

Lyon's Creek East, Welland, ON - Remedial Action Plan
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE, June 28, 2007
COMMENT SHEET

Thank you for attending our Public Open House. The following four proposed remedial options have been selected based on a variety of Evaluation Criteria including: (1) the ability to identify and address risks to human health and the environment, (2) the ability to maintain ecological integrity, (3) the ability to address current federal and provincial regulatory requirements, (4) an evaluation of short-term impacts, (5) an evaluation of long-term effectiveness and performance, (6) the reduction of toxicity and mobility of contaminants, (7) technical feasibility, (8) cost, (9) regulatory acceptance, and (10) community acceptance. Please assist us by ranking the following Remedial Options or suggesting an alternative in the General Comments Section. To stay posted of news on this project as it progresses, please fill-out the bottom of page 2:

Proposed Remedial Management Option, Description and Estimated Cost	Remedial Management Options Pros and Cons	PLEASE RANK THE IMPORTANCE OF EACH PROPOSED REMEDIAL OPTION: 1 to 4 1 = Most Preferred, 4 = Not Preferred
<p>1. Monitored Natural Recovery</p> <p>This option involves the sediment being left in place and the area being naturally covered by the generation of new sediment. There are no immediate disturbances to the site. Site is fenced and signs are posted with "No Fishing". Planning rules will be imposed restricting future development. The estimated cost is approximately \$20,000 per year for decades.</p>	<p>Pro (i): The predicted risks will be present for 10 to 40 years but these risks have been assessed to be minimal.</p> <p>Pro (ii): The site is a designated Provincially Significant Wetland (PSW) and physical alteration of the wetland is restricted or requires significant regulatory approvals.</p> <p>Pro (iii): Lowest Cost.</p> <p>Con (i): There is a very low accumulation rate of new sediment since clean water is pumped from the Welland Canal.</p> <p>Con (ii): Implementation of planning restrictions that are similar to PSW planning restrictions.</p>	<p>RANKING: _____</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS: _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>2. Enhanced Natural Recovery</p> <p>This option involves the placement of a clay-like cover on ice in the winter and when the ice melts, additional sediment drops on the existing sediment further isolating it. Pre-determined access points will be disturbed for a winter season with trucks and heavy equipment. Similar planning rules to Option 1 are imposed restricting future development. The estimated cost is \$1.2 to \$2 million with periodic monitoring costs.</p>	<p>Pro (i): Sediments are further isolated from the natural environment.</p> <p>Con (i): A safety risk is present to workers who could fall through the ice cover.</p> <p>Con (ii): The methodology is unproven.</p> <p>Con (iii): There will be some degree of disruption to the wetland at access points to the ice cover – approvals will be required for this disruption.</p> <p>Con (iv) There are significant costs for this Option.</p>	<p>RANKING: _____</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS: _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>

<p>3. Capping</p> <p>This option involves the additional placement of more clay-like cover than Option 2. Placement occurs on the ice cover. Pre-determined access points are disturbed for a winter season with trucks and heavy equipment;. Similar planning rules to Option 1 are imposed restricting future development. The estimated cost is \$5 to \$10 million.</p>	<p>Pro (i): Sediments are more further isolated from the natural environment.</p> <p>Con (i): A safety risk is present to workers who could fall through the ice cover.</p> <p>Con (ii): The methodology is unproven.</p> <p>Con (iii): There will be some degree of disruption to the wetland at access points to the ice cover – approvals will be required for this disruption.</p> <p>Con (iv) There are significant costs for this Option.</p>	<p>RANKING:_____</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS:_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>4. Sediment Removal</p> <p>This option requires the removal of contaminated sediment from the base of the wetlands. There will be significant disruption to the wetlands area that will involve heavy equipment. The estimated cost is \$10 to \$15 million.</p>	<p>Pro (i): Sediments are removed from the site.</p> <p>Con (i): There will be significant destruction to the environment associated with the wetland – approvals will be required for this work.</p> <p>Con (ii): This is the most expensive Option.</p>	<p>RANKING:_____</p> <p>SPECIFIC COMMENTS:_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>SUGGESTIONS OR OTHER COMMENTS:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>		
<p>PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS OR EMAIL ADDRESS TO BE NOTIFIED OF FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS AS WORK PROGRESSES:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>		
<p>FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, PLEASE CONTACT THE LYON’S CREEK REMEDIATION PROJECT COORDINATOR:</p> <p>David Slaine, M.Sc., P.Geo. Terra-Dynamics Consulting Inc. 404 Queenston St. St. Catharines, ON L2P 2Y2 905-646-7931 or dslaine@terra-dynamics.com</p>		