what specific roles do each of these species play in their ecosystem? 8. are they a part of a food chain for other species? 9. is their role critical in any way? 10. are they adaptable enough to survive again as they once must have? 11. are there reasons they are endangered that the dam decision will have little effect? 12. all turtles are endangered due to global warming why is this one special? 			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
 Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued)</p> <p>Random Thoughts</p> <p>I was going to a meeting but I got the sense the restoration of the dam is a lost cause because the main Ministries involved have spoken against. The one that said it had to be comparable to the new bridge in Windsor was particularly offensive. I think improving the aesthetics, recreational opportunities and any economic benefits that may accrue are just as Important to Londoners as getting snowbirds to Florida and golfers to Myrtle Beach. The Council should keep in mind the litany of ecological failures these Ministries have overseen from clear cut logging in Provincial Parks to allowing agricultural pollution to decimate fish populations in rivers and streams (my grandfather caught trout in Pottersburg Creek in 1911). At a minimum Councillors preserve as much of the dam as possible and make certain the Ministries have to keep proving their case on an ongoing basis. Much can change in twenty years. The turtle, the minnow and the clam may fall into perspective.</p>			

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/19/2017	E-mail	<p>I am most concerned that the Springbank Dam will not be repaired. This for a hundred years has been a fine recreational site for thousands of Londoners, the site of Canada's Olympic Rowing team, a beautiful winding full river used by kayakers, canoeists, rowers, fishermen close to the city centre so able to be used and appreciated by all segments of society, not just the elites.</p> <p>Many object to its revival, but why? Why is a 5 km stretch of a 200 km long river so important to the health of the river, the great lakes and endangered species? Why is this when there are many other dams on the river (Fanshawe, Pittock, Wildwood, Stratford to name only a few) especially considering it is only in operation less than 5 months of the year and not in the critical period of fish movement? Why is a dam so bad for the environment when beavers have for millions of years been building dams and improving the environment to the great benefit of both flora and fauna.</p> <p>Why is there no evidence yet provided that the dam's failure for the past 8 years has made the river more healthy? Yes, it is more healthy, but isn't this because of other factors, such as the improvement to the Greenway Pollution plant, the building of storm management ponds reducing runoff into the river, and the banning of pesticides for gardens as well as the reduction of fertilizers in local farming?</p> <p>Why would London forgo the beauty and economic benefits of a beautiful river only to keep a small creek running through the city benefiting nobody not even wildlife (except perhaps deer now using the dry river bed as a route into downtown).</p> <p>Are we going back to the river or turning our backs to it?\</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/19/2017	E-mail	<p>I attended yesterday's info centre at the Library. Thanks for the opportunity . Talked to several folks with name tags but remain a bit confused by the options detail and questionnaire in which I selected the 1) do nothing based on the assurance/impression that the steel gates and hydraulics would be removed for safety and passage reasons. So it's not a do nothing option but one that requires the least amount of \$ expenditures and red tape from structural removals? ? The 2nd option complete removal I had as second preference because of the relative impact \$\$ costs and approvals but nevertheless a freer flowing river is indeed a desirable option . The 3rd option is a non-starter or should be in my view -- aside from some face saving bias and superficial nostalgia . Odd that repurposing concept was include in 2 and 3 (polling?) but not 1 where the river based columns would remain???</p> <p>I hope that we will gain a bit more clarity as this decision making proceeds because the information and questionnaire left my questions unanswered-- aside from the weight of environmental evidence not enabling option 3 Options 1 and 2 should be cumulative rather than divisive in tabulation!</p>	10/21/2017	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Thank you for attending last night's PIC and your engagement in the One River process.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment Act requires an EA to consider a "Do Nothing" option, even if we know it is not feasible. "Do Nothing" is literally that – no repairs, no alterations, no repurposing. In this case, "do nothing" results in a free flowing river since the dam is non-operable without repairs being done. We understand that this can create some confusion between Alternatives 1 and 2.</p> <p>Once we make any changes to the structure, such as removing gates, it falls under Alternative 2. Alternative 2 does not dictate full removal of the dam, but rather decommissioning it – no longer using it to hold back water. If that is the selected alternative, we will then evaluate the best course of action, whether it is to remove the gates only or to remove the entire structure.</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
					<p>(Continued) I hope this clarifies the alternatives, and I will ensure all project team members have a better explanation for those who attend tonight's PIC. I would agree with you that a vote for Alternative 1 falls on the "no dam" side of the argument. If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to ask.</p>
10/19/2017	E-mail	<p>Thank you for the prompt reply. Much appreciated</p> <p>Regrettably the verbal assurance we got "do nothing doesn't mean do nothing—because of safety considerations" inclined me to select option 1 and writing in removal of gates and hydraulics. To me a "free flowing" river and decommissioning include removal of the 3 central columns and the side barriers/constricting the flow. Also the concrete base /raceway . Since there is this confusion , I would reiterate that options 1 and 2 should be summed up to not repairing/operating this dam since they are clearly contrary to option 3 and should not be used to "split this body of input."</p> <p>Since the cost aspects , timing and complexity was provided in a table –aligning the 3 options with this informative criteria prompted me to choose the "lowest hanging fruit option" as being most readily quickly achievable.</p> <p>If option 1) is that literally interpreted then how is option 2 without total removal of structures a "free flowing River?"</p> <p>We also raised the COL's fish passage study Biotactics, , as evidence that the gates do and continue to represent a barrier to passage of some species –seasonal flow related issue</p> <p>Please consider this as supplementary input which now leads me to select the #2 option based on your clarification</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/22/2017	E-mail	<p>Ashley, Dan and Tom, It is mentioned on the GetInvolved site and at the PIC I was told there would be an online survey available Friday along with the information from the boards presented.</p> <p>There are quite a few people and organizations interested in providing feedback that could not attend those events. Will they be live tomorrow?</p>	10/22/2017	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Hi Robert,</p> <p>Yes, there was a delay getting the final boards for posting on Friday, so it will all be posted tomorrow.