

Zoar Levee and Diversion Dam, Dam Safety Modification Study  
Community Advisory Committee Draft Meeting Minutes March 8, 2012

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 March 8, 2012. The meeting was in session between 7:00pm and 9:00pm. Those present at the meeting were Mayor Larry Bell (Zoar), Jon Elsasser ((Zoar), George Kane (Ohio Historic Society), Sandy Worley (Zoar), Hans Fisher (Zoar), Holly Thouvenin (Zoar), Joe Cline (Zoar), Chuck Meiser (Zoar), Scott Gordon (Zoar), Melanie Eddy (Zoar), Steve Shonk (Zoar), Rodney Cremeans (USACE), Aaron Smith (USACE), Nick Krupa (USACE), Brian Maka (USACE), and Gus Drum (USACE).

Copies of the February 9<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes were distributed as well as the agenda for the current meeting. There were no suggested changes to the minutes.

Rodney Cremeans opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and introduced Brian Maka, the new chief of Public Affairs Office in Huntington.

Rodney Cremeans continued by discussing the study schedule and handed out copies of the latest schedule to everyone.

Rodney Cremeans pointed out that the District goes through monthly reviews of the schedule and reports those changes to the District leadership. He noted that there has been one schedule change since the last CAC meeting, which impacts the entire schedule. Rodney noted the completion of the Baseline Risk Assessment has slipped from 19 March 2012 to 31 May 2012. This activity consists of the risk cadre defining all of the potential failure modes of the levee system and characterizing the existing condition of the levee system. The identification and concurrence of potential failure modes are a key element in informing the District of what exactly needs to be fixed at the Zoar project before committing a large amount of time and money in project alternatives design.

Rodney Cremeans pointed out that we were still in Step 2 of the 6 Step study process but that we were moving into Step 3 with consideration of the Remove the Levee & Diversion Dam (Project) Alternative to save time in the schedule while we wait for completion of the Baseline Risk Assessment.

Aaron Smith expressed that since we were waiting on the failure mode analysis for the levee, that the team had decided to move forward with brainstorming on the one nonstructural alternative that was largely unaffected by the failure analysis, that being Remove the Project Alternative. Aaron asked that the CAC help the District consider mitigation possibilities during this and following meetings so that the overall study schedule wouldn't be affected.

Jon Elsasser expressed a concern that the structural alternatives would have to wait on the failure mode analysis and that only one nonstructural alternative was being considered now in Step 3 of the process.

Rodney Cremeans responded that only Remove the Project was being considered now, not all the structural and non-structural options. It was also emphasized that advancement of Remove the

Project Alternative is in no way favored. It was the only alternative the District could pursue while awaiting the results of the Baseline Risk Assessment. Following completion of that task, other alternatives would be advanced with the same level of analysis.

Aaron Smith responded that other nonstructural alternatives would likely be considered as more is known about the failure analysis of the levee.

Han Fisher noted that the schedule indicated that the project would be completed in the year 2020 and that seemed like a long time if all you were going to do was remove the levee and acquire the Village.

Rodney Cremeans explained that the initial pages of the schedule addressed the study itself and that the remaining pages addressed project design and construction activities.

Rodney Cremeans indicated that the design and construction schedules were just estimates since the remainder of the work would be contingent upon which alternative the study recommends for construction.

Aaron Smith pointed out that the schedule for nonstructural alternatives could also be long depending upon the option selected and the requirements that resulted from it.

Mayor Bell asked whether all 6 steps of the study process were required and where those steps came from and whether the engineers would be working on the nonstructural alternatives as well, or just the planners.

Rodney Cremeans and Aaron Smith explained that the 6 step study process is defined by USACE regulations and were required to reach a decision on what alternative would be selected to address the levee problems. They also explained that rather than sitting still and waiting on the failure mode analysis that the District decided to move forward with the Remove the Project Alternative since it is largely unaffected by the failure analysis. Engineers participation is required for the development of all alternatives, including Remove the Project Alternative. Rodney Cremeans stated that for example, engineers needed to design how and where to breach the levee and diversion dam

Joe Cline stated that we should not just breach the levee, but should remove the entire levee; diversion dam and diversion channel since they would be scars on the landscape and return the surrounding landscape to a more natural condition (pre-levee/Zoar landscape condition).

Rodney Cremeans responded that if just breaching was not acceptable with the community that USACE could study removing the entire project.

