

The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Huntington District (District) held a regularly scheduled Zoar Village Community Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting at the Zoar Schoolhouse on April 12, 2012. The meeting was in session between 7:00pm and 8:30pm. Those present at the meeting were, Chuck Knaack (Zoar), Sandy Worley (Zoar), Hans Fisher (Zoar), Holly Thouvenin (Zoar), Chuck & Judy Meiser (Zoar), Scott Gordon (Zoar), Ellen Seabrook (Zoar), Mark and Sandy Agricola (Zoar Area), Rodney Cremeans (USACE), and Aaron Smith (USACE). Jon Elsasser (Zoar) also joined the meeting near its completion.

Rodney Cremeans opened the meeting with a schedule update. He noted that the District will receive a draft copy of the Baseline Risk Assessment in the coming weeks and the District will perform a District Quality Control (DQC) review. Rodney added that the entire Baseline Condition or Without Project Condition will be complete by September 2012. Rodney noted that heavy formulation of alternatives would then proceed in December of 2012. Other important milestones include the Selection of a Risk Management Plan in October 2013, the Distribution of the Draft report in March 2014, and the final approval of the report in April of 2015.

Rodney Cremeans noted that the time it takes between the draft report and final approval are due to the intensive reviews that occur to ensure that we provide quality engineering solutions in accordance with all applicable laws and policy.

Rodney Cremeans asked if there were any questions on the schedule.

Holly Thouvenin asked for clarification of what product was completed in the next few weeks?

Rodney Cremeans answered, that the draft Baseline Risk Assessment or the document that identifies all the ways the project could fail and designates some as actionable will be provided to the District from the Risk Cadre for review and comment. He clarified that this process was called District Quality Control (DQC).

Rodney Cremeans went on to say that the District would provide DQC comments to the Risk Cadre and they would work to resolve any issues. The draft Baseline Risk Assessment would also go through an Agency Technical Review (ATR) from other members in the Corps of Engineers not on the Project Delivery Team or the Risk Cadre. Finally, the draft Baseline Risk Assessment will go through Quality Control and Consistency (QCC) review and approval. This is scheduled to be accomplished by 2 August 2012.

Aaron Smith asked that everyone introduce themselves as there were two new members, the Agricola's, who live south of Zoar off Dover-Zoar road.

Aaron Smith asked if there were any revisions to the last meeting's minutes and reminded the CAC that these minutes were not the Corps, but the groups and if revisions, changes, or additions were ever necessary to just let him know.

Aaron Smith reminded folks to feel free to provide any information they feel the Corps might want to know. For example, the Corps would appreciate information on visitor-ship, information on revenue generated, or if your property or Zoar is featured in the media.

Aaron Smith also asked that if CAC members know of folks who have information, please feel free to have them call or email me, or stop by our monthly public office hours.

Aaron Smith also gave a brief summary of the Section 106 Meeting that occurred on March 29, 2012. He noted that consulting parties were appreciative of having an understanding of the CAC's concerns about Remove the Project or potential mitigation alternatives associated with Remove the Project alternative. He said he would provide copies of the notes from that 106 meeting when complete to the CAC.

Aaron Smith said the 106 group has asked that the Corps develop a more intensive study schedule that incorporated the key elements of 36 CFR 800 consultation process. He said he would provide the result of this effort to the CAC when completed.

Aaron Smith also noted that at some point we would probably want to have a dual meeting of the CAC and 106 parties.

Aaron Smith then reviewed the types of alternatives discussed at the last CAC meeting and at the Section 106 meeting.

MITIGATION ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSED AT 8 MARCH 2012 CAC MEETING

1. NEED TO REMOVE THE ENTIRE LEVEE, DIVERSION DAM & DIVERSION CHANNEL.
2. RAISE ROUTE 212 BEHIND LEVEE TO REDUCE INCREASED FREQUENCY OF FLOODING.
3. RELOCATE ROUTE 212 TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO AND FROM TUSCARAWAS VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL OUTSIDE OF DOVER DAM'S FLOWAGE EASEMENT.