</p> <p>Ashley</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/20/2017	E-mail	<p>Hi Stephen,</p> <p>A concerned resident called and left a message. Her opinion is to not repair the dam, she thinks that you should let the river run free. I called her back to ask if we could share her view with staff and also explained that you are in favour of a healthy river and that Council did not bring the issue forward. She was very pleased to have the call back and wanted to pass on the following two points to staff:</p> <p>Regarding the Back to the River dreams of boating - people have fond memories, however between 20-30 years ago, they used to have a dock and row boats and paddle boats down by the merry-go-round, as well as a replica steam boat. They all went broke, couldn't make any money then and the river was high. Times have changed and there was even talk of getting rid of the merry-go-round. She doesn't think the dream boats would get filled.</p> <p>Secondly, the dam used to catch garbage - flotsam and jetsam piles up against the dam. Will the people be willing to go roll up their sleeves to collect that garbage? She doesn't think so. She thinks that no dam is better for people and animals alike.</p> <p>There is no need to call her back unless you would like to.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Elizabeth Hunt (Appleton) Administrative Assistant Elected Officials, Councillors' Office City of London</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/25/2017	Letter	<p>To Whome it might concer:</p> <p>Re: "Springbank Dam"</p> <p>1) In our opinion it should be left as is 2) It isn't doing any harm, in fact in my 70 years have never seen it so clean. 3) The city CANNOT afford to have it repaired ot the labour costs to tear it down 4) I am a resident of Byron, and there should be a meeting IN Byron, as we are the most affected by it. 5) If the city proceeds with what some of our councillors want, you can be very sure our taxes will go up.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>			
10/25/2017	E-mail	<p>I am 16 years old, I have lived in London all my life and hope not to see the dam again. I think it's time we let the life in the river flourish and grow while it can. In the summer my dad and I bike along the river and count turtles in the river, this year I had the amazing pleasure of holding and releasing a young soft shell turtle into the river. It was breathtaking and I hope that it can have a full life without the dangers the dam will bring.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
12/16/2017	E-mail	<p>Louis 14th did a great job of Paris. Canal St-Martin provided an underground controlled river waterway for drainage - they could force it to flood up through the man holes everyday to wash away the streets.....The lake they created through dams in the middle of Paris kept the city cool- allowed waterskiing behind motor boats in August —.....So far- sighted. Do the citizens not realize that our river is not free-flowing??? It has 50 or so dams along its length.....Why do these ill-informed people get to be so loud and so noticed?????</p> <p>I do feel for Delaware, though, with that mid-summer trickle of reduced flow should a dam close at Springbank Park. My solution - build a dam that we can open and close — and, build that dam below Delaware to keep the level of water up for recreational purposes in that area of South Western Ontario as well as in London. So much water, so much wasted that could stop for a time here at the Forks and be admired and utilized.....</p>			
12/18/2017	Not specified	<p>I walk along the Thames River almost every day in the summer The Thames River may be in great shape flowing freely, however, no one can use it because the water level are usually so low during summer. In the four years that I have walked it, I can count on both hands the number of anglers! I do see more kayakers bouncing off rocks, putting themselves in danger. Yes the river flows nicely along, sadly I think our river is soooooo under used. I think the dam, the Forks project and the flexible Dundas Street project are all tied together, and, as a group would bring more impact to attracting people to the Forks area. Wouldn't it be wonderful to sit in a restaurant on the banks of the river and have a beverage and dine. No where along the river can you do that.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
12/18/2017	Not specified	<p>(Continued) On Sundays,during July and August, there are 200 people at the Civic Gardens listening to music and entertainment. To me that indicates the potential the River holds to attract people. I see no reason why the dam cannot be used in a flexible manner and raise it in low water times and lower in in times of heavy run off or sewage leakage. Surely we can have two kilometers of the river for people while it flows freely below the dam with a place for all the natural species that live in the other 200 kilometers. I hope that you will vote for the repair of the dam so it can be used in a flexible manner. Thanks for reading this message.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
1/5/2018	Not specified	<p>Thank you for the prompt reply. Much appreciated</p> <p>Regrettably the verbal assurance we got “do nothing doesn’t mean do nothing—because of safety considerations” inclined me to select option 1 and writing in removal of gates and hydraulics. To me a “free flowing” river and decommissioning include removal of the 3 central columns and the side barriers/constricting the flow. Also the concrete base /raceway . Since there is this confusion , I would reiterate that options 1 and 2 should be summed up to not repairing/operating this dam since they are clearly contrary to option 3 and should not be used to “split this body of input.”</p> <p>Since the cost aspects , timing and complexity was provided in a table –aligning the 3 options with this informative criteria prompted me to choose the “lowest hanging fruit option” as being most readily quickly achievable.</p> <p>If option 1) is that literally interpreted then how is option 2 without total removal of structures a “free flowing River?”</p> <p>We also raised the COL’s fish passage study Biotactics, , as evidence that the gates do and continue to represent a barrier to passage of some species –seasonal flow related issue</p> <p>Please consider this as supplementary input which now leads me to select the #2 option based on your clarification</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
1/9/2018	E-mail	<p>Hello</p> <p>I am writing about the river. I was very disappointed of the results that were reported in the news. Every great city has a river that is usable, whether it is for recreation or competition. It unites people and it becomes the heart of the city. London without a river that people can use, becomes a city that is merely burdened by a body of water that people have to navigate around. If the river becomes a river that residents can use, then there will be a sense of pride and excitement to find out what activities are happening on the river.</p> <p>The list becomes endless for on water activities: canoeing, kayaking, rowing paddle boarding and many other activities that currently we may not even know about. The river becomes a meeting point for young families, for skilled sports people to display their talents and teach others and simply for those who just want to enjoy the outdoors. How lucky we were to have the female national rowing team in London for so many years. What an inspiration it would have been had kids seen them row on the river. I am sure future Olympians could have been the result. Businesses could thrive as well. Sporting events that attract food vendors and others. The economic impact can be enormous.</p> <p>With future unpredictable weather, the dam becomes a necessity. Rising and falling water will erode the banks and flood those areas that are not meant to flood. With so much snow on the ground, once the weather warms up, where will all that water go? Aren't we worried about accidents along the banks if we can't control rushing water?</p> <p>I beg you to reconsider and look to other cities that have become great cities because of rivers that people can use and enjoy.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
