# Lakeview Waterfront Connection Coordinated Environmental Assessment Project (LWC EA)

Draft:

# Record of Consultation

May 2012

Region of Peel Working for you

CVC Credit Valley Conservation

inspiration lakeview

Toronto and Region Conservation for The Living City

MISSISSAUGA Leading today for tomorrow

**SENES Consultants Limited**

*Specialists in Energy, Nuclear and Environmental Sciences*

*In Association with:*

***Shore*Plan *Engineering Limited***

LimnoTech
Water | Environment | Scientists | Engineers

BrookMcIlroy

DCS
DECOMMISSIONING CONSULTING SERVICES LIMITED

crsp Clare Randall Smith Pendlebury Cost Consultants

PARISH geomorphic

Grant Thornton

MORRISON HERSHFIELD

**DRAFT**

# RECORD OF CONSULTATION
# for
# Lakeview Waterfront Connection
# Coordinated Environmental Assessment

**Prepared for:**

**Credit Valley Conservation**
**Regional Municipality of Peel**
**and**
**Toronto and Region Conservation Authority**

**Prepared by:**

**SENES Consultants Limited**
121 Granton Drive, Unit 12
Richmond Hill, Ontario
L4B 3N4

May 2012

Printed on Recycled Paper Containing Post-Consumer Fibre

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

1.0 INTRODUCTION ..... 1

2.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION ..... 1
- 2.1 Objectives ..... 1
- 2.2 Contact List ..... 2
- 2.3 Consultation Mechanisms ..... 2
  - 2.3.1 Notice of Commencement ..... 2
  - 2.3.2 Notice of Submission ..... 2
  - 2.3.3 Website ..... 3
  - 2.3.4 Newsletter ..... 3
  - 2.3.5 E-mail Notification ..... 3
  - 2.3.6 Public Information Centres (PICs) ..... 4
  - 2.3.7 Community Liaison Committee (CLC) ..... 5
  - 2.3.8 Letters to Local Business Owners ..... 6
- 2.4 Summary of Public Comments ..... 8

3.0 FIRST NATIONS AND MÉTIS CONSULTATION ..... 22
- 3.1 Objectives ..... 22
- 3.2 Contact List ..... 22
- 3.3 Consultation Mechanisms ..... 23
  - 3.3.1 Letters to First Nations and Métis Communities ..... 23
- 3.4 Summary of First Nations and Métis Comments ..... 23

4.0 AGENCY CONSULTATION ..... 25
- 4.1 Objectives ..... 25
- 4.2 Contact List ..... 25
- 4.3 Consultation Mechanisms ..... 26
  - 4.3.1 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) ..... 27
  - 4.3.2 Agency Meetings ..... 28
    - 4.3.2.1 Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) ..... 28
    - 4.3.2.2 Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) ..... 28
    - 4.3.2.3 Ministry of the Environment (MOE) ..... 29
    - 4.3.2.4 Ontario Power Generation (OPG) ..... 29
    - 4.3.2.5 City of Mississauga ..... 30
- 4.4 Summary of Agency Comments ..... 30

5.0 FEASIBILITY STUDY CONSULTATION ..... 39
- 5.1 Public Consultation ..... 39
  - 5.1.1 Public Stakeholder Workshop ..... 39
  - 5.1.2 Meeting with Lake Ontario Waterkeeper (LOW) ..... 39
  - 5.1.3 Summary of NGO Comments as they related to the Project ..... 39
- 5.2 First Nations and Métis Consultation ..... 44

5.2.1 Summary of First Nations and Métis Community Response ..... 44
5.3 Agency Consultation ..... 45
5.3.1 Core Steering Committee ..... 45
5.3.2 Agency Meetings ..... 45
5.3.2.1 Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) ..... 45
5.3.2.2 Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO) ..... 46
5.3.2.3 Ministry of the Environment (MOE) ..... 46
5.3.2.4 Ontario Power Generation (OPG) ..... 47
5.3.2.5 City of Mississauga ..... 47
5.3.3 Summary of Agency Comments ..... 47

6.0 NEXT STEPS ..... 53

## LIST OF APPENDICES

**Appendix A: Notice of Commencement (NoC)**

A1 Notice of Commencement
- A1.1 NoC Press Release, February 1st, 2012
- A1.2 NoC Distribution Summary Table

A2 Notice of Submission (to come)

**Appendix B: Public Information Centres (PICs)**

B1 PIC#1 Public Notices
- B1.1 Public Notice published in the Mississauga News and the Etobicoke Guardian on February 8, 2012 and February 9, 2012
- B1.2 Direct Email Notices
- B1.3 Direct Mail Notices
- B1.4 Website Notice
- B1.5 PIC #1 Press Release, Feb 7, 2012

B2 PIC#1 Material
- B2.1 Agenda and Workbook
- B2.2 Newsletter, Volume 1, February 23, 2012
- B2.3 Information Boards
- B2.4 PowerPoint Presentation

B3 PIC#1 Summary
- B3.1 Meeting Notes
- B3.2 Summary of Group Workbook Comments
- B3.3 Summary of Individual Workbook Comments

B4 PIC#2 Public Notices
- B4.1 Public Notice published in the Mississauga News and the Etobicoke Guardian on April 25, 2012
- B4.2 Direct Email Notices
- B4.3 Direct Mail Notices
- B4.4 Website Notice
- B4.5 PIC#2 Press Release, April 23, 2012

B5 PIC#2 Material
- B5.1 Agenda and Workbook
- B5.2 Newsletter, Volume 2, May 1, 2012
- B5.3 Information Boards
- B5.4 PowerPoint Presentation
- B5.5 Draft preliminary list of comparative evaluation criteria and indicators for evaluation of alternative methods

B6 PIC#2 Summary
- B6.1 Meeting Notes
- B6.2 Summary of Group Workbook Comments
- B6.3 Summary of Individual Workbook Comments

**Appendix C: Community Liaison Committee (CLC)**

**C**1 NGO Stakeholder Meetings (Feasibility Study)
- C1.1 PowerPoint Presentation
- C1.2 Summary notes to the August 16, 2011 meeting
- C1.3 Summary notes to the meeting with Lake Ontario Waterkeeper

C2 CLC Terms of Reference

C3 CLC#1
- C3.1 Agenda
- C3.2 PowerPoint Presentation
- C3.3 Meeting Notes

C4 CLC#2
- C4.1 Briefing Note (sent April 13, 2012)
- C4.2 Agenda
- C4.3 PowerPoint Presentation
- C4.4 Meeting Notes

**Appendix D: Business Consultation**

D1 Initial Introductory Letter

D2 Project Background Included with the Introductory Letter

D3 Notice of Commencement Included with the Introductory Letter

D4 CLC Briefing Note – Please see Item C4.1

D5 Notice of PIC #2 – See Item B4.1

**Appendix E: Website**

E1 LWC Website (May 22, 2012)

E2 LWC Project website statistics (From the Notice of Commencement until May 22, 2012)

**Appendix F: First Nations and Métis Consultation**

F1 Correspondence from Region of Peel with LWC Contact List for First Nations and Métis Communities
- F1.1 Region of Peel Contact List (send via email May 31, 2011)

F2 Letter to Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs and Ministry of Natural Resources (Feasibility Study)
- F2.1 Response

F3 Letter to Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development (Feasibility Study)
- F3.1 Response

F4 Letter of Intent (Feasibility Study)
- F4.1 LWC Feasibility Study Project Summary (encl)
- F3.2 Response

F5 Follow Up letter
- F5.1 LWC Feasibility Study Project Update (encl)

F6 Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (MNCFN) Meeting Summary Notes

F6.1 Meeting Summary Notes for August 18, 2011
F6.2 Email to MNCFN August 23, 2011
F6.3 Email from MNFCN August 23, 2011
F6.4 Meeting Summary Notes for Oct. 17, 2011
F6.5 Email to MNFCN Oct. 18, 2011
F7 Notice of Commencement of the EA ToR
F7.1 Notice of Commencement (encl)
F7.2 LWC EA Project Update (encl)
F7.3 Response
F8 Terms of Reference Progress Notification
F8.1 Response
F9 Submission of ToR Notification
F9.1 Response
F9 LWC First Nations and Métis Contact List and Registry (working version)

**Appendix G: Agency Consultation**
G1 Feasibility Study Core Steering Committee
G1.1 Minutes to June 15, 2011 Meeting
G1.2 Minutes to July 27, 2011 Meeting
G1.3 Minutes to August 9, 2011 Meeting
G1.4 Minutes to September 20, 2011 Meeting
G2 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
G2.1 TAC Terms of Reference
G2.2 Agenda to TAC #1
G2.3 PowerPoint Presentation to TAC #1
G2.4 Minutes to TAC #1
G2.5 Agenda to TAC #2
G2.6 PowerPoint to TAC #2
G2.7 Minutes to TAC #2
G2.8 Comparative Evaluation Criteria and Indicators for Evaluation of Alternative Methods, distributed to TAC members following TAC #2 on April 27, 2012 – Please see Item B5.5
G3 Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)
G3.1 Minutes to June 6, 2011 Meeting (Feasibility Study)
G3.2 Minutes to June 9, 2011 Meeting (Feasibility Study)
G3.3 Minutes to June 14, 2011 Teleconference (Feasibility Study)
G3.4 Minutes to August 3, 2011 Interagency Briefing and Input Meeting (Feasibility Study)
G3.5 Minutes to August 10, 2011 DFO / MNR Monthly Meeting with CVC (Feasibility Study)
G3.6 Email correspondence between February 1, 2012 and March 19, 2012
G3.7 Notes to April 2, 2012 Interagency Meeting with CVC
G3.8 Presentation to the May 7, 2012 Meeting