ZOAR LEVEE & DIVERSION DAM, DAM SAFETY MODIFICATION STUDY
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MEETING NOTES APRIL 12, 2012

4. RE-ESTABLISH THE VILLAGE, INCLUDING PEOPLE, TO NEW LOCATION.
5. RELOCATE ONLY HISTORICAL BUILDINGS TO NEW LOCATION AND ENDOW A HISTORICAL SITE WITH A VISITOR'S CENTER / MUSEUM AND PERHAPS A SECOND MUSEUM ADJACENT TO THE CANAL.
6. USE LEVEE AND DIVERSION DAM FILL TO RAISE THE VILLAGE IN IT'S ORIGINAL LOCATION AND OUTSIDE OF DOVER DAM'S FLOWAGE EASEMENT.
7. DOCUMENT ZOAR WITH MOVIES, DRAWINGS, 3D DIGITAL AND REAL MODELS AND BUILD A MUSEUM TO HOUSE COLLECTIONS AND TEACH ABOUT HISTORY.
8. SUPPLEMENT OTHER NEARBY, REGIONAL, OR STATE-WIDE HISTORICAL SITES OR PROPERTIES IN NEED OF ASSISTANCE.
9. HELP OHIO & ERIE CANALWAY COALITION SUPPORT ITS MISSION.
10. SOME COMBINATION OF ALL.

RISK MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSED AT 8 MARCH 2012 CAC MEETING

1. REMOVE DOVER DAM.
2. LOWER DOVER DAM AND BUILD OTHER FLOOD DETENTION STRUCTURES TO REDUCE FREQUENCY OF FLOW ON ZOAR LEVEE.
3. DON'T FIX THE LEVEE AND PAY FOR DAMAGES BY PROJECT FAILURES DURING THE NEXT 50 YEARS.
4. DON'T FIX THE LEVEE, BUY OUT INDIVIDUAL OWNERS, PROVIDE HISTORICAL BUILDINGS TO ORGANIZATION (OHS / ZCA) AND ENDOW ACCORDINGLY TO RUN A HISTORICAL SITE AND PAY FOR DAMAGES OCURRED BY PROJECT FAILURES DURING THE NEXT 50 YEARS.

RISK MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES DISCUSSED AT 29 MARCH 2012 106 MEETING

1. LEAVE LEVEE, HYRAULICALLY FILL BEHIND LEVEE AND PLACE TOWN BACK.
2. PLACE IMPERVIOUS BLANKET OUTSIDE OF LEVEE TO BLOCK WATER FROM SEEPING BELOW THE LEVEE.

Aaron Smith and Rodney Cremeans then opened the meeting for discussion.

Chuck Knaack: What did the Corps do at Magnolia Levee and is that type of “fix” applicable to Zoar Levee?

Rodney Cremeans replied that the Corps installed a seepage blanket at Magnolia Levee to address under seepage. This blanket was very similar to what we did in 2008 at Zoar Levee with a seepage blanket at the Rock Knoll. However, the seepage blanket at Magnolia Levee was far more designed and not done in response to an emergency. As a result, the seepage blanket at Magnolia was a more permanent solution, even being designed to incorporate top soil for little league baseball fields.

Chuck Knaack noted that Corps is spending lots money to repair the issue at Dover and Bolivar Dams. He asked if that gives a good indication that the Corps will do the same thing for Zoar Levee?

Rodney Cremeans answered that he would like to say yes, but can't. He said we have to go through the study process, and from there it will be scheduled for implementation according to the nation's priorities.

Holley Thouvenin asked what happens if a flood occurs during the study and another failure occurs?

Rodney Cremeans answered that we have a monitoring plan in place to make sure we have the right folks on the ground monitoring the levee's performance to see if emergency action is warranted. He gave a summary of what happened in 2008 as an example of what emergency action could be and proof that the Corps can act with little or no notice.

Holley Thouvenin stated that the Corps may have thought the process worked great, but from the Village's perspective, what happened in 2008 was not well communicated or planned and was extremely scary, as they didn't know what was going on until the Corps had already started trucking in gravel for the emergency blanket.

Sandy Worley agreed that the public coordination was poorly handled. She noted that the community had no idea what the problem was, how severe it was if they should evacuate, begin to move valuables to higher elevations. She said a day is a long time to wait to understand what is happening. She made it clear the Community would appreciate earlier alerts.

