

Attachment 2: TRCA Flood Infrastructure Location Detail and Deficiency List

Table 1

Dams						
Dame Name	Dam Height (m)	Region/Municipality	Second Tier Municipality	Hazard Potential Classification*	Date Constructed	Known Deficiencies
G. Ross Lord Dam	19.3	Toronto	N/A	Very High	1972	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dam Safety Review due in 2024. • Dam foundation drainage system investigation and maintenance.
Claireville Dam	15.0	Toronto/Peel	Brampton	Very High	1963	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spillway capacity is too small, and the dam is at risk of overtopping during extreme events. • Right bank wing wall has settled and needs replacement. • Gates and hoisting systems require major maintenance. • Spillway stilling basin is too short for extreme events.
Stouffville Dam	7.6	York	Whitchurch-Stouffville	Very High	1969	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency spillway requires erosion protection. • Earthen embankment does not meet factor of safety requirements.
Milne Dam	9.3	York	Markham	Very High	1969	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spillway capacity is too small, and the dam is at risk of overtopping during extreme events. • Spillway does not meet loading requirements and is at risk of sliding during extreme events. • Spillway stilling basin is too short for extreme events.
Palgrave Dam	4.3	Peel	Caledon	Very High	1860	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spillway capacity is too small, and the dam is at risk of overtopping during extreme events. • Dam requires upgrades to the stop log lifting system. • Earthen embankment does not meet factor of safety requirements.
Black Creek Dam	7.3	Toronto	N/A	Moderate	1959	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flow control structure is susceptible to debris blockages and requires reconfiguration
Secord Dam	5.0	Durham	Uxbridge	Low	1930	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Earthen embankment is in very poor condition. • Dam is at risk of failing.
Osler Dam	5.0	Durham	Uxbridge	Low (Assumed)	1937	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete flow control structure is failing. • Dam is at risk of failing.
Glen Haffy Dam West	5.5	Peel	Caledon	Low	1950's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dam has separated discharge pipe.
Glen Haffy Dam East	5.5	Peel	Caledon	Low	1950's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires vegetation removal from embankment.
Glen Haffy Extension Upper Dam	5.0	Peel	Caledon	Low	1950's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spillway pipe failing • Embankment unstable • Dam is at risk of failing
Glen Haffy Extension Lower Dam	5.0	Peel	Caledon	Low	1950's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Embankment unstable • Dam is at risk of failing

*See Table 4 below for criteria used to determine Hazard Potential Classification for dams

Attachment 2: TRCA Flood Infrastructure Location Detail and Deficiency List

Table 2

Flood Control Channels					
Channel Name	Channel Length(m)	Region/Municipality	Second Tier Municipality	Date Constructed	Known Deficiencies
Yonge/York Mills Channel	530m	Toronto	Toronto	1959	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gabion lining has deteriorated.
Woodbridge Channel	1850m	York	Vaughan	1962	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two grade-control baffle chute structures are public safety issues and should be removed.
Stouffville Channel	370m	York	Whitchurch-Stouffville	1980	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gabion baskets are deteriorated and causing channel walls to fail. Sediment in channel requires removal.
Black Creek Channel	2370m	Toronto	Toronto	1969	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many concrete panels have cracked and settled.
Scarlett Channel	3600m	Toronto	Toronto	1959	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many concrete panels have cracked and settled.
Brampton Channel	570m	Peel	Brampton	1951	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Channel outfall is a public safety hazard.
Sheppard Channel	350m	Toronto	Toronto	1960's	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many concrete panels have cracked and settled. Low flow channel is failing
Mimico Malton Channel	650m	Peel	Mississauga	1969	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires maintenance dredging and clearing
Oak Ridges Channel	90m	York	King	1981	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires maintenance dredging and clearing

Attachment 2: TRCA Flood Infrastructure Location Detail and Deficiency List

Table 3

Dikes					
Dike Name	Dike Length(m)	Region/Municipality	Second Tier Municipality	Date Constructed	Known Deficiencies
Pickering Dike	1250m	Durham Region	Pickering	1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dike does not meet current engineering requirements for stability
Ajax Dike	350m	Durham Region	Ajax	1983	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dike does not meet current engineering requirements for stability
Bolton Dike	800m	Peel Region	Caledon	1983	None
Etobicoke Dike	460m	Peel Region	Brampton	1969	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dike has small erosion scar that needs to be repaired
West Don Flood Protection Landform	710m	City of Toronto	City of Toronto	2015	None
Tyndall Flood Wall	100m	Peel Region	Mississauga	1991	None