G3.9 Minutes to the May 7, 2012 Meeting

G4 Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)

G4.1 Minutes to June 2, 2011 Aquatic Habitat Toronto Meeting (Feasibility Study)

G4.2 Minutes to June 6, 2011 Meeting (Feasibility Study) – Please see Item G3.1

G4.3 Minutes to August 10, 2011 DFO / MNR Monthly Meeting with CVC (Feasibility Study) – Please see Item G3.5

G4.4 Presentation to the March 1, 2012 Aquatic Habitat Toronto Meeting – Please see Item G3.8

G4.5 Minutes to the March 1, 2012 Aquatic Habitat Toronto Meeting

G4.6 Minutes to the May 3, 2012 Teleconference

G5 City of Mississauga

G5.1 April 10, 2012 Presentation to the Environmental Advisory Committee

G5.2 City of Mississauga Recommendation from the April 10, 2012 Presentation to the Environmental Advisory Committee

# LIST OF TABLES

Page No.


Table 2-1 Notice of Commencement Publication Information ..... 2
Table 2-2 Notice of Submission Publication Information (pending) ..... 3
Table 2-3 Summary of PIC Notices ..... 4
Table 2-4 Overview of PICs ..... 4
Table 2-5 Overview of CLC Meetings ..... 6
Table 2-6 Landowners and Businesses Located within the Project Study Area ..... 6
Table 2-7 Project Notifications to Landowners and Businesses ..... 7
Table 2-8 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During PIC#1 and PIC#2 ..... 9
Table 2-9 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During CLC Meetings #1 and #2 ..... 16

Table 3-1 Mailed correspondence to First Nations and Métis Communities ..... 23
Table 3-2 Responses from First Nations and Métis Communities with an Interest in the LWC Project ..... 24

Table 4-1 Agencies contacted during the LWC EA ToR ..... 26
Table 4-2 Final TAC Membership ..... 27
Table 4-3 TAC Meetings ..... 27
Table 4-4 Overview of Correspondence and Meetings with MNR during ToR ..... 28
Table 4-5 Consultation Activities held with DFO ..... 29
Table 4-6 Meetings Held with the MOE ..... 29
Table 4-7 Consultation Activities with OPG ..... 30
Table 4-8 Consultation Activities with the City of Mississauga ..... 30
Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments ..... 31

Table 5-1 Summary of NGO Comments as they related to the LWC Project ..... 40
Table 5-2 Responses from First Nations and Métis Communities with an Interest in the LWC Project ..... 44
Table 5-3 Overview of meetings and correspondence with MNR ..... 46
Table 5-4 Summary of Consultation Activities Held with DFO Outside of the Feasibility Study Core Steering Committee ..... 46
Table 5-5 Overview of meetings held with MOE ..... 47
Table 5-6 Overview of consultation activities with OPG ..... 47
Table 5-7 Summary of Agency Comments Related to the LWC Feasibility Study ..... 48

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Record of Consultation documents the public, agency and First Nations and Métis consultation activities which took place as part of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Lakeview Waterfront Connection Project Environment Assessment (LWC Project EA). While the official consultation activities for the ToR began with the Notice of Commencement (NoC) for the EA, much of the formative consultation was initiated in 2011 during the LWC Feasibility Study.

This document primarily outlines the consultation activities related to the LWC EA ToR; however, it does provide a separate section (Section 5) that outlines the formative consultation activities that took place during the Feasibility Study.

# 2.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

## 2.1 OBJECTIVES

Public consultation serves to bring stakeholders and the community together in a way that channels community energy and fosters wide-based support for the Project. To date, CVC and the Region of Peel have conducted various activities for the public and interest groups to provide input.

The objective of the ToR public consultation was to consult with all interested members of the public and interest groups about the ToR, the proposed evaluation framework, and the proposed consultation plan for the EA such that there is buy-in as to how the EA will be conducted. This was done by providing:

- information in a user-friendly format;
- opportunities for input before decisions were made;
- appropriate, flexible and convenient opportunities for consultation that met the needs of the public;
- responsive listening to comments;
- written responses to key issues; and
- clear documentation of all consultation activities.

During the development of the ToR, many stakeholders were invited to and participated in consultation activities. The consultation program included two Public Information Centres (PICs) and two Community Liaison Committee (CLC) meetings, among other consultation mechanisms.

## 2.2 CONTACT LIST

The contact list of interested members of the public was compiled by combining the e-mailing lists of relevant projects in the vicinity of the LWC Project (Inspiration Lakeview, Arsenal Lands/Marie Curtis Park Master Plans), in addition to attendees of the two PICs, and people who contacted the Public Consultation Coordinator via e-mail or phone expressing interest in the Project.

## 2.3 CONSULTATION MECHANISMS

### 2.3.1 Notice of Commencement

A Notice of Commencement (NoC) was released announcing the initiation of the LWC EA ToR. The NoC described the project, and provided information on the location and date of the first PIC. The NoC was posted on the Project website and e-mailed/mailed to the contact list. It was also published in various local newspapers, as outlined in Table 2-1. The NoC is included in Appendix A.1.1.

**Table 2-1 Notice of Commencement Publication Information**

| Event | Media Outlet | Date of Publication |
|---|---|---|
| Notice of Commencement | Mississauga News | Jan. 25th, 2012 |
| | Mississauga News this Week | Jan. 26th , 2012 |
| | Etobicoke Guardian | Jan. 26th, 2012 |

### 2.3.2 Notice of Submission

A Notice of Submission was posted on the Project website, e-mailed/mailed to the contact list, and published in local newspapers (Table 2-2). The Notice described the Project and directed the public to locations where the ToR could be reviewed. It included the dates of the review period, and the details of where comments could be sent.

**Table 2-2 Notice of Submission Publication Information (pending)**

| Event | Media Outlet | Date of Publication |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

### 2.3.3 Website

A website for the LWC Project was initiated at the beginning of the ToR stage (Appendix E). The site contained a detailed description of the Project to date, as well as a number of document links. The documents available for download included:

- LWC Feasibility Study;
- NoC;
- PIC presentation;
- PIC agendas and workbooks with questions;
- Newsletters; and
- Poster Displays.

### 2.3.4 Newsletter

Two editions of the LWC Project newsletter have been printed to date. The first was provided to the attendees of PIC#1 and the second was available at PIC#2. Both newsletters were also made available at various events attended by CVC's Lake Ontario Integrated Shoreline Strategy (LOISS) Project Team and were posted to the project website. The newsletters provided information related to Project background, challenges and opportunities, the EA process, opportunities for public involvement, and next steps. The two newsletters are included in Appendices B2.2 and B5.2.

### 2.3.5 E-mail Notification

Emails notifying the public of PIC#1 and PIC#2 were sent to the contact list. More detailed information about e-mail notification can be found in Section 2.3.6 below (Public Information Centres).

### 2.3.6 Public Information Centres (PICs)

During the development of the ToR, CVC and Region of Peel hosted two PICs. The PICs were open to any member of the public or interested organization and were meant to provide an opportunity for attendees to gain an understanding of the Project and to provide input at key milestones during the ToR phase. The PICs included information poster boards in an Open House style layout, followed by presentations by members of the LWC EA Project Team, and a facilitated discussion and questions and answers.

Notices of PIC#1 and PIC#2 were published in local papers and sent via e-mail to the contact list. Details of PIC public notices are provided in Table 2-3. Details of direct e-mail notifications are provided in Table 2-4.

**Table 2-3 Summary of PIC Notices**

| Event | Media Outlet | Date of Publication |
|---|---|---|
| PIC#1 | Mississauga News | February 8 , 2012 |
| | Mississauga News this Week | February 9 , 2012 |
| | Etobicoke Guardian | February 9, 2012 |
| PIC#2 | Mississauga News | April 25, 2012 |
| | Mississauga News this Week | April 25, 2012 |
| | Etobicoke Guardian | April 25, 2012 |

Table 2-4 provides an overview of PIC#1 and PIC#2. Appendix B documents PIC meeting summary notes, workbooks, agendas, display boards, presentations, summary of input received, and copies of PIC newspaper notices and direct e-mail notices. Key questions and comments received during both PICs are summarized in Table 2-9.