ZOAR LEVEE & DIVERSION DAM, DAM SAFETY MODIFICATION STUDY
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MEETING NOTES APRIL 12, 2012

Aaron Smith answered that the Corps is working to look for ways to communicate our monitoring, communication and emergency plans to the community now, so that in the event of an emergency, the community will have a better understanding of how we respond.

Aaron Smith did ask that everyone keep in mind that emergency situations are just that, and often when an emergency occurs, things happen quickly, so communication of issues often has to be done with little or no warning. He did note that since 2008 we have a better handle on the issues, and as a result, our communication during an emergency event should be better.

Chuck Knaack asked how deep water is seeping underneath the levee.

Rodney Cremeans answered that the exact depths of seepage paths is something that will be studied when formulating alternatives.

Chuck Knaack replied that he can't believe you don't know by now how deep that water goes by now and wondered what the Corps has been doing all this time.

Rodney Cremeans stated that the Corps has done some analysis associated with the Major Rehabilitation Report, but the Corps needs to await the Baseline Risk Assessment, before we do the detailed risk assessment to start looking, as we could be looking to address problems that don't exist or are not significant.

Holley Thouvenin asked if the depths of the seepage paths would be in the Baseline Risk Assessment?

Rodney Cremeans answered that Risk Cadre is really only looking at existing probabilities of failure, identifying the areas or locations of under seepage and piping.

Aaron Smith noted that often we don't have the answers to all the specifics of a recommended plan developed in the Dam Safety Modification Report. Some of the details will be developed later in the Pre-construction Engineering and Design (PED) phase of study. During the PED phase, the Corps will develop detailed design for the selected risk management plan and come up with plans and specifications to give to a contractor.

Aaron Smith went on to say that it is important during the Study Phase to capture how each considered alternative will address the problems, what the costs of the alternatives

will be, and what the impacts from the alternatives will be. However, we don't need to know all the specific details associated with an alternative.

Hans Fischer stated that if money was not issue, I have no doubt you would fix the levee as it would be the best solution with the least impact. So no matter what it costs, it seems to me you should fix the levee, because the impacts are too severe.

Rodney Cremeans said that based on what we know right now, fixing the levee appears to have the least amount of impact on social effects, setting cost aside. So, that is one positive aspect of a "fixing" the levee alternative, but we have to consider all the factors and effects.

Aaron Smith noted that we don't know enough about costs to say that a structural rehabilitation would be the most economically efficient plan and noted that risk was the number one driving factor in selecting a plan, not cost. He also noted that costs had to include costs to mitigate for impacts caused by alternatives, and that can make a difference on the total project cost of those alternatives that have more severe impacts.

Aaron Smith concluded that we don't have the information to make an informed decision yet on what is the best plan and that the evaluation and comparison process would get us there.

Chuck Knaack asked if we had any idea at all where the seepage was occurring.

Rodney Cremeans noted that yes we have two primary areas of concern, the ball fields and the rock knoll and several suspected seep entrances to both locations.

Holley Thouvenin noted that she lives on the north edge of town at the base of the levee and knows that she had seeping boils in her yard in 2008 and witnessed bubbling water.

Chuck Knaack asked if it is possible that the levee could be leaking from other locations we don't know about, or could water be submerging at locations well outside of the levee?

Rodney Cremeans and Chuck Knaack sat down with an aerial map of Zoar and talked about where the under pressure is coming from.

Chuck Knaack asked that when flooding occurred, did you monitor what the ground water levels were within the Village.

Rodney Cremeans stated that the ground was saturated due to ground water and that the Corps does have piezometers in town to monitor ground water pressure.

Aaron Smith asked everyone to inform the Corps at anytime about any issues you see or suspect. He noted that we don't live here and it is possible that you all may be aware of issues we are not aware of.

Holley Thouvenin wanted to make sure the Corps knew about all the basement problems that occur, concerning water seeping into basements and those that have collapsed in the past.

Chuck Meiser noted that the house directly behind the Post Office has water come up in the basement a couple of feet.

Aaron Smith noted that based on similar concerns expressed last spring, our engineers toured several basements in the Village to observe damage and get a better sense of the issues. He said the Corps would like to inspect and observe basement issues during its monitoring of events based on this feedback.