1/17/2018	E-mail	<p>Dear Ashley,</p> <p>I hope all is well with you this day. I grew up just west of London and have recently returned home to live here again. Having grown up as a young boy in the Byron area the Springbank dam has always been a part of life in that area.</p> <p>I have read many studies and researched many water retention sights on line in looking for a solution to the Thames River situation in London. I suggest lets try something new and reinvent the concept of river control and aquatic life sustainability. Some conclusions I have determined, which may or may not be implementable, and need further investigation before the river debate is totally shelved, are as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scrap the current dam configuration and return this area to natural appearance • to retain a minimum of three feet of water in the downtown core for recreational use while saving the aquatic life and return of improved water conditions that is happening without the dam <p>To accomplish this I propose a series of two or three water control structures that would retain the minimum water level while allowing waters to pass by under them, and over them in times of high water. This could provide a slowing of river waters down stream in times of water excesses. Such a structure could be as simple as the square log retention structures, used throughout Ontario for flood control.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued)</p> <p>Only in this case with these logs not reaching the floor of the river allowing water and aquatic life to pass underneath. Having the logs a foot above the river bed, to retain the desired water level.</p> <p>Based on river elevations and the height of land topographical feasibility, starting, approximately at the Wonderland Road bridge back through the core of the city to allow the best of two worlds, recreational use and preservation of aquatic life.</p> <p>These structure could have a portage point at one end allowing passage over each by carrying or pulling a small water craft and to allow a continual passage for those that like to paddle and enjoy being on the water.</p> <p>I have not been able to find a good topographical cross section map to show the height of land to ascertain if this is a conceivable concept but I feel there is a way to accommodate both goals if we look further into a method to achieve what is best for all concerned and a great return to the river solution.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
2/13/2018	E-mail	<p>Hello Ashley Rammeloo and Daniel Hsia, My name is Neil and my companyt helps surfers build surfing waves and strong surf communities around the world. I have been contacted by a group of London citizens regarding helping them build recreational river waves on the Thames as part of the One River project. Good river waves provide substantial and lasting economic, cultural and environmental benefits. Are you available for a brief conversation?</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	2/14/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Hi Neil,</p> <p>Is this within the river itself, or a manmade structure next to the river?</p> <p>If it is within the river itself, you should be aware that Council recently accepted the staff recommendation to decommission a recreational dam on the river. I'm not sure how your infrastructure compares, or if it would be compatible with a seasonally shallow river and endangered species habitat. I have passed the information along to our consultant for review.</p> <p>Thanks, Ashley Rammeloo</p>
2/14/2018	E-mail	<p>[In response to initial comments in the above entry] Hello Ashley,</p> <p>Thanks for the quick response. The structure would be within the river itself. I am aware of the decision to decommission the Springbank dam. The waves are compatible with seasonally shallow rivers. The work can be done in environmentally sensitive areas and these projects can have substantial net environmental benefits along with major economic and cultural benefits. The minimum flow requirements for a wave is 5 m³/s and often waves are built with parallel natural channels and recreational waves channels.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
5/9/2018	Not specified	<p>Hi Ashley,</p> <p>I was reading about the proposed Thames River Project .I am hoping this proposal includes canoe access to the Thames River. Some years ago, my family loved renting canoes, from the London Canoe club and paddling on the Thames River. It was a great way to spend a summer evening, or weekend! We also enjoyed watching the boat races that took place there. They drew a lot of people. Consequently, it is my opinion that any project for this river , should necessarily include access for canoeing, i.e as it did in the past. The London Canoe club could then be reinstated. This club, staffed by volunteers, provided affordable and enjoyable recreation, for families of all ages to enjoy. Please bring that back to London!</p> <p>Thanks for considering my suggestion.</p>			
6/1/2018	Not specified	<p>leave mother nature alone! Why do we insist on tinkering with a river that has been around since the dawn of time. Fanshawe Dam is doing its job. People are fishing, enjoying the serenity of a river. With teh damn dam out of the picture, let it be. or is this a make work project. The Springbank Dam failed due to an engineers screw up! I suggested at time, placing railway ties across teh dam site to increase the level of water, but turns out, the river is healthier now. So leave it alone.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
1/9/2018	Letter	<p>Healthy Rivers – Healthy Communities 9 January 2018 Civic Works Committee: Councillor Virginia Ridley (Chair), Councillor Tanya Park (Vice Chair), Councillor Phil Squire, Councillor Paul Hubert, Councillor Harold Usher, Mayor Matt Brown. Re: One River Stage 1 Master Plan Environmental Assessment Report – Springbank Dam Dear Civic Works Committee Members: The Thames River Anglers Association, the Ontario Rivers Alliance, and those listed below, are pleased to offer our feedback on the findings and recommendations with respect to the preferred options for the Springbank Dam, as set out in the One River Stage 1 Master Plan Environmental Assessment Report (EA). After carefully reviewing the various reports and supplemental documents contained in the EA, we offer our support for the preferred recommended option of a “Free-Flowing River”, through the decommissioning of Springbank Dam so that it no longer provides a water retention function. The City of London, consultants and provincial regulatory agencies are to be commended for their combined effort in submitting such a comprehensive and thorough series of reports.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