**Table 2-4 Overview of PICs**

| Event | Date | Objectives | Attendance |
|---|---|---|---|
| PIC#1 | February 23, 2012 | - To introduce the public to the project team.<br>- To summarize requirements of the EA process.<br>- To provide a summary of projects in the vicinity of the LWC project.<br>- Introduce the LWC project vision, goals and objectives.<br>- To outline aspects of the project to be considered. | 106 |
| PIC#2 | May 1, 2012 | - To report back on changes made to the Terms of Reference and scope as presented during PIC#1 and CLC#2.<br>- To present draft material from the Terms of Reference for review and comment. | 52 |

### 2.3.7 Community Liaison Committee (CLC)

As part of the EA consultation process, a Community Liaison Committee (CLC) was established. The purpose of the CLC was to assist in reaching out and maintaining contact with representative community residents, groups, associations, and organizations, and to provide community input and advice throughout the Individual EA ToR, Individual EA, and CEAA Environmental Screening EA processes of the LWC EA. A key role of the CLC was also to provide feedback on the content and format of presentation materials in advance of the PICs.

The CLC was composed of a broad range of community groups, associations, and organizations as well as community members and appointed representatives, and included:

- Port Credit Village Residents Association;
- Mississauga Bassmasters;
- Credit River Anglers Association;
- Port Credit Yacht Club;
- South Peel Naturalist Club;
- Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee;
- Mississauga Residents' Associations Network;
- Rattray Marsh Protection Association;
- Ontario Cycling Association;
- Lakeview Estates Ratepayers' Association;
- The City of Mississauga;
- Port Credit Salmon and Trout Association;
- Port Credit Business Improvement Area;
- Mississauga Canoe Club;
- Town of Port Credit Association;
- Sierra Club of Ontario, Peel Region;
- Mississauga South Historical Association;
- MP – Mississauga South;
- City of Mississauga Councillor – Ward 1; and
- Select community members/residents.

Overviews of CLC meeting #1 and #2 are provided in Table 2-6. Appendix C documents CLC meeting summary notes, briefing notes, agendas, comment summaries, presentations, and sign-in sheets. Key questions and comments received during both CLCs are summarized in Section 2.4 (Table 2-10).

**Table 2-5 Overview of CLC Meetings**

| Event | Date | Objectives | Attendance |
|---|---|---|---|
| CLC Meeting #1 | March 1, 2012 | - To introduce the CLC to the Project Team.<br>- To summarize the LWC EA consultation plan.<br>- To summarize the consultation outcomes and key findings of the LWC Feasibility Study.<br>- To provide context for and administration of the LWC EA.<br>- To describe the environment in the vicinity of the LWC project.<br>- To describe the approach for completing the LWC EA.<br>- To receive feedback on the EA approach and Project goal and objectives.<br>- To present an outline of the proposed ToR and scope. | 16 CLC members |
| CLC Meeting #2 | April 19, 2012 | - To report back on changes made to the ToR and scope as presented during PIC#1 and CLC Meeting #2.<br>- To receive feedback on the PIC#2 presentation.<br>- To present and receive feedback on: (i) the preliminary evaluation of 'Alternatives To'; (ii) the framework for the development and comparative evaluation of 'Alternative Methods'; and (iii) the preliminary comparative evaluation criteria. | 15 CLC members |

### 2.3.8 Letters to Local Business Owners

The Project Team consulted with the landowners and businesses located south of Lakeshore Road and east of Lakefront Promenade to Etobicoke Creek regarding the LWC Project. A total of 21 landowners and 26 businesses were identified, as shown in Table 2-7.

**Table 2-6 Landowners and Businesses Located within the Project Study Area**

| Landowner | Business | Business Address |
|---|---|---|
| National Bait Incorporated | National Bait Incorporated | 946 Lakeshore Road East |
| Northam Realty | Interior Manufacturing Group Incorporated | 974 Lakeshore Road East |
| | Lakefront Manufacturing Incorporated | 925 Lakefront Promenade |
| | Northstar Composites | 983 Rangeview Road |
| | Bolton Bookbinding (2000) Limited | 1025 Rangeview Road |
| Unknown | AJ Lanzarotta Wholesale Fruit and Vegetable Limited | 1000 Lakeshore Road East |
| 1207238 Ontario Limited | Oasis Convention Centre | 1036 Lakeshore Road East |
| Ilsco of Canada Limited | Ilsco of Canada Limited | 1050 Lakeshore Road East |
| Ingersoll-Road Canada Incorporated | Ingersoll Rand Security & Safety | 1076 Lakeshore Road East |
| 1131829 Ontario Limited | Toronto Fabricating & Manufacturing Company | 1021 Rangeview Road |
| Gaspard & Sons (Ontario) Limited | Gaspard & Sons | 1035 Rangeview Road |

**Table 2-6 Landowners and Businesses Located within the Project Study Area (Cont'd)**

| Landowner | Business | Business Address |
|---|---|---|
| Select Overhead Door Service Incorporated | Select Overhead Door Service Incorporated | 1045 Rangeview Road |
| DiamondCorp. | Vacant | 1083 Rangeview Road |
| C/S Construction Specialties Ltd. | C/S Construction Specialties Company | 895 Lakefront Promenade |
| Elias Brothers Construction Limited | Avenue Moving & Storage Limited | 996 Rangeview Road |
| | Specialty Gaskets Inc. | 996 Rangeview Road |
| 1594282 Ontario Limited | Genco Marine Limited | 1008 Rangeview Road |
| Stratos Technologies | Stratos Industries | 1024 Rangeview Road |
| 2120412 Ontario Limited | Xtreme Tire Garage | 1044 Rangeview Road |
| Wesley Holdings Incorporated | Long Branch Foundry | 1062 Rangeview Road |
| Kotyck Properties Limited | Kotyck Brothers Limited | 1076 Rangeview Road |
| Dunwin Realty Limited | Plasterform Incorporated | 1180 Lakeshore Road East |
| Anchor Lamina Incorporated | Vacant | 1200 Lakeshore Road East |
| Grohe Canada Incorporated | Grohe Canada Incorporated | 1230 Lakeshore Road East |
| McKenna Holdings Limited | ACA Immigration Incorporated | 1258 Lakeshore Road East |
| | McKenna Logistics Centres | 1260 Lakeshore Road East |

The businesses and landowners within the Project Study Area were contacted a total of three times (including PIC notices) during the ToR phase, as described in Table 2-8 (see Appendix D). All correspondence included an open invitation to meet with Project staff to discuss the LWC in greater detail.

**Table 2-7 Project Notifications to Landowners and Businesses**

| Notification | Date |
|---|---|
| NoC, including Project background information and notice of PIC#1 | February 3, 2012 |
| CLC Briefing Note (Project update) | April 17, 2012 |
| Notice of PIC#2 | April 23, 2012 |

Three landowners/businesses responded to the initial NoC and requested further information regarding the project (Elias Brothers Construction Limited, Grohe Canada Incorporated, and Oasis Catering Limited). Respondents were encouraged to attend PIC#1 and PIC#2 and were advised that Project staff would be pleased to meet following the PICs to address any further questions or comments. Several landowners and businesses were in attendance at either PIC#1 or PIC#2, including McKenna Logistics Centres, Oasis Catering Limited, and Elias Brothers Construction Limited.

In addition, a number of utility companies have infrastructure located south of Lakeshore Road and east of Lakefront Promenade to Etobicoke Creek. These are:

- Enersource Hydro Mississauga;
- Enbridge Gas;
- Bell Canada; and
- Rogers Cable.

These companies were provided with the NoC, including background Project information; an invitation to PIC#1; and an open invitation to meet with Project staff to discuss the Project in greater detail on February 3, 2012. To date, no utility company has responded to correspondence from the Project Team.

## 2.4 SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following tables present a summary of the issues and comments received to date through the mechanisms described in Section 2.3. Consideration of the issues raised and comments provided by the LWC Project Team is also provided.