Aaron Smith noted that basement water may be attributable to ground water, since a rise in the Tuscarawas River occurs as a result of significant precipitation over a period of time and the ground water rises over the entire region when we are impounding water behind Dover Dam.

Holley Thouvenin stated that she had photos of basement in the Sewing House during either the 2005 or 2008 flood events.

Aaron Smith asked that anyone with photographs of flooding during these two events share them with the Corps so we can copy them.

John Elsasser Joined the CAC at 8:10.

Judy Meiser asked if the rights of entry requests were extending up Dover-Zoar road north of the village. She stated her son had been contacted concerning a right of entry and wanted to know if they wanted inside his house.

Aaron Smith explained that rights of entry were being sought for the whole baseline study area and not because any particular activity is planned, but to help us identify constraints to consider for during formulation. He explained that no access inside homes was being requested and that most of the access would be non-invasive, with

the exception of the desire to excavate a small amount of post-sized holes to test for wetland soils or archeological potential.

Aaron Smith explained that no holes would be dug without landowner coordination and no holes would be planned for gardens or other heavily landscaped areas. He also confirmed that no material would be collected from lands.

The following is an example of the types of access being requested:

a. Non-Invasive Pedestrian Survey to systematically look for and photograph environmentally sensitive habitat, cultural material, above ground evidence of archeological remains, other buildings, structures or landscapes on the property to evaluate if they qualify as historic properties, and/or for other non-invasive inspections. Nothing will be collected or removed from the property.

b. Conduct a jurisdictional evaluation for "waters of the U.S." including wetlands. The evaluation will determine if wetlands, water courses or bodies of water are present on the property, and if found, to obtain the actual size, shape and location. Evaluate the quality of each water body, if found, using current Ohio Environmental Protection Agency protocols (ORAM or HHEI/QHEI). The evaluation shall include documentation of site conditions and vegetation. The Government's employees or agents shall also examine aquatic resources for suitable habitat of federal and state protected species. These efforts will require the digging of test pits (approx. 12" x 12" x 24") for soils assessment. All holes will be refilled and the sod replaced. No excavation will be required in dry well drained areas, or in ornamental / vegetable gardens.

c. Catalog the main types of terrestrial habitats on the property which involves a reconnaissance level survey to describe the main types of habitats including size, shape, dominate vegetation, wildlife attributes and location. Examination for suitable habitat of federal and state protected species.

d. Cultural Resource shovel test pits (if required). The need for Cultural Resource test pits will be determined during the pedestrian survey. All work will be coordinated with the landowner prior to any excavation taking place. No shovel test pits will be excavated in locations not approved by the Owner. The work will include no more than 5 holes measuring approximately 20 inches in diameter and no more than 40 inches deep, excavated by hand tools (e.g., shovels and picks) on a random basis. Attempts will be made to remove the sod prior to excavation. Fill from each shovel test pit will be screened by hand through a 0.25 (1/4) inch hardware mesh. Screening of fill will take place next to each test pit. Screened fill will be replaced into test pit by hand and sod will be replaced over the test pit. All observed material will be returned in the hole and no material will be collected or removed from the property.

ZOAR LEVEE & DIVERSION DAM, DAM SAFETY MODIFICATION STUDY
COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE DRAFT MEETING NOTES APRIL 12, 2012

The next meeting was schedule for May 17th 2012 between 7:00-8:30 pm at the Zoar School House, if it is available.

Scott Gordon asked if we will know more about the Baseline Risk Assessment by then.

Rodney Cremeans said that yes we should have completed or be near completion of the District review by then.

Aaron Smith noted that Section 106 parties had requested a management summary of the Baseline Risk Assessment that was easily understandable by a non-engineer. He said the same summary will be provided to the CAC when ready.

Holley Thouvenin asked Jon Elsasser if he had any updates from George Kane and the OHS's progress on getting Zoar listed as a National Historic Landmark or if they needed any assistance.

Jon Elsasser said that OHS was waiting for a person from the National Park Service to get back from leave to move forward. He noted that OHS had the funding to do the study in place.

The meeting was adjourned.

Next Meeting Date: 7:00-8:30 pm on 17 May 2012.