1/9/2018	Letter	<p>(Continued) Ample opportunity was provided to stakeholders to communicate fully and effectively in a consultation process that demonstrates an open and transparent science and evidence based decision making framework. Given the level of detail in the EA, we are optimistic that the preferred overall river management strategy to be explored in Stage 2 will ensure a successful final outcome for the Thames River. The decommissioning of Springbank Dam would demonstrate that our community understands the value and importance of protecting our fresh water, as well as the diverse species of fish, turtles, mussels and plants that inhabit the Thames River Watershed. We urge the Civic Works Committee to recommend the preferred “Free-Flowing River” option to City Council. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Respectfully, Robert Huber President, Thames River Anglers Association Vice Chair, Ontario Rivers Alliance www.Anglers.org www.OntarioRiversAlliance.ca 519-630-1892</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/5/2018	Letter	<p>Suite 203-240 Wharnctffe Rd. N London, Ontario N6H4P2 September 4, 2018 ATTN: Ms. Ashley Rammeloo, P. Eng Environmental and Engineering Services City of London 300 Dufferin Ave London ON N6A4L9</p> <p>Dear Ms. Rammeloo:</p> <p>This letter is written with the intention of promoting the return of rowing on the River Thames where it flows through the City of London.</p> <p>I have been a member of the London Rowing Club for 43 years during which time the club has enjoyed periods with a membership of 250 oarsmen and women involved in different programs ranging from complete novices to national team members. Since the Springbank Dam broke, the membership has declined significantly because we are forced to take to the water at Fanshawe Lake. It is simply too far for most young people to travel. This is unfortunate because London Rowing Club was once the third most successful rowing club in Canada and was repeatedly bringing credit to this city. Together with the London Canoe Club activity on the river from Springbank Park to the Forks was a constant sight and many Londoners gathered at the Club House on summer days and evenings to picnic. Exposure to these sports most definitely encouraged future membership.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/5/2018	Letter	<p>(Continued) The rowing and canoeing facility on Wonderland Road was paid for by many benevolent donors who saw the perpetuity of the clubs as beneficial to the city. While it is recognised that the city owns the facility there is a moral obligation to continue operating the building in order to promote the sports in a manner which the donors envisaged. Unfortunately the majority of current London Rowing Club members have never rowed on the river which is perhaps one of the best venues for novice athletes to be introduced to this sport. Together with the rowing tank located at the back of the building there is a strong probability that the recreational and schools rowing programs can expand again if we have access to the river thereby enabling athletes to aspire to greater accomplishments. Allowing access to the river will reconnect people with the Thames. I will now list some issues that need consideration.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued)</p> <p>1. The Launching of Boats. The much reduced width of the river now makes it virtually impossible to have four and eight person crews training on the water but single sculls can certainly operate on a mote confined stretch of water. The existing concrete steps at the present facility would need to be extended out into the middle of the river. Selective boulder removal and perhaps a small amount of dredging would enable small rowing shells to row in both directions, downstream to the Springbank Dam and upstream to Wharncliffe Road bridge. That stretch of water by the pollution plant may still permit four parallel 1000 metre lanes. A racing lane needs to be 13.5 metres wide. Where racing would not be feasible due to the bends and narrowing of the river a width of 20 metres will allow small boats to travel opposite directions.</p> <p>2. Alternative facility. If access to the river close the current rowing facility is not possible an alternative site maybe upstream of the Richmond Street weir. Such a building would not need to be as large as the current facility because larger boats being unable to negotiate the tight bends could not be used. Again the water needs to be at least three feet deep and have a width of 52 yards for 1000 metres to provide a racing course. That however is not essential because even a stretch of water 20 yards wide with gradual bends will still allow small boats to pass in opposite directions. Reaching the water from a new facility will require concrete steps similar to those located at the current facility.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
9/5/2018	Letter	<p>(Continued) 3. Cost. Over the last 12 years the growth of vegetation has obliterated access to the river at the current facility. There will be a cost to cutting down those trees and extending the steps out into the river. Nevertheless that is a much cheaper option than building of a new facility. These are just introductory comments which are the basis for consideration and investigation. Perhaps the most appropriate method of exploring options is to actually take to the water and assess the feasibilities. I am happy to respond to any questions that you may have. cc: Mr. Daniel Hsia Mr. Andrew MacPherson</p>			
9/23/2018	E-mail	<p>Without the dam to control the level of the river, Londoners will not be able to consistently enjoy (use) the river for recreational purposes. As far as I'm concerned, that one bad decision has ruined the chance for any meaningful connection to the river through development and recreation. This is running contrary to any world-class city on a river. Too bad. Maybe the next municipal government will convince people to give their head a shake.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/1/2018	E-mail	<p>Good morning Ashley, I likely will not be able to attend the public meeting on Wed., and therefore am glad the public are given an opportunity for input regarding the Thames.</p> <p>For several years, the city has been 'studying' what to do about the river. In my humble opinion, i think, in as much as is possible, the river is best left alone. The more humans interfere, the worse the water quality becomes. Much interference, and building along a river is harmful, and very costly.</p> <p>The most important thing about the river is the water, therefore, we need to focus on keeping the water healthy. This will benefit us the most. The more we build, and make more accessible areas with concrete and many other materials, the more this will ultimately impact the water quality. The tens of thousands of dollars we spend on 'studies' and coming up with new master plans, (which basically get renamed with fancy titles and filled with much rhetoric) is absolutely better spent on repairing the outdated storm water and sewage systems, for example.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/1/2018	E-mail	<p>(Continued) I know the city is working on these projects of separating the pipes, which is the kindest thing one can do to a water way, (and to our health). This should be top priority for our hard earned tax dollars. The river is still receiving raw sewage, and this along with so many other pollutants which run into the river, cannot be good for life in and around the river. The Thames flows to Lake St. Clair which goes to Lake Erie and we receive some of our drinking water from that lake. What can be more important than our water (and air)?</p> <p>We seem to be living in a time when everything around us needs to possess some sort of entertainment value. We do a disservice to nature by thinking about the natural environment in this manner. Naturally we are curious and we can learn much about and from our natural world, but it can be done in a respectful and non-exploitative manner. We can simply enjoy viewing the river on the many pathways we have at present.</p> <p>Our natural environment should not be part of today's selfie circus parade of pictures. Everything we need comes from nature; respect it and it will respect you back.</p>			

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
 Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/12/2018	E-mail	<p>Hi Ashley, I did not have a chance to fill out the form until now. Hope it is still timely. Let me know if you would like more detail. I understand from Arnie that the consultants will be presenting their work to EEPAC. I mentioned to him and his team that EEPAC turns over at the end of February.</p> <p>1. Process has been fine except the EIS is not done and the preferred alternatives have already been selected. Isn't that a little backwards?</p> <p>2. I agree with the partial removal of the Dam. It is the most beneficial to the riparian and aquatic habitat.</p> <p>I disagree with the suspended walkway and terraces. Given the number of months of winter and no current plans for programming at the Forks, this seems to be a "image" project rather than one that meets some objectives that have already been set. Build and they will come is not a good strategy.</p> <p>I disagree with strategic access and use proposal. In the city, recreation seems to have had a greater weighting than environmental protection. This appears to be a "compromise" proposal when the best result for the aquatic and riparian environment would be to spend more effort on restoration and protection given the species at risk in particular. There is already a lookout to the Fountain and a canoe launch with parking at Wonderland and Riverside. You create hard infrastructure you end of providing a lot of pavement for parking (which is another issue with the walkway and terraces - nothing seems to account for how people will arrive at the Forks).</p>	10/12/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Thanks Sandy, I will ensure that this is included.</p> <p>We do have a draft EIS complete. Work was sufficiently complete to inform the preferred alternatives – field work had been done, it was a matter of completing the written report at that time as I understand it.</p> <p>The thought is that directing access to where it is more appropriate and protects habitat is better than allowing people to find their way to their own informal access points, which happens now. We have avoided mapped areas of sensitive habitat with the access point suggestions.</p> <p>The draft EIS is scheduled for the November meeting of EEPAC. We will not be taking the draft EA report to committee until February.</p> <p>Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/14/2018	E-mail	<p>Hello Ashley, Daniel, I have just two question areas for you at this time. The PowerPoint presentation part 2 shows pictures of small boats (canoes, kayaks) in the river forks area. 1) Is boating representative of expectations of the plan? With the Springbank dam decommissioned, what is the expected mean water depth from the forks to the west end of Springbank Park? Is small craft boating an expected result of this project? How far will boats be able to navigate in, say, July and August, from the forks along the full scope of the river? If the dam were not decommissioned, could the boating season be extended to larger boats an for a longer season? 2) I hope I didn't just overlook this. In the budget, how much will maintenance costs be for the entire project once complete? Will maintenance include every day tidying of the area? Will it include maintenance of the greenery? Including weed control? (Observation... a lot of London parkland is overgrown with a wide variety of weeds. These appear all right in the distance, but up close they are UGLY! I assume this showcase for tourism is intended to be immaculate 24x7 for the full summer and autumn.) Thank you.</p>	10/15/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Good afternoon Brent, Thank you for your email. For your first question, yes, the Thames River is often passable for small craft like canoes and kayaks. I suggest you check out the Thames River Paddling Routes project if you are interested in routes, typical flows, etc. as they have done quite a bit of work mapping the Thames and the flow rates at which it is navigable. Their website is https://thamesriverpaddlingroutes.webs.com/?fbclid=IwAR2FbjlQRQ8T4Ok0CJEdd9alwkDwD1i5s6uY567VqPg6xBCjy-TQYAB46uQ. Springbank Dam was strictly a recreational dam, and was built exactly for extending the boating season and allowing larger craft. However, it has not functioned in ten years. Last January Council voted unanimously to endorse the recommendation of the Stage I report to decommission the dam. At this point we are undecided whther to partially or fully removed the structure.</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
					<p>(Continued) The maintenance items included in the budget were only for lifecycle maintenance of the dam structure to ensure its safety for the passing public. Maintenance of the parks areas remain part of the City's operational budget. Some of the overgrowth you have noticed may be due to the influx of invasive species along the shoreline that was previously under water. Part of the river management strategy recommendations is to include these shoreline areas in invasive species removal and mitigation problems. Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/15/2018	E-mail	<p>Hi Ashley, sorry. More questions.</p> <p>a) Did the decision to decommission the dam take into account that "the Thames River is often passable for small craft like canoes and kayaks"? How often is "often"? Is this "often enough"? Some time ago there was a "paddle wheel" boat that ran from Springbank Park to the forks. Is this even feasible if there is no dam? Considering climate change, is it possible (even likely) that the river might become impassible during the summer months? Some time ago there was a "paddle wheel" boat that ran from Springbank Park to the forks. Is this even feasible with no dam? Did the dam decommissioning take into account One River. It seems to me these projects are intertwined...</p> <p>b) If the dam decision failed to account for future dry summers (in precipitation as well as tourism), should it be revisited? Might a new council have a new opinion?</p> <p>c) How much tourism has London lost in the last 10 years as a result of no recreational use of this river segment?</p> <p>d) What is the cost of rebuilding the Springbank dam from scratch once it is decommissioned (2018 dollars)? What is the cost fixing the existing structure? We will soon have a new council. Do you believe they would also vote unanimously to leave the dam decommissioned? Is London guaranteed a climate that will permit significant tourism if the Thames is taken out of the equation?</p>	10/15/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Hi Brent,</p> <p>In short , yes, boating and the fluctuating river level was taken into account in the evaluation of alternatives for Springbank Dam. The report is available here: https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.lon-getinvolved.files/5215/1328/1346/Stage_1_EA_DRAFT_REPORT.pdf.</p> <p>The discussion surrounding the dam is part of the One River Master Plan, as the decision whether or not to rebuild the dam was completed in Stage I, in order to inform Stage II which is where we are at now.</p> <p>The life cycle maintenance of the dam structure includes things like concrete repairs and was included in the decommissioning options analysis.</p> <p>The purpose of the EA process is to make recommendations, not set budgets. The recommendations are then used by staff to set capital construction as well as operational budgets. Operations budgets are increased when the capital construction costs are approved and the associated operational costs are calculated.</p> <p>Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/15/2018	E-mail	<p>(Continued)</p> <p>e) Has the city's operational budget been expanded to keep the forks project in the pristine state that tourism mandates? (Ontario governments in the past have given Western money for buildings but no money for maintenance. My concern is that this project will turn shabby over time. Are you completely comfortable that it will not?)</p> <p>What exactly is "lifecycle maintenance"? Dam maintenance is a distinct issue and it should be part of decommissioning.</p> <p>Was it not? Why does this seem to be part of the forks project?