**Table 2-8 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During PIC#1 and PIC#2**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| **EA Study Area** | | |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider extending the study area through the OPG lands. | Discussions are ongoing between OPG, Region of Peel, CVC, and City of Mississauga to explore opportunities for expansion of the Project Study Area as part of this EA. Currently, no decision has been made to include OPG lands and water lots. The LWC EA has the flexibility to expand the Project Study Area to the west if the opportunity arises. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | The study area is reasonable. | Noted. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Would like to see study area extended east of Etobicoke Creek. | TRCA and City of Toronto are implementing the Marie Curtis Park Master Plan. There are no plans to undertake lakefilling along the existing sand beaches of Marie Curtis Park in the Master Plan, nor as part of the LWC Project. In the event that that is contemplated through the LWC EA process, we do have the flexibility to expand the Project Study area at that time. The LWC EA will include consideration of parallel projects and planning activities which extend beyond the current Project Study Area as part of the effects assessment. |
| **EA Study Process** | | |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Ensure that the process aligns with previous work conducted during the Inspiration Lakeview process. | The LWC is a project that fits within the Inspiration Lakeview planning context. The Project Team is working closely with the City of Mississauga to ensure that all aspects of the LWC Project are consistent with the Inspiration Lakeview vision. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider negative impacts as well as positive impacts. | The EA process requires the proponent to consider both the positive and negative effects of each alternative considered. |
| **EA Consultation and Communications Process** | | |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Provide regular progress updates on web site and maintain public involvement. | The EA ToR stage will include two CLC meetings and two PICs. All of the material presented at the PIC meetings will be posted online to the LWC website. The consultation plan for the EA will be open to public comment and presented in the ToR. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Include 3D visuals to get a better sense of what is being proposed. | 3D visuals are an effective way to present ideas that are being contemplated through a planning process once we are at the stage of considering the short list of alternatives. The LWC EA does include some budget to include the development of visuals and renderings for the EA alternative and for consultation purposes. We do not currently possess budget to undertake detailed 3D modeling exercises and flyovers. |

**Table 2-8 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During PIC#1 and PIC#2 (Cont`d)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | First Nations should be consulted over the course of the EA study. | Extensive consultation has been initiated during the LWC Feasibility Study and continues throughout the LWC EA with First Nations and Métis. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Keep language accessible and easy to understand throughout the EA study. | The Proposed Goal and Project Objectives have been edited based on comments received so that language is clear and simple. Moving forward we will continue to use simple language. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Could you please provide a definition of "terrestrial" | Terrestrial habitat refers to habitat (flora and fauna) that exists above the waterline. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Will there be additional opportunity to review the findings of the EA, including the effects and the project details? | Yes. There will be opportunity to review EA study results over the course of the EA phase of the Project during more public meetings. In addition, there will also be an opportunity to review the draft EA prior to submission to the MOE and once the final EA is submitted to the MOE and placed on public record for review. |
| Email sent to Brooke Erickson, May 3, 2012 | Other organizations who may wish to participate in consultations include heritage organizations, universities and colleges, naturalist organizations and Etobicoke residents. | We have ensured these groups have had the opportunity to provide input on the LWC Project by including representatives from these organizations and individuals with these interests on the CLC. |
| **EA Goals and Objectives** | | |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider incorporating educational opportunities on site, such as interpretive signs and education facilities. | The objective addressing access includes opportunities for educational opportunities on site. It should be noted that it is unlikely that the EA will detail these types of opportunities; this is more appropriate for the detailed design stage after EA approval has been granted. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | The Lakeview Waterfront should be open to the public year round. | This operational consideration will be part of the discussion around alternatives and suitable uses during the EA. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | An important goal of the EA study should also include social sustainability, such as quality of life and community impacts | The Project has received strong direction to make the goal statement simple and clear. Incorporating terminology such as "social sustainability" would require substantial clarification that would diminish that direction. Project impact on residential quality of life and the community will be addressed however in specific evaluation criteria during the EA. Extensive opportunities will be provided to the public to review these criteria to ensure those elements are included in the overall evaluation. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Maintaining access to the shoreline and views of the water should be a critical goal of the study. | Access to and along the water is included in the Project goal and objectives. Specific evaluation criteria will assess views to the water through the EA process. |

**Table 2-8 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During PIC#1 and PIC#2 (Cont`d)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Building habitat for a range of different non-invasive species should be a key objective of the study. | This recommendation was incorporated in the first objective. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | The LWC project should be imaginative and inspirational. | Noted. The LWC EA is being undertaken within the context of the overall Inspiration Lakeview activities. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | The piers should be open to the public. | The OPG piers are not part of the LWC Project. Access to the Piers is an ongoing discussion element between the City and OPG as part of the overall Inspiration Lakeview discussions. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider security issues, ensuring that the Lakeview Waterfront is a safe destination not to be used for unsavoury activities. | The LWC EA will develop evaluation criteria specifically to address elements of public access, public use and access by emergency vehicles/personnel. The eventual programming of the space, following EA approval, will need to address specific security issues as part of the on-going management of the site. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Cultural heritage should be maintained and featured. | Cultural heritage will be incorporated into the evaluation criteria, and has been added specifically to the Project objectives. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Consider changing the word “natural” to “naturalized”. | “Naturalized” frequently refers to vegetation or wildlife that was introduced to an area and has since become well-established in this new area. Dandelions and common carp are deemed to have become naturalized in North America. “Natural” infers that the project will be planned and established with the intention of encouraging use by “native” plants and animals. Since, the LWC EA will seek to maximize opportunities for the establishment of “native” plants and wildlife, it is appropriate to leave the terminology as “natural” rather than “naturalized”.<br><br>Similarly, for the purposes of this EA, the term “naturalization” is referred broadly as the process of improving land and aquatic habitat and function. While this allows for a wide range of actions as it relates to implementation, it does assume that efforts will seek to maximize opportunities to establish “native” plants and wildlife. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Consider including recreational opportunities. | Recreational Opportunities are mentioned as a priority in the *Access* objective. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Consider clarifying what is meant by “degraded area”. | Degraded area refers to an area with impaired or underperforming terrestrial or aquatic habitat function. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | For “access”, consider clarifying what is meant by “compatible recreational | ”Compatible recreational opportunities” refers to those activities that are compatible in a “natural” park environment. Passive recreation opportunities |

**Table 2-8 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During PIC#1 and PIC#2 (Cont`d)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| | opportunities". | are typically envisioned in these environments. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | For "resource optimization", consider changing "natural park" to "naturalized park". | See response to comment on "natural" vs. "naturalization" above. |
| **Alternatives To** | | |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider including Inspiration Lakeview activities in combination with the LWC – one large EA. | The LWC EA is being undertaken with close involvement of the City of Mississauga and within the context of Inspiration Lakeview. However, the LWC EA is not the appropriate planning tool to program municipal infrastructure and services, and municipal plans for the broader Inspiration Lakeview area. Separate planning processes are required including a Municipal Master Plan Class EA and Secondary Plans. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Additional "Alternatives To" ought to be explored. | The Project goal states that the Project will "create a new natural waterfront park that will improve ecosystem habitats and public linkages to the eastern Mississauga waterfront". We propose to undertake the EA by identifying two broad categories of approaches ('Alternatives To') to meet the Project goal: alternatives that use lakefill, and alternatives that do not use lakefill. However, in the EA ToR we also identify that the existing shoreline in the Project Study Area is used by critical infrastructure and as such, a high level evaluation of 'Alternatives To' indicated that alternatives that do not use lakefill will not meet the Project goal. As such, the EA ToR proposes the two 'Alternatives To', with a number of alternative approaches to lakefilling ('Alternative Methods') being developed during the EA stage to meet the Project goal. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | The lakefill approach is a good 'Alternative To' and preferred over a dig and dump approach. | Noted. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | It would be helpful for the Project Team to include photographs of historical conditions in the area. | These air photos were shown during the first PIC and can be incorporated in future PICs for context. |
| **Alternative Methods** | | |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider the incorporation of restaurant and commercial uses. | Currently, the LWC EA is only contemplating passive recreation uses and naturalization functions within the lakefill area. The Inspiration Lakeview planning process is intended to contemplate the broader suite of commercial uses within the adjacent lands. |
| PIC #1 | Consider a range of different recreational | The LWC EA will consider providing opportunities for a broad range of passive |

**Table 2-8 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During PIC#1 and PIC#2 (Cont`d)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| February 23, 2012 | uses. | recreational uses through the EA process. The eventual programming of the site will follow EA approval. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | The Lakeview Waterfront should be designed with active transportation in mind. | The LWC EA itself will consider opportunities for multi-modal access to and within the Project Study Area. Issues such as parking and proximity to existing or future transit along Lakeshore will be assessed. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider incorporating off-leash area, picnic area, and community gardens. | A more detailed discussion of opportunities for "appropriate" passive recreation uses will be held during the EA stage and following EA approval. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider creating habitat that would benefit migratory species. | This is a major consideration of the natural functions for the LWC Project. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider naturalizing Serson Creek. | At this time, two alternative concepts for Serson Creek are being contemplated and will be evaluated as part of the LWC EA. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Consider the possibility of creating off-shore spawning habitat. | The LWC EA will consider the possibility of creating off-shore spawning habitat. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Will the incorporation of a wetland as part of the LWC project purify the water entering Lake Ontario and help to reduce odour? | The intent of the wetland habitat is not to clean water, but rather to maximize habitat function and diversity. While there will be some minor benefits such as a reduced amount of silt entering Lake Ontario and minor diversion of nutrient uptake by wetland plants instead of algae, such improvements would be difficult to quantify. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Why don't we design the wetland to also purify water because we want to improve sustainability, not just habitat? | From a regulatory perspective, if we design the wetland to clean water, it effectively becomes a stormwater pond and it will no longer be considered "habitat". This has implications on other areas of the Project that will require us to create habitat that compensates for the loss of habitat. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | It would be helpful to understand the downside of each step of the 'Alternative Methods' framework, and it is difficult to make decisions without knowing all of the 'Alternative Methods' options. | Fundamentally, there are no "downsides" to each step, only different ways of approaching the development of 'Alternative Methods'. A different way of posing this question is: "is there a more effective way to develop and evaluate a range of alternatives?" For the LWC, a wide range of shoreline modifications can be implemented using the approach. We have attempted to create a rationalized framework from which we can establish alternatives that are viable and replicable. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Type of recreational activities. | Specific recreation types will be defined during the development of parks Master Plans, which is a separate process from the EA. However, input during |