Jon Elsasser asked whether parts of Route 212 would have to be raised after the levee was breached or removed entirely so that it wouldn't be flooded with more frequency than it already is. He also asked how high the road would have to be raised.

Nick Krupa asked where the low spot on Route 212 was that would have to be raised behind the levee.

Based upon these questions a general discussion began among the group regarding how and where Route 212 may be raised and/or relocated if the project was breached or removed altogether.

The issue of Route 212 flooding near the entrance to Tusky Valley High School after Dover Dam construction was complete was brought up by Joe Cline. He asked who was responsible for raising the road after Dover Dam was built.

Rodney Cremeans and Aaron Smith responded that the State of Ohio was responsible at the time Dover Dam was built and that funds had been provided to raise roads.

Joe Cline stated that that ODOT had a plan to reroute Route 212 around Zoar 25 years ago and the District should look to that plan and consider that for mitigation if the project is removed.

Aaron Smith said the District would contact ODOT about this study.

Scott Gordon expressed that the railroad had been raised but not Route 212.

Nick Krupa indicated that the USACE had raised the railroad as part of the Dover Dam construction project, but it was the responsibility of the State of Ohio to raise Route 212.

Raising of Route 212 was discussed as a mitigation feature of remove the project alternative and most of the community participants seemed to feel that would be a necessary mitigation feature.

Nick Krupa pointed out that the low spot on SR212 inside the levee was higher than low spots on SR212 outside the levee.

Scott Gordon asked whether the pump station would be removed as part of the Remove the Project Alternative.

Rodney Cremeans replied that yes the pump station would be removed and the pumps, generator and other equipment would likely be salvaged or disposed of appropriately. Rodney Cremeans indicated that the District had considered breaching the levee at the location where Goose Run, SR 212, and Dover-Zoar road intersects to allow Goose Run to run naturally, but that no designs have been prepared and community input was welcomed.

Aaron Smith asked the CAC where a logical location might be to breach the levee and suggested that USACE engineers could look at several locations during the study of that alternative.

Jon Elsasser asked whether a bridge or culvert would be used to get Route 212 over Goose Run. He suggested that if the entire levee were removed that a bridge on a raised Route 212 might be used or the current culvert under Route 212 would remain to handle Goose Run flows.

Joe Cline asked whether the USACE may consider breaching Dover Dam to reduce the threat to Zoar as one alternative. He noted that the industry that Dover Dam was built to protect no longer survives.

Aaron suggested that several methods of reducing back water flooding on the Zoar levee would be looked at including allow more flow downstream of Dover Dam and that breaching the dam could be considered in the alternatives analysis.

Aaron Smith stated it was clear that the remove the project was unacceptable to most and that measure of acceptability would be used during the evaluation and comparison process when making a selection. He clarified, that our discussion of this alternative and the group's consideration of mitigation options were not taken as consent or endorsement of that alternative. Aaron Smith stated, as we have communicated in the past, we have to, by law, regulation and policy fully vet this type of alternative on an equal basis with other structural and non-structural solutions, at least to some logical milestone, because it is an effective means of addressing risk from the project. However, to effectively evaluate and compare this alternative equally, we need to engineer it at the same level as other alternatives. We also need to understand the severity of the impacts created from it, which by all accounts appear to be extreme. We also we need to understand all the costs associated with the development and execution of that alternative, including costs to mitigate for those severe impacts. Key to this understanding is that mitigation may never be able to off-set or compensate for the loss of a historic property like Zoar. That understanding speaks to the severity of the impact as well. Clearly everyone's number 1, 2 and 3 concern appears to be impacts to Zoar Village, for its unique heritage, integrity of location and design, and value as a heritage asset and living community. So while the District considers the details of how exactly Remove the Project Alternative would work, the impacts seem clear enough to engage the help of stakeholders on what we should study for mitigation at the same time.

Aaron Smith elaborated that given the severity of impacts, it was likely that many mitigation alternatives themselves will require study and analysis and buy-in. It is critical that the District did not act within a black box or assume it had the ability to envision alone what appropriate mitigation strategies would or could be.

Aaron Smith further clarified that these sessions should be considered brainstorming and that no idea would be eliminated from consideration at this time. However, he pointed out that the District would have to carefully study and consider a number of items associated with each potential mitigation action, including the acceptability, the authority, the technical feasibility, and the reasonability to implement.

With that in mind, Aaron Smith asked whether there were any other ideas regarding the Remove the Project Alternative or mitigation measures that might be used to reduce impacts on the Village.