</p> <p>My concern for maintenance is for the forks project itself. This project deserves ongoing long term maintenance so it becomes a tourism-quality attraction. That means making it look like a mini-Augusta, or a mini-Disney, for at least 20-30 years downstream. imo if this project delivers anything less, it has failed. It doesn't matter whether current parks overgrowth is native or invasive. It is still ugly. If invasive species settle at the forks, it will also be ugly. Considering that the city's operation budget has failed to keep our parks tidy, do you really believe they can handle the extra responsibility of this project? The project only "recommends" mitigation. It has not budgeted for it. Are you comfortable with this? Just punting it to city operation? "Not my job"?</p> <p>Sorry this is so long and skeptical. Thank you for listening to my nickel's worth.</p> <p>Further follow-up in regards to Ashley's Oct 16th response: (dated Oct. 16, 2018) Ashley, ok. Thank you. (You might have noticed that I supported retaining the dam.)</p>	10/16/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Hi Brent,</p> <p>In short , yes, boating and the fluctuating river level was taken into account in the evaluation of alternatives for Springbank Dam. The report is available here: https://s3.ap-southeast-2.amazonaws.com/hdp.au.prod.app.lon-getinvolved.files/5215/1328/1346/Stage_1_EA_DRAFT_REPORT.pdf.</p> <p>The discussion surrounding the dam is part of the One River Master Plan, as the decision whether or not to rebuild the dam was completed in Stage I, in order to inform Stage II which is where we are at now.</p> <p>The life cycle maintenance of the dam structure includes things like concrete repairs and was included in the decommissioning options analysis.</p> <p>The purpose of the EA process is to make recommendations, not set budgets. The recommendations are then used by staff to set capital construction as well as operational budgets. Operations budgets are increased when the capital construction costs are approved and the associated operational costs are calculated.</p> <p>Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/4/2018	E-mail	<p>Daniel and Ashley, I have a few questions from within our group that I'd like to ask regarding the PIC presentations and recommended preferred alternative.</p> <p>a) Please provide the names of the contacts that were involved through the office of the MNR and DNR during the EA process.</p> <p>b) We'd like to request full disclosure of the social/cultural & economical estimates and technical considerations that were scored and weighted leading to the preliminary scoring. For example how would it be determined that "doing nothing" with Springbank Dam would score a 3.0 for social cultural yet full removal would be 3.9 and partial dam removal would be even higher; meanwhile the costs & technical elements had a far greater range in scores. Full dam removal being a 2.7 while partial removal was 4.2 and doing nothing was 4.4. --- it is really important that there is transparency and accountability behind how these figures were determined.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued)</p> <p>c) Did full dam removal take into consideration opportunities to offset those costs through provincial or federal dam removal funding? Keep in mind it cost \$14M to build the dam with a 1 year delay mid-construction – we find it very difficult to believe it would cost \$10M-\$20M to remove it even with needing to building a berm to access on the north shore. Most mid-to-large dam removal projects – even with sediment removal and disposal as a factor – come in at far less than even the \$10M range.</p> <p>d) Did partial dam removal take into consideration ongoing maintenance costs associated with keeping the stripped down structure safe; along with earmarking funds for its eventual removal when it deteriorates beyond repair at end of life? Realistically the entire decision of whether to partially or full remove the dam comes done to the difference of 1.0 in technical/economic scoring for those options.</p> <p>e) In the newspaper today they reported that partial dam removal may not include removing the gates. Given that the steel gates themselves cannot be left on the bottom of the river is it even viable to suggest this? They present a barrier to fish passage and migration. We need to know with clarity if partial dam removal will at minimum include the removal of the gates.</p> <p>Thanks,</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/5/2018	E-mail	<p>Daniel and Ashley, This might help. As you might know the City of Cambridge is also 10 years into a debate regarding Riverside Dam on the Speed River.</p> <p>After years of meetings with the public, stakeholders including First Nations and numerous lengthy environmental and other studies; the final decision came down to a simple scoring chart with average scores very similar to One River. With Riverside Dam; the consultants initially recommended that the city go with a free flowing river through decommissioning; but the councillors subsequently instructed staff to go back and rework the numbers so that the replace with a new dam option was preferred. It was pretty easy to see that this had happened because the scores did not correlate with the years of data, reports and other feedback during the process itself. This link is just for the structural repair assessment along: https://www.cambridge.ca/en/learn-about/resources/Structural-Investigation---2014.pdf</p> <p>There has been a Part II Order request already filed because of the scoring matrix used for that decision making process along with numerous other discrepancies.</p> <p>Needless to say that those who are actively involved in the One River EA expect far more detail when it comes to the economic/technical comparisons of the preferred options along with how the suggested scores for social and cultural impact were determined. This may not be what is shared at the PICs but we will want to review that material before commenting.</p>	10/5/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Hi Robert, We will respond to both emails in more detail, but I wanted to respond in the meantime at least with this. I know your concern is that if any of the structure is left in place a subsequent Council will vote to reinstate it. However, because the recommendation to decommission the dam was already endorsed by Council (and that evaluation is public), to overturn that decision and instruct staff to repair the dam would require a 2/3 majority. The question now is how much do we remove now versus later given the existing budgets, environmental conditions, and potential reuse of the concrete superstructure to make use of its remaining lifespan and some of the investment that went into it. Habitat, fish passage, technical feasibility, safety, and cost will all come into consideration in the detailed removals plan and whether we remove all, one, or none of the gates. Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/5/2018	E-mail	<p>Ashley, I look forward to seeing what you can send back. To be fair; a broken dam sitting idle in the river was how this ended up being part of a mayoral platform run and subsequently bundled into the One River EA after the pushback against repairing it when the lawsuit was settled. As long as any of those gates remain on Springbank Dam we will consider it a sleeping giant threat to the river ecosystem. Our concern is that if we are being shown ballpark and seemingly exaggerated figures to roughly estimate the expected costs of either full or partial decommissioning; it challenges the integrity of the decision matrix unless it can be clearly shown how those costs and scores were tabulated. For example if the economic/structural score for full removal was a 3.7 instead of a 2.7 it would have shifted the average to favor a different preferred alternative. What determines the even a 0.5 variance for social/cultural impact? It is not unreasonable to ask for transparency into how those figures were determined if at the end of years and years of public engagement and millions spent on this process. If even the Mayor himself expects an evidence based decision; well it's completely fair for us to ask for that level of detail to be made public. Robert</p>	10/5/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Robert, To your first paragraph, the difference now is that an EA to decommission the dam will be complete with decided matters of Council supporting it. Even with partial rather than full removal it will have been decommissioned and cannot function or be operated as a dam. Any new attempt to put a new recreational dam in the river would be met with the same environmental and regulatory constraints. It would also likely be better to start from scratch with a new, more modern design rather than try to reuse the concrete superstructure.