**Table 2-8 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During PIC#1 and PIC#2 (Cont`d)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| | | the EA regarding what the public would like to see will help frame space requirements and set the framework during detailed design. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Type of habitat. | Habitat possibilities include wetlands, aquatic habitat, meadow and successional forest and shoreline habitats. Detailed design, following the EA, will detail specific habitat. The EA will establish ecological functions at a coarse level of detail. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | A discussion about the OPG lands. | The ToR is being written so that if we are able to incorporate the OPG lands into the Study Area at a later date, we will have the flexibility in the EA to do so. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Policy implications in the regional context. | Ecosystem functions and recreational function of the Preferred Alternative will seek to meet Regional Study Area policy goals. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | The method for transporting fill from the arsenal lands to the project site. | At this point it is assumed that fill will be transported by trucks; however, other options may be reviewed as part of the EA. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | The Small Arms building renovation and the potential use of the building as an interpretive centre. | The Small Arms building renovation is not a part of the LWC Project, but does fit within the larger Waterfront Parks Strategy for the City of Mississauga. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | That aquatic habitat is more favourable than terrestrial habitat, especially riparian habitat. | Both aquatic and terrestrial habitats are priorities for the LWC EA. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Existing recreational uses in the area, such as windsurfing. | Existing water uses of the area will be considered in the evaluation of alternatives and refinement of the Preferred Alternative. |
| **Scope of EA Study for Socio-Economic and Biophysical Effects to be Examined** | | |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | The effects of stockpiling should be examined. | We are undergoing the required permitting processes to implement an interim stockpile for the fill material. The LWC EA will consider alternative routes to transport material from the stockpile to the project area. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Transportation effects should be examined. | The EA will assess the effects of transportation of fill and of visitors to the site. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Visual effects should be examined. | Evaluation criteria on aesthetics and viewscapes will be considered as part of the evaluation. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Atmospheric emissions should be examined. | Effects to air quality from construction dust and vehicle emissions will be assessed as part of the EA. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Ground water and storm water effects should be examined. | The EA will assess effects of the Project on groundwater and storm water and of groundwater and storm water on the Project. |
| PIC #1<br>February 23, 2012 | Review the origin and quality of the fill. | MOE regulations for lake fill quality will be met and fill will be tested prior to use. Fill from local infrastructure projects will be prioritized for this project. Fill |

**Table 2-8 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During PIC#1 and PIC#2 (Cont`d)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| | | sourced from local private development may be sought if required. |
| PIC #2<br>May 1, 2012 | Have the effects (especially odour) of the water treatment plant in the area been studied? | Several studies have been conducted assessing odour effects. The Region of Peel established a committee to receive feedback from the public in the vicinity of the Water Treatment Plant with respect to odour issues. In addition, the Region of Peel has invested approximately $380 million in upgrades to the Lakeview Plant to monitor and reduce odour. No odour studies have been undertaken specific to LWC Project but the Region of Peel does conduct continuous monitoring. Furthermore, an odour study that will include additional mitigating measures will be conducted as part of the Inspiration Lakeview Master Plan which will be starting in approximately two months. |
| E-mail sent to Brooke Erickson (TRCA), May 3, 2012 | Please address the project effects on:<br>- Downstream effect on Etobicoke beaches.<br>- Navigation and boat traffic.<br>- Trans-Canada Trail disruption<br>- "bloom" direction from Etobicoke Creek.<br>- Wet weather flow on western beaches.<br>- Existing uses of Etobicoke Bay. | The EA will consider impacts on beaches, navigation, trail use, and water uses. Cumulative effect considerations of other projects including wet weather flow will be included. |

**Table 2-9 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During CLC Meetings #1 and #2**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| **EA Study Area** | | |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Consider extending the study area through the OPG lands. | Discussions are ongoing between OPG, Region of Peel, CVC, and City of Mississauga to explore opportunities for expansion of the Project Study Area as part of this EA. Currently, no decision has been made to include OPG lands and waterlots. The LWC EA has the flexibility to expand the Project Study Area if the opportunity arises. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | The Project Study Area, Regional Study Area and temporal timelines make complete sense. But use less jargon: instead of 'temporal' use 'time'. | Noted. |
| **EA Study Process** | | |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | It may be challenging to have two municipalities (Region of Peel and City of Mississauga) involved in the EA study. | The Region of Peel is a co-proponent on the LWC EA with CVC. Both the Region and City have a long history of working together and see strong economic, ecologic and public benefits behind this Project within the context of the broader planning context of Inspiration Lakeview. CVC and TRCA also have a long history of collaborating on inter-jurisdictional conservation projects and have a strong working relationship with the various partners. |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | In light of the aggressive timeline for the LWC EA study, we should be discussing Phase 2. | The EA is proceeding on the assumption that Phase 1 (Eastern Sector, the current Project Study Area) can be implemented as a stand-alone component, but have the ability to be expanded efficiently if, and when Phase 2 (the OPG Lakeview site) gets approval to proceed. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider accelerating the process. | We are already ahead of schedule. Because fill from the Hanlan Water project will be generated shortly, the opportunity for the LWC EA is ahead of the overall Inspiration Lakeview schedule. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Will the accelerated process affect the outcomes of the project? | No. The only difference in accelerating the process is pace. There have been many EA studies of similar scope and complexity completed over a shorter period of time than the timeline for this project. We will need to be focused and complete this EA according to MOE standards. We will also have to accept that the decisions made may not be scientifically optimal. While science is considered in the EA process, the EA is not about science, it is about a decision-making. |

**Table 2-9 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During CLC Meetings #1 and #2 (Cont'd)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| **EA Consultation and Communications Process** | | |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Consider preparing Facebook page or password protected online forum for CLC discussion. | When consulted post-meeting, most CLC members were comfortable with an online forum, but not comfortable making it a Facebook group. At CLC meeting #2 we will revisit this topic with the group. |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Ensure that materials are provided far enough in advance in order to provide comments. | Given the accelerated timelines we are working under, it can be difficult to provide information in advance of the meetings. However, we will make every effort to provide information up to one week in advance of CLC meetings. CLC members will also have the opportunity to provide feedback following the CLC meeting on material made available at the meeting. |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Keep language accessible and easy to understand throughout the EA study. | The proposed goal and objectives have been edited based on comments received so that language is clear and simple. Moving forward we will continue to use simple language. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider using colloquial terms instead of the following terms: geomorphology, bathymetry and habitat. It will be hard for members of the public to understand what these terms mean. If appropriate terms are not used, these should be explained. | Noted. A glossary is proposed for such terms in the EA ToR and EA. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider not using as much technical information and providing an opportunity to engage the public in a more creative, hands-on manner. A charrette-style workshop might be a good approach. Also consider using more visuals in presentations. | We have incorporated hands-on, more workshop style sessions for other projects to allow the public more opportunities to explore ideas. We will consider organizing a charrette-style session during the EA process once the ToR has been approved. |
| **Alternatives To** | | |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Review the extent to which fill will be provided from public and private infrastructure work. | The intent is to focus on fill generated from public infrastructure works. In the event that insufficient local fill is being generated by the City of Mississauga and Region of Peel, or if fill generation decreases, we will consider receiving privately generated fill at a market-competitive rate. |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Dredged material from the Credit River may be considered as fill material. | We have considered using this material and CVC will be seeking further clarification on the quality of sediment that the Credit River supplies. In general, sediment quality deposited at the mouth of major rivers in the GTA, such as the Credit, do not meet open lake disposal guidelines. We will need to ensure the sediment quality is appropriate for the LWC Project for either |

**Table 2-9 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During CLC Meetings #1 and #2 (Cont'd)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| | | aquatic or terrestrial habitat uses. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider more 'Alternatives To'. | The goal of the Project is to provide ecological habitat and public linkages along the waterfront from Marie Curtis Park to the west side of the G.E. Booth Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). We either use the existing land or we need to create new land. Given that the existing waterfront shoreline for the Project Study Area is occupied by critical infrastructure (the WWTP), creating ecological habitat and public linkages with the existing land base is not feasible.<br><br>As such, we are seeking to focus the LWC EA to only consider alternative methods that involve the use of lakefill to meet the Project goal. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider stating in the ToR that this project is a natural progression based on the kinds of work that has been done on the Lake Ontario shoreline in the past (i.e., lakefill). | We recognize that this is an intuitive project and that many studies have identified the need for the project. However, we need to assemble and present the studies in a way that meets MOE EA standards and reflects the unique problems and opportunities specific to this location. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider the potential to use fill from other excavation sites, beyond the Hanlan Water project. | We will be taking this into consideration throughout the EA. Currently all Region of Peel project sites within the City of Mississauga and City of Mississauga project sites can be considered as a potential source of fill. The EA will further refine which of these sites are appropriate for use from a fill type, quality, timing and economic perspective. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider leaving an option to use other sources of fill beyond municipal sources. | There is an option to use fill generated by local developers. However, that fill will be considered if supply of fill generated by the Region of Peel or City of Mississauga becomes low and costs and schedules are impacted. The stockpile at the Arsenal Lands does offer capacity to continue building the Project during periods of low fill production. |
| **Alternative Methods** | | |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Examine where to connect Serson Creek to Applewood Creek. | At this time, two alternative concepts for Serson Creek are being contemplated and will be evaluated as part of the LWC EA. |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | It is important for the community that Serson Creek is naturalized or rejuvenated. There will likely not be support from the local community for realigning Serson Creek to Applewood Creek. | The purpose of the LWC EA is to create alternatives for consideration, understand fully the benefits and issues of each and then through and technical and public evaluation process, select the most appropriate alternative. As such, it is premature to disregard viable alternatives for Serson Creek until the EA stage. |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Consider the use of more sandy material for the beaches, instead of the more | A variety of beach materials will be considered giving priority to those materials that would be naturally occurring and those that can withstand the |