Aaron Smith began the discussion by stating that mitigation might include removing structures and documenting the buildings through photographs text descriptions and film documentaries that could

be used for education curriculums in local schools and universities. He noted that was usually a stock mitigation package which may not be sufficient in this case.

Aaron Smith asked what would be important to preserve or salvage from Zoar if it were purchased. Are the buildings important; is the history important; is the educational value important, is the village lifestyle significant? These are the types of questions that need to be considered when looking for ways to mitigate for effects to historic properties and communities. The District needs help defining what makes Zoar as a historic property both significant and important to the public as a community or heritage asset.

Aaron Smith also suggested that mitigation could be off-site and not necessarily directly associated with Zoar. For example, we could study repairing or enhancing other historic properties in Ohio. Producing educational materials to teach others about Zoar and possibly financing canal trail projects could be potential mitigation possibilities as well.

Mayor Bell asked as part of Remove the Project Alternative whether a museum could be built to house the artifacts of the town and its collections housed in Zoar and elsewhere. The Mayor suggested that the gardens could be restored but the “experience” of Zoar could not be replicated or offset and that would be a significant loss to the region, the state and the country.

Aaron Smith said the District appreciated that mitigation may never compensate for the loss. Aaron Smith asked the group how many parts of the historic Village need to be preserved in a move or did it all need to be relocated saved. Should the Village be replicated somewhere else entirely or just some historic buildings and a museum relating the Zoar story in collections and documentation of the Village?

Scott Gordon asked whether the buildings could be disassembled and reassembled somewhere else rather than trying to moving them intact.

The general response was yes, that could be done, if necessary, given enough time and money.

Aaron Smith asked the group, should we consider relocating the Village as a community or as a collection of historic properties and how they would be taken care of in the new location if they were not lived in or permanently occupied by individual owners. In other words, if a historical memorial Zoar site was created at a new location, we would need to carefully consider the solvency or ability for it to be operated in the future. Aaron said it is very unlikely the USACE could commit to any long-term operations and maintenance of a facility.

Jon Elsasser and Scott Gordon suggested that an endowment could be established as part of the project costs to support the relocated buildings in the future.

Aaron Smith offered the example of the Bulltown Historic area at Burnsville Lake in Braxton County, West Virginia. At this location is a restored historic area that was constructed and is currently

operated and maintained by the USACE. Aaron went on to say that this arrangement was rare today, as these recreational developments fall under the auspices of P.L. 89-72 (1965) requiring cost sharing (50%-50%) of the planning and construction of the facility and with a non-federal partner. That non-federal sponsor would also have to assume 100% of the operations and maintenance costs for recreation/visitor type developments. Aaron Smith made it clear he was uncertain how this would apply in a relocation scenario or in the development of any off-site recreation facility, including a visitor's center, but it would have to be considered and weighed when looking at these alternatives.

George Kane suggested that the Village could be relocated vertically rather than horizontally by raising the buildings using the levee material as fill to raise the Village.

Holley Thouvenin asked whether the basements could be raised when such a fill was placed to raise the Village.

Aaron Smith said that is something that could be studied. He noted that the Government would not want to maintain any fee ownership of land excess to authorized purposes. He noted that if lands were purchased in fee as a result of the Remove the Project Alternative, and then deemed excess to needs, there are procedures in place for disposing of land. It might be possible to consider turning over land to some organization or sponsor who could maintain them, perhaps as a memorial site, where the cellars are left exposed. Within consideration of our flowage needs, other mitigation possibilities might include constructing frame representations of the buildings, plaques and gardens could be added where Zoar stood before.

Some CAC members suggested that a memorial site would be too macabre and questioned who would maintain it and what value would be added.

Mayor Bell suggested that the vacated land could be farmed.

Aaron Smith noted that the land could still have some archeological significance. If Federal Government owned land was disposed of, it may have covenants attached to protect any remaining resources should the land be transferred to a non-federal entity. Otherwise the damage to the resources may have to be mitigated for in advance.

Scott Gordon asked whether there could be a priority established for which historic buildings would be saved and protected or moved using some priority system for different building types, architectural style or historic value. Scott Gordon named off several examples in the Village like the Tin Shop, Gus Ruetenick's Cabin, and others that would be good examples.

Jon Elsasser asked whether the Government could purchase or condemn property for a relocation site.