Table 4

Hazard Potential Classification				
Hazard Potential	Life Safety	Property Losses	Environmental Losses	Cultural Losses
Low	No Potential Loss of Life	Minimal damage to property with estimated losses not to exceed \$300,000.	Minimal loss of fish and/or wildlife habitat with high capability of natural restoration resulting in a very low likelihood of negatively affecting the status of the population.	Reversible damage to municipally designated cultural heritage sites under the Ontario Heritage Act.
Moderate	No Potential Loss of Life	<p>Moderate damage with estimated losses not to exceed \$3 million, to agricultural, forestry, mineral aggregate and mining, and petroleum resource operations, other dams or structures not for human habitation, infrastructure and services including local roads and railway lines.</p> <p>The inundation zone is typically undeveloped or predominantly rural or agricultural, or it is managed so that the land usage is for transient activities such as with day-use facilities.</p> <p>Minimal damage to residential, commercial, and industrial areas, or land identified as designated growth areas as shown in official plans.</p>	Moderate loss or deterioration of fish and/or wildlife habitat with moderate capability of natural restoration resulting in a low likelihood of negatively affecting the status of the population.	<p>Irreversible damage to municipal designated cultural heritage sites under the Ontario Heritage Act.</p> <p>Reversible damage to provincially designated cultural heritage sites under the Ontario Heritage Act or nationally recognized heritage sites.</p>
High	Potential Loss of Life of 1-10 persons	Appreciable damage with estimated losses not to exceed \$30 million, to agricultural, forestry, mineral aggregate and mining, and petroleum resource operations, other dams or residential,	Appreciable loss of fish and/ or wildlife habitat or significant deterioration of critical fish and/ or wildlife habitat with reasonable likelihood of being able to apply	Irreversible damage to provincially designated cultural heritage sites under the Ontario Heritage Act or damage to

		commercial, industrial areas, infrastructure and services, or land identified as designated growth areas as shown in official plans. Infrastructure and services includes regional roads, railway lines, or municipal water and wastewater treatment facilities and publicly-owned utilities.	natural or assisted recovery activities to promote species recovery to viable population levels. Loss of a portion of the population of a species classified under the Ontario Endangered Species Act as Extirpated, Threatened or Endangered, or reversible damage to the habitat of that species.	nationally recognized heritage sites.
Very High	Potential Loss of Life of 11 or more persons	Extensive damage, estimated losses in excess of \$30 million, to buildings, agricultural, forestry, mineral aggregate and mining, and petroleum resource operations, infrastructure and services. Typically includes destruction of, or extensive damage to, large residential, institutional, concentrated commercial and industrial areas and major infrastructure and services, or land identified as designated growth areas as shown in official plans. Infrastructure and services include highways, railway lines or municipal water and wastewater treatment facilities and publicly-owned utilities.	Extensive loss of fish and/ or wildlife habitat or significant deterioration of critical fish and/ or wildlife habitat with very little or no feasibility of being able to apply natural or assisted recovery activities to promote species recovery to viable population levels. Loss of a viable portion of the population of a species classified under the Ontario Endangered Species Act as Extirpated, Threatened or Endangered or irreversible damage to the habitat of that species.	

Notes:

1. Incremental losses are those losses resulting from dam failure above those which would occur under the same conditions (flood, earthquake or other event) with the dam in place but without failure of the dam.
2. Life safety. Refer to Technical Guide – River and Streams Systems: Flooding Hazard Limits, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, 2002, for definition of 2 x 2 rule. The 2 x 2 rule defines that people would be at risk if the product of the velocity and the depth exceeded 0.37 square metres per second or if velocity exceeds 1.7 metres per second or if depth of water exceeds 0.8 metres. For dam failures under flood conditions the potential for loss of life is assessed based on permanent dwellings (including habitable buildings and trailer parks) only. For dam failures under normal (sunny day) conditions the potential for loss of life is assessed based on both permanent dwellings (including habitable dwellings, trailer parks and seasonal campgrounds) and transient persons.
3. Property losses refer to all direct losses to third parties; they do not include losses to the owner, such as loss of the dam, or revenue. The dollar losses, where identified, are indexed to Statistics Canada values Year 2000.
4. An HPC must be developed under both flood and normal (sunny day) conditions.
5. Evaluation of the hazard potential is based on both present land use and on anticipated development as outlined in the pertinent official planning documents (e.g. Official Plan). In the absence of an approved Official Plan the HPC should be based on expected development within the foreseeable future. Under the Provincial Policy Statement, 'designated growth areas' means lands within settlement areas designated in an official plan for growth over the long-term planning horizon (specifies normal time horizon of up to 20 years), but which have not yet been fully developed. Designated growth areas include lands which are designated and available for residential growth in accordance with the policy, as well as lands required for employment and other uses (Italicized terms as defined in the PPS, 2005).
6. Where several dams are situated along the same watercourse, consideration must be given to the cascade effect of failures when classifying the structures, such that if failure of an upstream dam could contribute to failure of a downstream dam, then the HPC of the upstream dam must be the same as or greater than that of the downstream structure.
7. The HPC is determined by the highest potential consequences, whether life safety, property losses, environmental losses, or cultural-built heritage losses.