**Table 2-9 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During CLC Meetings #1 and #2 (Cont'd)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| | rocky/cobbly material. | wave and erosion forces acting on the shore. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Ensure that the EA is broad enough that it does not restrict 'Alternative Methods' in the future. | Noted. |
| **EA Goals and Objectives** | | |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider including the word 'heritage' as part of the Project goal. | The Project Team needs to exercise caution so as to not prejudge Project outcomes. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Considered removing the terms "degraded" and "disconnected" from the Project goal. | We have updated the Project goal accordingly. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider including "restoration" as a Project objective. | The term 'restoration' is a loaded term indicating a desire to "return things back the way they were". As such, we do need to avoid setting such a lofty goal. The current goal does allow for us to greatly improve conditions over the current condition. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Consider changing the project goal to read: "to create a new natural park that will establish ecological linkages." | Noted. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Why have you used the term 'resource optimization' instead of 'sustainability' as a Project objective? | We felt that the term 'sustainability' is too broad and that 'resource optimization' is a more accurate, clear description of what it is we are trying to achieve; that is: to use an innovative funding approach that seeks to maximize public benefit and value by reusing locally generated fill to create a new habitat and a public realm along Mississauga's waterfront. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Is it prudent to give the reuse of locally generated fill a cap of a 10 year horizon? | The 10 year horizon was used to forecast the volume of fill likely to be generated by the Region of Peel capital works projects. Ideally, to maximize efficiencies, the time for implementation of the Project will be a much shorter horizon: 4-5 years. A funding formula will be established as part of the EA that seeks to maximize efficiencies based on fill supply, costs to implement, and possibly alternative sources of fill. We shall remove the "10-year horizon" from the Project objective statement. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Why is 'coordination' a Project objective? | To recognize that the Project is part of a larger vision (i.e., Inspiration Lakeview) and must coordinate with other adjacent efforts such as Master Plans (i.e., the Arsenal Lands/Marie Curtis Park Master Plan) and to ensure that the Project is moving forward in a way that builds on, and is consistent with previous work completed. |
| | | |

**Table 2-9 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During CLC Meetings #1 and #2 (Cont'd)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| **Scope of EA Study for Socio-Economic and Biophysical Effects to be Examined** | | |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Consider identifying a barrier mitigation project on Etobicoke Creek above Lakeshore, at the golf course that will be removed shortly. | TRCA staff is working closely with the golf course to finalize designs and approvals throughout 2012. Improving fish migration beyond the first barrier in Etobicoke Creek is complementary to the proposed establishment of wetlands and softer shorelines proposed throughout the LWC project, though fish migration initiatives are outside of the scope of the LWC EA. |
| CLC #1<br>March 1, 2012 | Review the possibility of using existing rail lines for trains or other LWC functions. | The rail line to the WWTP has been recently decommissioned. We could explore opportunities for rail use to the OPG lands if they are available to us. However, given the distributed nature of the fill throughout Mississauga, it may add significant cost due to double handling. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Ensure to measure and monitor the refuse that shows up on the shore from the lake such as debris, algae blooms, etc. | This will be addressed as part of a Parks Operations and Maintenance Plan following the EA process, in the Detailed Design stage. The EA will primarily focus on the resilience of the park that is created – does it provide stable dynamic shorelines? Does it improve sustainable terrestrial and aquatic habitat? Does it significantly impact water quality at the intake of the Water Treatment Plant? Is it resilient to climate change? However, the EA should be able to provide high level tests as to whether the proposed configuration of the Project will result in less debris accumulating on the beaches or whether the Project Study Area is more susceptible to algae blooms than under current conditions. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Ensure to measure and improve the contaminated state of Serson and Applewood creek and surrounding lands. | LOISS is looking at improvements for the entire catchment of these creeks. As such, planning efforts underway for LOISS and LWC EA are complementary. The LWC EA Project will also be planned with sediment, debris and water quality conditions in mind. Based on the development of 'Alternative Methods', there are ways we can still create good wetland habitats, even with sub-par water quality. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Ensure to examine the impacts of the City of Toronto's proposal to build islands at the mouth of the Humber River to prevent contaminants flowing in an easterly direction toward the City of Toronto. | During the EA Phase of the Project we will take into consideration cumulative effects, including how the Toronto shoreline will impact Lakeview Park. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Ensure to consider water flows and directions during the EA study. | Noted. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Ensure that the fill to be used is clean. | We will only accept clean fill that can be reused for the Project. The soil will meet the MOE's "Fill Quality Guide and Good Management Practices for |

**Table 2-9 Summary of Key Questions and Comments Received During CLC Meetings #1 and #2 (Cont'd)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| | | Shore Infilling in Ontario, March 2011, Table C-1 Confined Fill Guide Parameter List," and fill will be tested prior to use. In addition, spot site checks will be conducted to ensure the fill is clean and meets all required standards. |
| CLC #2<br>April 19, 2012 | Ensure that there are qualified experts on the Project Team to decide the importance of habitat and where to locate trails. | We will be following established general habitat targets and guidelines for habitat enhancement along this portion of the waterfront. These have been established by the City of Mississauga, CVC, MNR and other regulatory agencies. Specifically, we have a large Project Team of consultants, as well as biologists and ecologists from CVC and TRCA. We will be corresponding with other specialists at the City and Region, as well as at MNR, DFO, MOE and Environment Canada, and other regulatory agencies. In addition, we will be consulting with stakeholders and the public regarding desired elements of the environment. |

# 3.0 FIRST NATIONS AND MÉTIS CONSULTATION

## 3.1 OBJECTIVES

The objective of First Nations and Métis consultation was to engage First Nations and Métis communities in the EA process in a fashion they deem appropriate for the Project. Communities have been asked if they are interested in the LWC Project and how they wish to be consulted.

## 3.2 CONTACT LIST

The contact list for the First Nations and Métis consultation component of the LWC Project was initially based on a list provided by the Region of Peel. A letter was sent to federal (Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada) and provincial (Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs) authorities outlining the LWC Project, the Study Areas and scope (see Appendix F2 and F3) and the final list of First Nations and Métis was compiled with additional information from the various authorities. This list was updated frequently throughout the consultation process as contacts and contact information changed.

The following communities were contacted:

- Alderville First Nation (Williams Treaty First Nation);
- Anishnabek Nation/Union of Ontario Indians, Nipissing First Nation;
- Beausoleil First Nation (Williams Treaty First Nation);
- Chippewas of Georgina Island (Williams Treaty First Nation);
- Chippewas of Mnjikaning/Chippewas of Rama (Williams Treaty First Nation);
- Credit River Métis Council;
- Curve Lake First Nation (Williams Treaty First Nation);
- Fort William First Nation;
- Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council;
- Hiawatha First Nation (Williams Treaty First Nation);
- Huron-Wendat First Nation;
- Kawartha Nishnawabe;
- Metis Nation of Ontario;
- Métis National Council;
- Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation;
- Mississaugas of the Scugog Island (Williams Treaty First Nation);
- Mohawks of the Bay of Quinte;
- Moose Deer Point First Nation;

- Nishnawabe Aski Nation;
- Peel Aboriginal Network; and
- Six Nations of the Grand River.

## 3.3 CONSULTATION MECHANISMS

### 3.3.1 Letters to First Nations and Métis Communities

The LWC Project Team engaged with First Nations and Métis communities according to the requirements of the *Duty to Consult* process. First Nations and Métis communities that have potential or established treaty rights in the vicinity of the LWC Project were contacted throughout the ToR stage of the EA. Materials sent to communities are outlined in Table 3-1.

**Table 3-1 Mailed correspondence to First Nations and Métis Communities**

| Notification | Date |
|---|---|
| Notice of Commencement of the EA (encl. Notice of Commencement and EA Project Summary) | February 1, 2012 |
| ToR progress/PIC#2 notification | March 30, 2012 |
| ToR review notification | To be sent |

In all correspondence to First Nations and Métis communities, the Project Team extended an open invitation to meet and discuss the Project in greater detail, and provided the URL to the Project website.