Aaron Smith said that the ability to find a suitable relocation site would have to be part of the analysis of the feasibility of such a mitigation alternative. He also noted that the USACE has purchased new

land for mitigation in the past, but that we would never want to take any property unless necessary for authorized purposes and would likely not want to maintain permanent ownership. However, a project is authorized with the mitigation, so if we were able to commit to a relocation site, the approval of the project would be the authority required to complete that mitigation.

Gus Drum noted that the use of condemnation to acquire the property would be only used as a last resort after all other acquisition measures were exhausted.

Hans Fisher suggested that perhaps Dover Dam could be removed as a nonstructural alternative thus eliminating the threat to Zoar and then the levee could be removed. Hans Fisher noted that you can't relocate the history that happened in Zoar because it is tied to the place on the ground.

Aaron Smith said that removal of Dover Dam could be explored, but effects of that action would also be have to be accounted for and if necessary mitigated for.

Aaron Smith noted that the process being used by the USACE to formulate and evaluate alternatives at Zoar is no different than what would normally be used in any flood risk management project and that mitigation for project impacts is frequently used to offset those impacts.

Aaron Smith explained that in many instances we are able to assume some worst case scenarios for mitigation costs, often allocating up to 1 % of total project costs for historic property mitigation as contingency. However, in this instance, the District is concerned that given the severity of impacts and unacceptability of a Remove the Project Alternative, this may be inappropriate. Assigning some contingency number, without studying the alternatives and assigning a feasibility level cost to the mitigation is unlikely to satisfactorily capture the legitimate true cost of this alternative.

Nick Krupa asked if there was a limit on what the USACE could spend on mitigation for historic properties.

Aaron Smith said that generally USACE policy limits data recovery costs to 1 % of the total project cost, but it is not always clear what data recovery means or covers. For example, data recovery is often tied to archeological excavations and the types of alternatives being discussed tonight did not really fit that description. Aaron Smith clarified that in the past we have been able to seek waivers from the 1 percent limit. The bottom line is that these types of issues needed to be vetted up the USACE ladder early to understand what limitations might exist or if waivers might be needed or granted.

Sandy Worley asked that the decision of which buildings might be preserved would be made by the Village and not the Corps. Sandy Worley stated that Zoar is known for being a living museum and a community not just a collection of historic buildings. Sandy Worley stated that people are important in the decision process and that Williamsburg, VA was not a living historic community but Zoar is. Sandy Worley noted that the success of Zoar has always depended on the unspoken partnership between public and private landowners.

Aaron Smith said he had meet with some concerned citizens that day that also expressed concern that only buildings and not people were being considered. Aaron Smith said that people are always our primary concern and mediating the potential loss of life from the risk of the project is our number one goal. He also made clear that we need to consider impacts to community, as well as historic properties.

Gus Drum elaborated on how the Corps considers effects to communities and people through our Other Social Effects accounts and briefly summarized the Community Impacts assessment we planned on undertaking. Gus Drum also noted that these impacts are not always easily mitigated for.

A discussion regarding fiscal sustainability of the Village since it is lived in versus a historic village where no one lives ensued between the CAC members. Out of that discussion was general agreement that its continuance as a viable, sustainable community was contingent upon its livability.

Mayor Bell expressed his concern that the Village could be lost as a self-sufficient community if it could not pay for its own services through its tax base. The Village would no longer be an incorporated legal entity. Loss of too many residents, or all the residents within the 916 elevation would threaten the existence of the Village all together.

Rodney Cremeans suggested that the District could study mitigation options that included relocation of a few key buildings and construction of a museum or re-establishment of the entire Village at another location.

A discussion ensued on the merits of artificially replicating the community vs. a historic site in another location and the dangers in dividing the community whereby neither portion of the community would survive apart from the other for fiscal reasons. Dividing the community would risk loss of the self-governing aspects of the Village. This discussion opened up the question of whether or not the impacts of the Remove the Project Alternative extended beyond those structures within the 916.0 elevation flowage easement boundary to a larger geographic area of the municipal boundary.

Aaron Smith asked if the members felt that the Village would be sustainable if it were moved to another location. For example, how many residents would be willing to live through the relocation of their home/business until the “community was re-established”?

Many felt that the risks of losing the community were very high and that the community could face insolvency in the future under the Remove the Project Alternative. It seemed more likely that you could move some buildings than the “community”.

Hans Fisher inquired as to whether there were any cheaper alternatives such as leaving the levee alone, leaving the historic buildings as they are, let people live there and just fix damages when they occur or pay for future damages when they occur.