</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued) Further followup based on Ashley's response (dated Oct 5th, 2018): Ashley, So is there any way that the stakeholders involved can review those document prior to commenting on the preferred alternatives – or do we have to wait until the recommendation goes to committee? I figured it was fairly easy to get comparable and accurate cost estimates considering how many dams are now being removed from rivers across North America every year. Normally exaggerated or generous estimates with a +/- of 100% aren't considered conservative but rather liberal (nothing to do with politics ofcourse).</p>			<p>(Continued) Detailed cost estimates were prepared and will be shown in the report, along with the detailed matrix. The narrative to explain the cost differential that leads to the scoring will be shown in the report which allows for full transparency in the decision making. Costs may seem exaggerated but in engineering terms it is necessary to be conservative in the early stages of the estimation and the +/- percentages applied to these types of engineering cost estimates are very conservative. Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/10/2018	E-mail	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I was reviewing the online pdf materials with one of our partner/stakeholder and we realized that there were boards at the PIC session that were not included in the downloadable documents. For example each of the evaluated options for Springbank Dam had a dedicated board (not just the partial one). Could the pdf be updated so that those who are commenting online have access to the same material that was shared at the library?</p> <p>Secondly; can you confirm if a more detailed breakdown of costs associated with partial or full decommissioning will be made available to the public and/or stakeholders prior to the recommendation going to committee and our new council?</p> <p>We are preparing a joint submission with our comments based on the limited information presented and will be asking that council move ahead with full decommissioning if the marginal difference between the two options is subjective rather than evidence based.</p>	10/11/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Hi Robert,</p> <p>We just cross reference the boards (they are in Daniel's office) with what is online, and there are no missing boards. I haven't had a chance to discuss the timing of releasing the full report or other pieces such as the full evaluation ahead of the draft EA report with my Director or the steering committee yet. I don't see a big problem in doing so, but want to be sure I'm not stepping too far out of normal procedures without buy-in. I will let you know how we are proceeding as soon as I know.</p> <p>That said, we will not be taking the report or any recommendations to committee until February, so we have time for some discussions around the evaluation and so forth.</p> <p>Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/15/2018	E-mail	<p>Ashley & Daniel, Have you heard back on this? [referring to Ashley's reponse dated Oct 11,2018] We have drafted a letter that we'd like to submit with our comments that might change after we've had a chance to circulate to other stakeholders that support decommissioning. We have to do it this way because when we submit our reply on behalf of a group through the survey it is very difficult to capture that feedback for our own purposes.</p> <p>If I get the draft to them tomorrow we have barely enough time for some groups that have boards and processes for participating within their bylaws. It would be preferable that we have ample time to review that information as part of our response rather than just criticizing that we are being asked to comment on a pretty major part; with a very narrow margin of decision based on partial publicly disclosed information.</p>	10/15/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Hi Robert, I have inquired, but have not heard back. I think it's important to note that this is not the only opportunity to provide feedback. Also, the detailed evaluation table benefits from the full text of the EA report in order to explain context and perspective from which the evaluation is done. We will be releasing the full EA report well ahead of the committee meeting in order to provide time to review the full text before the formal 30 day public review period is commenced.</p> <p>Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/3/2018	E-mail	<p>Dear Mr. Mahood and Ms. Arammeloo:</p> <p>RE: One River EA and the coal-tar blob in the river/ Blackburn Fountain/ ribbon bridge or lookout point</p> <p>As you may be aware, there are remains of a carcinogenic "coal-tar blob" in the Thames riverbed from the Thames Park area downstream to the river forks near the Walter J. Blackburn Memorial Fountain (activated in 2009), which operates using river water.</p> <p>This well-documented coal-tar blob is the result of the underground migration of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) from a former coal gasification plant on the block bounded by Horton, Thames, Bathurst and Ridout streets, an industrial plant which operated for nearly a century on the site, before closing in the 1940s.</p> <p>An attempt was made by London Hydro and the City of London to remove this coal-tar blob approximately 17 years ago, by track backhoe excavation, but my understanding based on a lengthy discussion with the actual backhoe operator, is that much of the blob remains in the river.</p> <p>Back in about 2007-8, the Middlesex-London Medical Officer of Health only signed off on the safety of the Blackburn Fountain blowing around vaporized carcinogenic polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons from the coal-tar blob and E.coli bacteria from the river water, due to the reported "wind sensors" on the fountain, which purportedly prevented the fountain spray from hitting people on shore.</p>	10/12/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for expressing your concerns. Your comments will be included in the project correspondence and Environmental Assessment report.</p> <p>The suspended walkway is to be located on the opposite shore from fountain. I took a measurement on our overhead mapping from the approximate tip of the conceptual ribbon walkway to the fountain and it is over 60m away. That said, we will be cognizant of the potential for spray from the fountain as we continue into the detail design phase.</p> <p>Regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued)</p> <p>During the 2009 CTV news segment covering the activation of the fountain, however, river water droplets appeared on the CTV camera lens which was filming the fountain on shore.</p> <p>My public interest concern at this point is the proximity of any project "ribbon bridge" or lookout point to the Blackburn Fountain and its vaporized toxins in the river water.</p> <p>A reply would be appreciated.</p>			