Following the mailings, phone calls were made on May 8 and 9, 2012 to all communities on the LWC contact list in an effort to confirm contact information, ensure all of the letters had been received, and confirm any interest in meeting with the Project Team or answer questions about the LWC Project.

Letters and attachments as well as a spreadsheet outlining the details of all contacts (i.e., follow-up calls, address corrections, etc.) can be found in Appendix F.

## 3.4 SUMMARY OF FIRST NATIONS AND MÉTIS COMMENTS

We received responses from communities listed in Table 3-2 during the ToR phase indicating a desire to be kept apprised of the Project.

**Table 3-2 Responses from First Nations and Métis Communities with an Interest in the LWC Project**

| Community | Method of Communication | Date |
|---|---|---|
| Métis Nation of Ontario | Phone | February 9, 2012 |
| Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation | Phone | February 15, 2012 |
| Scugog Island First Nation | Phone | February 26, 2012 |
| Haudenosaunee Confederacy Council | Mail | March 15, 2012 |
| Peel Aboriginal Network | Email | April 9, 2012 |

No communities expressed concern about the LWC Project moving forward as described. Curve Lake First Nation and Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation expressed particular interest in ancestral remains, and asked that we notify them immediately if findings of this nature occur in the study or implementation stage of the LWC Project. Other concerns cited included environmental issues and maintenance of established and potential treaty rights. Records of contact can be found in Appendix F. Responses from communities received in response to letters sent during the Feasibility Study can be found in Section 5.2.1.

Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation were the only community thus far to request a meeting. Details of this meeting can also be found in Section 5.2.

# 4.0 AGENCY CONSULTATION

## 4.1 OBJECTIVES

Throughout the ToR, regulatory bodies and interested agencies at the municipal, provincial, and federal level were invited to participate in a comprehensive agency consultation program. The objectives of the ToR agency consultation were to consult with all potentially interested agencies about the ToR; the proposed evaluation framework; and the proposed consultation plan for the EA, such that there would be agency buy-in as to how the EA would be conducted, and to ensure that all necessary approvals/authorizations for the LWC Project are understood. Agency consultation also ensured coordination between the LWC Project and the broader local and regional planning context; and allowed for coordination between federal and provincial EA requirements.

## 4.2 CONTACT LIST

The Project Team endeavoured to consult with any and all interested agencies during the development of the ToR. As such, a contact list of regulatory and interested agencies was developed through an identification of all:

- applicable provincial and federal regulatory agencies;
- provincial and federal agencies, as well as municipal and regional departments, with a potential or stated interest in the Project and/or the Project Study Area; and
- agencies involved as part of the Feasibility Study.

Table 4-1 documents those agencies contacted during the LWC EA ToR.

**Table 4-1 Agencies contacted during the LWC EA ToR**

| Agency | Department(s) |
|---|---|
| City of Mississauga | • Development and Design, Planning and Building<br>• Fire and Emergency Services, Community Services<br>• Park Development Section, Community Services<br>• Planning and Heritage, Community Services<br>• Planning, Development and Business Services Division, Community Services Department<br>• Strategic Community Initiatives, City Manager's Department<br>• Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, Transportation and Works |
| City of Toronto | • City Planning<br>• Parks, Forestry and Recreation<br>• Technical Services<br>• Toronto Water |
| Government of Canada | • Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency<br>• Environment Canada<br>• Fisheries and Oceans Canada<br>• Transport Canada |
| Ontario Ministry of Culture | • Programs and Services |
| Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources | • Fish & Wildlife Biology<br>• Integrated Resource Management<br>• Lake Ontario Management Unit<br>• Strategic Policy & Economics Branch |
| Ontario Ministry of the Environment | • Environmental Assessment Approvals Branch<br>• Technical Support Section |
| Ontario Ministry of Energy | • Energy Supply Branch |
| Region of Peel | • Community Liaison, Peel Region Police, 12 Division<br>• Environment, Transportation & Planning Services<br>• Planning, Policy & Research<br>• Public Health<br>• Transportation, Public Works<br>• Wastewater Treatment, Public Works<br>• Water Division, Public Works |

## 4.3 CONSULTATION MECHANISMS

The consultation for the LWC Project ToR included a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and individual meetings with key agencies, including the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR), the Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO), the Ministry of the Environment (MOE), Ontario Power Generation (OPG), and the City of Mississauga. A variety of consultation mechanisms were utilized to keep an open line of communication with all agencies, including updates to external working groups (i.e., Aquatic Habitat Toronto); e-mail correspondence; invitations to PICs; in-person meetings; and teleconferences. The TAC and the consultation activities with individual agencies are described in greater detail below.

### 4.3.1 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

The TAC was established to provide a forum for agency consultation during the ToR and EA stages. All identified regulatory and interested agencies were invited to participate on the TAC, and members were asked to recommend additional agency departments to participate if they believed key members were missing. The final TAC membership for the ToR phase is provided in Table 4-2.

**Table 4-2 Final TAC Membership**

| Agency | Department(s) |
|---|---|
| City of Mississauga | • Development South, Development & Design, Planning and Building<br>• Park Development, Planning, Development and Business Services<br>• Planning & Heritage, Planning, Development and Business Services<br>• Strategic Community Initiatives, City Manager's Department<br>• Transportation and Infrastructure Planning, Transportation and Works |
| City of Toronto | • Parks , Forestry and Recreation<br>• Water Infrastructure Management |
| Environment Canada | • Strategic Integration & Partnership Division, Great Lakes Area of Concern |
| Fisheries and Oceans Canada | • N/A |
| Ministry of Energy | • Energy Supply Branch |
| Ministry of the Environment | • Technical Support Section |
| Region of Peel | • Public Health<br>• Transportation, Public Works<br>• Wastewater Treatment Division, Public Works<br>• Water Division, Public Works |

Two TAC meetings were held on February 28 and April 26, 2012 as part of the ToR phase of the EA. Table 4-3 provides an overview of the TAC meetings, including the objectives and attendance. Appendix G2 documents the meeting agendas, presentations, and minutes.

**Table 4-3 TAC Meetings**

| Event & Date | Objectives | Attendance |
|---|---|---|
| TAC Meeting #1<br>February 28, 2012 | • Introduce the project team;<br>• Summarize the key findings of the LWC Feasibility Study;<br>• Introduce the LWC EA, including an overview of the broader planning context, EA administration, and current environmental conditions within the Project Study Area;<br>• Present the Consultation Plan and results of the consultation activities undertaken to date; and<br>• Receive feedback on the preliminary Project goal and objectives. | 13 TAC members |
| TAC Meeting #2<br>April 26, 2012 | • Review draft content for the EA ToR;<br>• Seek comments and suggestions on the draft ToR content;<br>• Identify issues to be resolved as the ToR moves forward; and<br>• Discuss next steps and review of the ToR in June and July. | 16 TAC members |

### 4.3.2 Agency Meetings

Where participation on the TAC was not possible, agencies were consulted through auxiliary technical consultation meetings. These are outlined below.

#### *4.3.2.1 Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)*

Throughout the ToR, Project staff sought to engage with the MNR to seek input into the LWC Project, including an invitation to participate on the TAC. Although the MNR was unable to participate in the TAC, Project staff continued to provide updates regarding the LWC Project to the MNR by circulated minutes of the TAC meetings. Departments within MNR who were contacted were the Aurora District Office, Lake Ontario Management Unit, Strategic Policy and Economics, and Integrated Resources Management. On March 18, 2012, as an avenue to provide regular updates to the MNR regarding the LWC Project ToR, the MNR was invited to participate on a bi-weekly teleconference with Project staff. Table 4-4 provides an overview of correspondence and meetings with the MNR during the ToR phase. Appendix G3 documents the meeting summaries, minutes, and presentations.

**Table 4-4 Overview of Correspondence and Meetings with MNR during ToR**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| February 1, 2012<br>(E-mail correspondence) | Invitation to participate on the TAC. |
| March 19, 2012<br>(E-mail correspondence) | Invitation to participate on the bi-weekly conference call with project staff. |
| April 2, 2012 | DFO/MNR Agency meeting with CVC. Discuss MNR involvement regarding the review of the LWC EA ToR. |
| May 7, 2012 | Provide an update on the LWC EA, discuss waterlot issues, and seek agency input and comment. |

#### *4.3.2.2 Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)*

Throughout the ToR, Project staff met with DFO to seek input into the LWC Project. In addition to DFO's participation on the TAC, Project staff provided regular updates as part of Aquatic Habitat Toronto meetings, and through individual meetings, as outlined in Table 4-5. Appendix G4 documents the meeting summaries, minutes, and presentations.

**Table 4-5 Consultation Activities held with DFO**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| March 1, 2012<br>Aquatic Habitat Toronto Meeting | Introduce the LWC EA, including an overview of the broader planning context, EA administration, and current environmental conditions within the Project Study Area; present the Consultation Plan and results of the consultation activities undertaken to date; and receive feedback on the preliminary project goal and objectives. |
| May 3, 2012<br>Teleconference | Review draft content for the EA ToR, seek comments and suggestions on the draft ToR content, and identify issues to be resolved as the ToR moves forward. |

#### *4.3.2.3 Ministry of the Environment (MOE)*

The Project Team initiated communication with the MOE regarding the LWC Project at the commencement of the Project. Communication mechanisms included e-mail status updates, teleconferences, and in-person meetings. Table 4-6 provides an overview of consultation activities with MOE.