Hans Fisher expressed that people live in Zoar, not historic buildings and that other non-historic buildings could be purchased and those residents could relocate if they wished to. If the Government just paid for damages due to flooding from the levee, over a 50 year period that would likely be cheaper than other alternatives.

Gus Drum noted that similar nonstructural alternatives, e.g. the Government compensating for damages incurred had been included as an alternative in past USACE documents, but to our knowledge hadn't been recommended or implemented in the past.

Aaron Smith noted that in this case we would also have to consider the risk to life as well as property from an existing project and that tolerable risk guidelines have to be considered. That being said, he noted that Hans Fisher had just developed a new alternative that needs to be carefully studied and considered, especially the ability for USACE to pay for damages down the road.

Scott Gordon suggested that Dover Dam be operated differently to reduce backwater elevations on the Zoar levee and not repair the levee at all. Scott Gordon further suggested that the people be removed from the Village by purchasing the properties from them and relocating them and leave the buildings in place as historic structures and the Government compensate for damages to the historic structures.

Jon Elsasser stated that there may be a higher risk for basement flooding under some alternatives and that the Government paying for annual damages would be like the flood insurance program paying for damages.

Jon Elsasser also asked how often the Village would be flooded if nothing were done to the levee at all and that paying damages for those infrequent events may be a cheap alternative.

A following discussion of the members suggested that, over time, the Village under those conditions of intermittent flooding could become a ghost town as people abandoned the community because they could not sell their property and future residents may not be willing to live with the risk today's residents are. There was some consensus that leaving the buildings, or most significant buildings in place would be perhaps more viable.

George Kane suggested that the crest elevation of Dover Dam be lowered to reduce inundation of the Zoar levee and that other retention structures may be constructed to handle that loss of flood storage.

Jon Elsasser asked whether lowering the wall at the dam would constitute a structural fix and whether we would be looking at structural changes as alternatives.

Aaron answered those questions affirmatively.

A discussion followed on the decision process of which buildings might be saved in an alternative where the historic structures were saved and whether descendants of the Zoarites would likely be part of that process.

Steve Shonk mentioned that there may be thousands of descendants who would want to be part of that decision process to preserve the heritage of Zoar and that he doubted that a consensus on a priority of buildings could ever be reached.

Jon Elsasser indicated that he had no idea of how many descendants there may be.

Steve Shonk indicated that he was starting a genealogy of the descendants but that search wasn't complete.

Steve Shonk left his name and contact information with Aaron Smith so that we might be able to access his database of names for documentation purposes.

Mayor Bell inquired how we would assess the impacts of the Remove the Project Alternative beyond the 916 elevation area.

Aaron Smith responded that the study boundary was designed to consider those potential impacts to the municipal footprint of the community and others surrounding the Village. Aaron also noted that the National Environmental Policy Act required that we consider cumulative effects and the National Historic Preservation Act required that we consider indirect effects.

Jon Elsasser asked whether all of the costs of the required mitigation would be part of the project alternative cost.

Aaron Smith answered in the affirmative.

Aaron Smith asked whether anyone on the CAC knew of the existence of buried fuel tanks, septic tanks, or cisterns in the Village. He indicated this information would be useful to the District when evaluating a wide array of alternatives.

Aaron Smith asked whether there could be a memorial site left behind should the Village be acquired. He also asked about the financial requirements to maintain such a site and what organization or group would maintain it.

Endowments were discussed as a possible way to maintain such a site.

Mayor Bell asked whether there may be impacts to the Ohio & Erie Canalway Coalition system if Zoar was acquired. He indicated that the loss of Zoar could affect the entire National Heritage Area and future use of that resource.

Jon Elsasser commented that the sustainability of Zoar is good now, but if it was split up that viability could be lost, or revenue from a partial surviving or relocated Zoar is likely to be much lower and the costs to operate it much higher. The loss would have to be made up in a mitigation scenario.

Jon Elsasser suggested that if the levee were breached and we did nothing else that the potential flooding of Route 212 could threaten transportation to area schools. Route 212 would almost have to be raised as part of that alternative.

Aaron Smith indicated that it was clear that Zoar had an educational value to the area schools. He wondered if a visitor's center or relocated Zoar would offer the same attraction or benefit.

Mayor Bell asked if the Corps would construct the same levee today at Zoar. He also asked whether the Corps has ever removed a historic village before anywhere due to flooding?

