

## False Facts from the Proponent

This would close-in Portage Landing with two 10'-high retaining walls, and there'd be no way to get down into Portage Landing. We don't want to just look at the Moon River, we want to be able to get to it.

No, the real fact is you plan on **fencing-off Margaret Burgess Park forever**, so people could not get to the water. Stop hiding inconvenient truths and be honest.

This isn't "vacant Township land", this is part of the historic and traditional Bala Portage. You want to cut down all the trees on it, fill it with blasted rock, and drive dump trucks down it. Your offer is that you'd occupy and destroy three sites rather than one. As usual, your offer is for your benefit, not Bala's.

What is this plan. Tell us the whole plan. Why do you keep the appearance of your proposed generating station a secret. Why don't you tell us about fencing-off Margaret Burgess Park so people can't reach the water. What about the danger you'd create for people trying to dock at the Town Docks on the Moon River.

No, your're not. This just continues your greedy, self-serving demands, with no care about the long-term health of the area's economy.

What "informed", it has been nine years and we still don't know what you propose the appearance of this would be.

No, your're not. If you were really responding, you would address the public's concerns about safety and appearance. Why have you ignored the Scenic Flow Committee you convened. Why don't you tell us how tall this proposed thing would be.

This would require building a 10'-high retaining wall between Muskoka Road 169 and the Township's Portage Landing. This would be dangerous, require a fence, and would block the view down the Moon River.

You were denied having a meeting because you insisted these be secret negotiations. If you have something to say about the use of public lands, delegate at an open Council meeting like everyone else does, or write a letter detailing exactly what you're offering and what you expect in return. Closed Council sessions are not for private business negotiations.

**Project Update June 2014**

**Swift River Energy LIMITED**

**We're listening and we're responding**

Swift River is committed to keeping you informed about the North Bala Small Hydro Project. In this issue, we look at Traffic, Heritage and the Economy.

**You asked us to: MAINTAIN TRAFFIC FLOW through Bala**

**FACT** We had a plan to reduce potential traffic congestion. Muskoka Lakes Township voted it down.


**Our Plan:** We would widen the shoulder on the west side of the Highway 169 for offloading equipment to keep lanes open.

**Long Term Benefits:** More street parking, easier snow removal, and a new spot to safely pull over to view the river.

**Result:** The Township asked the District to deny us permission to widen the shoulder. Lane closures on Hwy 169 will now be required during construction.

**You asked us to: KEEP MARGARET BURGESS PARK OPEN to the public during and after construction.**

**FACT** We want to keep it open for you, untouched, and we have a plan. But your Township Council has refused to discuss this plan for the past 7 months. We offered to meet last October but were denied a meeting.



**Our Plan:** To lease the vacant Township lands beside the site, the Shield Parking Lot and the Township's portion of the Portage Parking Lot\* for construction access and staging. This would leave the Park open. In April, we offered to pay the Township \$100,000 for this lease and asked for a response by May 21. The Township never responded. Given the community interest, we have reached out once again to the Township to discuss this plan and its benefits to the Township and the community. We look forward to Township's response this month.

**Result:** If we cannot come to some form of agreement on this plan in a timely manner, Swift River will have to move on with its current staging plan that would result in the use of the Park for construction access and storage. This could close the Park for approximately 18 months.

**Present Construction Staging Areas Plan A**

Park closed for construction  
Orange - Crown lands  
Green - Project Site

**Possible Construction Staging Areas Plan B**

Township lands used, Park stays open  
Orange - Crown lands  
Green - Project Site  
Blue - Township Lands

\*Use of a part of the Portage Landing Parking Lot would be for off peak season months only (fall through spring).

Yes, let's talk benefits, but net benefits. How often would traffic need to be stopped for blasting and inspections. What would the impact be on the Farmer's Market and Cranberry festival if they could not use the Precambrian Shield parking lot for two seasons. Who's going to come to Bala to see the year-round trickle of water instead of the Bala Falls.

If you really "shared a concern about heritage" you wouldn't consider Portage Landing to be "vacant land", and ask to destroy it by cutting down all the trees and dumping it full of blasted rock.

Your own Heritage Impact Assessment concluded the area is a "distinct cultural heritage landscape", yet you wasted the Township's time and money by being the **only** objectors attending the Conservation Review Board to object.

If you really "shared a concern" about heritage, you'd complete a Heritage Impact Assessment for Margaret Burgess Park, given you'd be turning around large construction vehicles, removing trees, and building a temporary construction bridge, all of which would disturb the soil.

Any economic benefits you claim are meaningless because you refused to consider, or even ask about the negative economic impacts.

This is deceitful. You have not examined or reported the negative economic impacts, so your inflated self-serving, unjustified numbers are worse than wrong because you did not look at the negative impacts.

**Waterpower is an important part of Bala's heritage**

**FACT** Swift River has completed archaeological and heritage studies for much of the area in the Township's proposed Heritage Conservation District. Conclusions from these studies point to Bala's rich heritage of waterpower generation that dates back 100 years. We share a concern for heritage, and we're interested in working with the community to respect Bala's history. In fact, our studies are referenced in the Township's own study.

*< Respecting Bala's proud heritage: Bala Electric Light and Power Company Generating Station.*

**Plans for a Bala Heritage Conservation District (HCD): What We Learned**

We attended the Township's public meeting on May 16 and learned the following:

- The proposed Heritage Conservation District (HCD) will impose restrictions on both the area within and adjacent to the HCD.
- The Township's draft report outlines that viewsapes will likely be protected as well.

**Result:** There could be restrictions on all buildings and land visible from within the proposed HCD.

**FACT** The Township has already designated the Shield Parking Lot, the Town Docks on Lake Muskoka, and the vacant land beside our project site as heritage sites. Most of the remaining land is under the jurisdiction and control of upper level governments (District, Provincial or Federal).

**You asked for: an ECONOMIC IMPACT study**


**FACT** An independent Economic Impact Study by the Centre For Spatial Economics (C4SE) concluded the "economic benefits of the project are significant."

**Highlights:**

- \$3.6 million of labour income (65 person years of work) for Muskoka.
- Local spending estimated at \$10.8 million (and over \$5 million in GDP for Muskoka).

**The study found potential for Bala to share in these economic benefits:**

- Directly by local businesses supplying goods and services during the construction and operational phases of the project, and;
- Indirectly through the cascading effects on other area businesses.



*Proposed HCD boundary. Project site is shown in green.*

Your Economic Impact Study was not "independent", you paid them, you set the terms of reference, and you decided not to consider the negative economic impacts.

This claim is as stupid as burning your house to keep warm. The **long term** is what matters. What about the:

- The long-term economic impacts when nobody comes to Bala because looking at dry rocks where the falls used to be would not be interesting.
- Or the on-going danger to in-water recreation you'd create both upstream and downstream.
- Or the danger to docking at the Town Docks on the moon River due to the fast water

All we want to know is:

- Would it be **safe**.
- Would it be **beautiful**, as the area is.
- Would there be enough **water over the falls** to continue to draw people to Bala.

But the greedy proponent won't answer the public's fair and relevant questions.

**Find out what's really happening at  
SaveTheBalaFalls.com**