10/25/2018	E-mail	<p>The cosmetic face lift to the Forks of the Thames is frivolous and unnecessary. What is necessary is to clean up the Thames River. I'm not talking about the banks of the river. I'm talk about the actual river.</p> <p>Patricia Concoran, a scientist at UWO, did a study this year at 34 spots on the Thames between Mitchell, Woodstock and London. She and her colleagues were testing for microplastics in the water. They found them everywhere. The highest concentration was at the Forks.</p> <p>Combine that with the phosphorus, lead and other chemicals entering the river branches upstream from farmer's pesticides and industries.</p> <p>This water goes downstream and connects with Lake St. Clair at Lighthouse Cove. It will go into the water supply of communities in Canada and the USA.</p> <p>Stop thinking about beautifying downtown for commercial benefit and start thinking about what's going in our bodies and future generations.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
10/26/2018	Letter	<p>[Refer to PDF titled "2018-10-26-TRAA-ORA-OneRiverStage2-Joint" for full Letter] **Key points from letter summarized below**</p> <p>"Our organizations recommend choosing Alternative 3 - the Full Removal of Springbank Dam and the naturalization of this section of the Thames River. We submit that full dam removal and naturalization are the preferred solutions from an environmental perspective and would likely prove to be the most cost-effective over the long-term when Life-cycle costs and available provincial and federal funding are considered."</p> <p>Regarding what information they would like shared with the public: "...the preliminary estimates for the Relative Cost of Design Alternatives for Dam Decommissioning (Fig. 1) were very broad, ranging from \$1M to \$5M for partial decommissioning and \$10M to \$20M for full removal; however, no breakdown of those costs was included." "...We submit that if the true costs of partial decommissioning (i.e. including life-cycle costs and removal of doors or provision for effective fish passage) had been included, then the Full Dam Removal score would likely have been higher than the partial dam removal score."</p> <p>"We do not support the preferred preliminary Alternative 2, to partially decommission Springbank Dam. This alternative would leave the concrete foundation apron, and potentially gate/s in place, which would impede fish and boat passage during low-flow conditions over the long-term."</p> <p>Regarding PIC and Public Engagment: "We have for the most part been impressed with the City's efforts to engage the public, and consultation has been effective at most stages. However, it is crucial that the City provide a clear and transparent process, along with detailed information to ensure the evidence corresponds with the scoring and preferred solution."</p>			

City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment

Comment Tracking Form

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
11/4/2018	E-mail	<p>Hello Ashley, I just wanted to add a few more thoughts on the idea of the Ribbon project or other proposals along the Thames.</p> <p>I do have a strong concern for the quality of the water and the natural environment along the river. I am, therefore, hoping that enough thought goes into whatever 'constructing' may occur in this area.</p> <p>I believe in one the presentations, the Pittsburg River Life project was mentioned. I am very glad to see this and i strongly encourage you and your department to take a good look at some of their ideas again. Please read the section: Stormwater Management, where they not only see water as precious, they also spell out the importance of having a natural buffer zone between man made constructions and the water. From a responsible river bank engineering point of view, this makes sense. They also state that storm water is not the enemy. I agree, because as we know, we need water from the atmosphere. How we manage it is an all important element. If you do not have time to read the whole of Section IV, please refer to page 25 for a brief overview.</p> <p>I feel that the use of concrete should be used very prudently used or avoided since water evaporates much more rapidly when is strikes concrete. The more concrete or man made materials we use the more negative impact there will be to the water, the natural environment and the wild life. I know this year we have had much rain, but we do often experience summer droughts, so water shortages can become problematic.</p> <p>If we truly want to revitalise the river, we need to take care of it, not harm it further by building to host events and draw crowds of folks who leave their garbage waste behind.</p> <p>The millions of dollars spent on a Ribbon project should be spent on affordable housing and programs to help people who truly need support.</p> <p>Do we have dates as to when City council makes decisions on any of these projects?</p> <p>Thank you</p>	11/5/2018	Ashley Rammeloo	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>Thank you for your email. It will be added into the EA report for consideration and comment. At this time we do not have set dates to take the completed report to Council.</p> <p>Best regards, Ashley Rammeloo</p>

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
11/4/2018	E-mail	<p>Hello, I am concerned that there is too much time and money being sought, spent in short wasted on the project for this downtown water beautification Ribbon Bridge system. Please consider the issue of Child Poverty needs or Mental Health housing funding needs before the water decorations downtown continue and cannot be stopped. I consider it a frivolous, unnecessary project. Thank you for your consideration</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
1/15/2019	E-mail	<p>Good Morning Ashley,</p> <p>I am writing this letter on behalf of the members of the Steering Committee of the local chapter of the Council of Canadians of which I am a member. This letter will mainly address the proposed Ribbon of the Thames project.</p> <p>We are very concerned about maintaining and improving the water quality of the Thames River, not just for the sake of the drinking water of everyone downstream (including the London intake from Lake Erie), but for the wildlife and the natural qualities of the river areas in general. Initiatives such as the Ribbon of the Thames, although it may draw some people to the downtown area, are costly and certainly not a priority. We all know that the creatures (some already endangered), and the water quality will be negatively affected by massive construction and loss of habitat, natural soil, grass and bushes which will be replaced by unnatural materials. What happens at the water, stays in the water!</p> <p>Given that London still has many areas where the antiquated dual pipe system is still in place (where storm sewers sometimes carry raw sewage into the river), it is surprising that the City would even contemplate the idea of spending money recklessly on such an unnecessary project as the Ribbon of the Thames. The first priority should be the health of the water; places of entertainment are secondary.</p>			

**City of London One River Master Plan Environmental Assessment
Comment Tracking Form**

Last Updated: 5/1/2019



Public Comment Tracking			City Response		
Date Received	Form of Communication	Comment	Date	Author	Response
		<p>(Continued)</p> <p>Every few years there is a certain push to 'revitalize the downtown', the purpose of which is sometimes unclear. Naturally, renewing the outdated water/sewer systems is a highly necessary pursuit and we are heartened to see these projects are underway. The amount of raw sewage still entering the river via the old dual pipe systems is definitely unhealthy and the priority should be to spend tax dollars on quickly speeding up these improvements.</p> <p>Please remember that the Beauty of the River is mostly reflected in the Quality of its Water.</p> <p>Sincerely, David Heap (co-chair), Julie Picken-Cooper (co-chair), Meg Borthwick, Roberta Cory, Robert Cory, Margo Does, Norah Fraser, Paula Marcotte, and Aldous Smith for the London Chapter, Council of Canadians</p>			