Rodney Cremeans noted that if we were considering building Dover Dam today, we would likely conduct a very similar study to determine if the feasibility of constructing Zoar Levee & Diversion Dam as we are currently doing.

Aaron Smith said he was sure the Federal Government has acquired countless communities when it was constructing flood risk management projects throughout the United States.

Nick Krupa noted that losing Zoar might lessen the heritage tourism value of the region, with its connectivity to Fort Laurens and Schoenbruun Village.

Aaron Smith suggested that we could consider embellishing other historic sites to help mitigate for such a loss and asked George Kane if other sites were available and needed assistance.

George Kane estimated a \$90.0 million backlog of historic rehabilitation work that could be addressed throughout the state. However, he indicated that although the money would help other properties, in his opinion that wouldn't mitigate for the loss of Zoar and therefore not be an acceptable mitigation strategy.

Jon Elsasser indicated that the Zoar story was significant and that if we couldn't fix the levee that we needed to build a museum to capture the history of Zoar with several types of media including film and saving some buildings as examples. It would have to be a nice museum and would need some funding to run it.

George Kane indicated that museums do not attract visitors like the real place they seek to describe and that funds would be needed to run the facility and change out exhibits. Paying for its upkeep with fewer visitations (fewer revenues) would be difficult. Relocation of all or parts of the Village was considered the minimum option for that reason.

George Kane suggested that perhaps re-establishing a portion of the Village such as the Main Street with its walkways and structures, the center garden, and at least the publically owned buildings or about 25 buildings could be operated over the project life of 50 years at some cost for operations and maintenance.

George Kane indicated this would be similar to Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan which operates under a very large endowment from the Ford Foundation. George Kane asked that the District find out what the operating costs were for the Greenfield Village.

Aaron Smith said he would work with a liaison in the Detroit District to see if we could find out. He asked whether the museum could attract enough people and revenue to offset operations and maintenance costs.

George Kane indicated that he was unsure, but it was doubtful anything would have the same appeal as Zoar Village as it does today.

Mayor Bell commented that museums get old after a while and lose visitors over time.

Jon Elsasser commented that he didn't believe that the museum would be practical as a standalone alternative and would not be successful in the long run. Jon Elsasser expressed that the Village now operates on a combination of public and private dollars and would have to replace the private investment if all the residents were gone. He said someone else would now have to make up for those private dollars used to care for their property now.

Aaron Smith wondered if CAC members were concerned that a relocated historical site and/or museum were really not viable solutions. If so, should we consider looking for other options?

The group seemed to think with all their faults, these solutions may be the best way to make lemons out of lemonade, but it would require some endowment from the Federal Government.

Mayor Bell indicated that the endowment would like be 10's of millions of dollars.

Aaron Smith mentioned the upcoming Section 106 meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup> of March. He greatly appreciated the input received tonight and said it would be used to guide the 106 meeting and help those parties gage what the CAC was most concerned with.

On a final note, Aaron Smith noted that future discussion of structural alternatives and other non-structural alternatives would have to include similar discussions about impacts, He noted that even in a rehabilitation scenario it was likely acquisition would be required. Aaron Smith pointed out that the baseline studies being completed would help the District identify significant resources to avoid if possible.

Sandy Worley asked if relocation was a possibility how long would that process take. She asked that if it would take years to complete what might happen to people's businesses, lives and the Village during that period. How would we fix those impacts during implementation? How would we fix buildings damaged during the move if they relocated? She stressed that there could be impacts doing it besides planning for it. People could lose their businesses and their jobs during that time.

Aaron Smith confirmed that relocation of buildings or a community could take a long time to complete and we needed to consider carefully if that was really viable solution from a number of aspects and that Sandy made good points.

There being no further discussions, the next meeting of the CAC was scheduled for Thursday April 12<sup>th</sup> between 7:00 and 8:30 pm.

Minutes Composed by:

Richard G. Drum RLA ASLA  
Community Planner  
Zoar Levee and Diversion Dam  
Dam Safety Modification Study  
Huntington District, USACE

Aaron Smith  
Lead Planner  
Zoar Levee and Diversion Dam  
Dam safety Modification  
Huntington District, USACE

**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
4. RE-ESTABLISH THE VILLAGE, INCLUDING PEOPLE, TO NEW LOCATION
5. RELOCATE ONLY HISTORICAL BUILDINGS TO NEW LOCATION AND ENDOW AN 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 OCCURRED 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 OCCURRED BY PROJECT FAILURES DURING THE NEXT 50 YEARS