**Table 4-6 Meetings Held with the MOE**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| January 6, 2012 | Introduce the direction of the LWC EA. |
| January 25, 2012<br>(E-mail Correspondence) | Email correspondence to provide update regarding the change in scope of work. |
| February 3, 2012<br>(E-mail Correspondence) | Provide an update regarding Project status, including the NoC and update regarding a temporary stockpile of fill. |
| February 27, 2012 | Provide an update regarding Project status, including consultation activities and proposed approach for developing the 'Alternatives To' and 'Alternative Methods' |
| March 30, 2012<br>(Teleconference) | Respond to agency questions and concerns and obtain input into the Project. |
| April 13, 2012 | Obtain input regarding the development of the ToR. |

#### *4.3.2.4 Ontario Power Generation (OPG)*

Project staff engaged with OPG throughout the development of the ToR. The Project Team met with representatives of OPG on January 19, 2012, and provided an open invitation for OPG to participate on the bi-weekly Project Team teleconference meetings. As a means to maintain an open line of communication with OPG, the minutes of the bi-weekly teleconference meetings (held on March 27, April 11, and May 9, 2012) were circulated to OPG. Table 4-7 provides an overview of consultation activities completed with OPG.

**Table 4-7 Consultation Activities with OPG**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| January 19, 2012 | Provide an update on the LWC EA process. |
| February 16, 2012 | Memo from CVC providing a status update regarding the LWC EA, including information pertaining to changes in the scope of work and request for access to OPG property to undertake technical studies in support of the LWC EA. |
| March 16, 2012 | Memo from CVC providing the requested summary of proposed surveys to characterize the OPG Lakeview site as it relates to the LWC Project and LOISS. |
| April 11, 2012 (Teleconference) | Bi-weekly project team teleconference. Provide an update on the LWC Project and discuss proposed access to the OPG site for surveys in support of the LWC Project and LOISS. |

#### *4.3.2.5 City of Mississauga*

As a Project Team member, the City of Mississauga provided Inspiration Lakeview portfolio management and assisted with coordination between relevant City of Mississauga departments. In addition to the regular bi-weekly Project Team meetings, meetings were held with City of Mississauga departments and Council to discuss the LWC Project. Table 4-8 provides an overview of consultation activities with the City of Mississauga outside of Project Team meetings. Appendix G5 documents meeting agendas, presentations, and minutes.

**Table 4-8 Consultation Activities with the City of Mississauga**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| April 10, 2012 | Introduce the LWC Project and its relationship within the Inspiration Lakeview planning context to the Environmental Advisory Committee. |
| April 27, 2012 | Deputation to City of Mississauga Environmental Advisory Committee to submit the recommendation for the "Lakeview Waterfront Connection: Environmental Assessment". |

## 4.4 SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS

Table 4-9 summarizes the agency comments which were received regarding the LWC Project, in addition to considerations by the Project Team.

**Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| MOE | January 6, 2012 | The two-sector approach appears to be consistent with EAs in which there are unknowns that are considered through the EA. Should the western sector (OPG Lakeview site) not proceed, there should be a sufficient level of detail that it becomes an amendment to the EA. | **UPDATE**: With the revised Project Study Area, only the eastern sector (current Project Study Area) will be considered as part of the EA. The Project Study Area may extend east to include the OPG Lakeview site, in whole or in part, should the opportunity arise. |
| TAC Meeting #1 | February 28, 2012 | Approval requirements for a WWTP require a specified set-back from a residential area. There may be implications regarding the development of a public park in close proximity to the G.E. Booth WWTP. | The development of residential units is not being considered as part of the LWC EA. The EA will consider issues related to public safety and WWTP security. |
| MNR | February 15, 2012 | Decline to participate on the TAC. MNR's participation will be limited to commenting on the EA ToR through the official MOE submission review process (Appendix G3.6). | Noted. |

**Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| TAC #1 | February 28, 2012 | Consider the water intake pipe located to the east, in the City of Toronto. | The EA will assess the effects of the alternatives on source water quality for the water intake pipe associated with the Water Treatment Plant, as well as the water intake pipe located east of the Project Study Area in the City of Toronto as part of the Regional Study Area. |
| TAC #1 | February 28, 2012 | Consider waiting to proceed with the eastern sector until the future of the OPG lands is determined (June 2014). | In order to meet the fill generation schedule and to maximize the cost effectiveness of the project, the EA is proceeding now and will only be considering the eastern sector unless opportunities arise in advance of June 2014. |
| TAC #1 | February 28, 2012 | Ensure the fill meets MOE standards. | The soil will meet the MOE's "Fill Quality Guide and Good Management Practices for Shore Infilling in Ontario, March 2011, Table C-1 Confined Fill Guide Parameter List," and fill will be tested prior to use. |
| TAC #1 | February 28, 2012 | Consider how the lakefill will affect the baseline water quality. | The EA will assess the effects of the alternatives on water circulation and water quality. |
| TAC #1 | February 28, 2012 | Consider where the funding for construction will come from. | A funding formula will be developed as part of the EA and will examine the ability to fund the construction wholly through the anticipated costs for long-haul transport and disposal of fill generated through other capital projects. The EA will also explore other funding mechanisms as part of the funding formula. |
| TAC #1 | February 28, 2012 | City of Toronto Transportation Services has plans to start construction in 2013 to replace the Lakeshore bridge as it crosses Etobicoke Creek. | Noted. |
| Environment Canada (Aquatic Habitat Toronto meeting) | March 1, 2012 | Toronto Water's proposed breakwater at Etobicoke Creek may have implications for cumulative effects on the LWC Project. | Noted. The effects of the lakefill footprint 'Alternative Methods' on water quality will be modeled both with and without the proposed breakwater at Etobicoke Creek. |
| DFO (Aquatic Habitat Toronto meeting) | March 1, 2012 | Run the HAAT on the conceptual designs. | Noted. |
| DFO | March 1, 2012 | Consider incorporating American Eel habitat into the | Noted. This will be developed in the EA phase. |

**Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| (Aquatic Habitat Toronto meeting) | | design of the backwater areas. | |
| OPG | March 8, 2012 | As part of the proposed site access agreement for OPG lands, provide a summary of the surveys proposed to be undertaken in support of the LWC Project and LOISS. | The summary of the proposed surveys were provided by CVC to OPG in the memo dated March 16, 2012. |
| MOE | March 30, 2012 | While an objectives-based approach is acceptable, a net effects analysis of the alternatives must be undertaken. | Noted. |
| MOE | March 30, 2012 | Clarify what is meant by an expedited EA process. | In order to take advantage of the fill generation schedule, the Project Team will be completing the requirements of the EA within a condensed timeframe. In order to accomplish this, the development of the ToR is drawing on the body of knowledge completed as part of the Feasibility Study. The expedited process does not refer to regulatory review periods, which will remain the same. |
| MOE | March 30, 2012 | Note that MOE may require flexibility in terms of review timing. | Noted. We anticipate submitting the draft ToR in June 2012, with final submission in July. We will try to provide the MOE with additional days for review to accommodate your timing. |
| MOE | March 30, 2012 | Provide more details regarding First Nations and Métis consultation that has been completed to date. | First Nations and Métis communities that have potential or established treaty rights in the vicinity of the LWC Project have been sent background information regarding the Project, and updates will continue to be provided as the Project progresses. An open invitation has been extended to First Nations and Métis groups to meet with the Project Team to discuss the proposal in greater detail and provide valued information about their treaty rights pertaining to the land. In addition to the meetings that have been held with the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, the Métis Nation of Ontario have been invited to participate on the TAC, and we are in the process of arranging a meeting with the Métis Nation of Ontario Council for June 2012. Consultation with First Nations and the Métis Nation of Ontario were initiated during the LWC Feasibility Study in |

**Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | the summer of 2011. |
| MOE | March 30, 2012 | Consider the impacts on the LWC Project of the new land claim by the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation for riparian rights 1 mile each side of the Credit River and Lake Ontario shoreline. | We are not anticipating any impact from the new land claim on the Project. The Mississaugas of the New Credit may claim a loss of rights to harvest materials to the riparian areas of the Credit and Lake Ontario shoreline. New land is not being sought as part of the claim, only access and compensation. If anything, the LWC Project will be a benefit to the Mississaugas of the New Credit by enabling improved access and ecological function to the Lake Ontario shoreline. |
| MOE | March 30, 2012 | Consider stormwater Low Impact Development (LID). | For the most part, the Project proposes to create public greenspace that will incorporate rainfall (snowmelt) directly into the ecological framework. There are some stormwater outfalls emptying into the lake, particularly Serson Creek. These will be considered as part of the development and evaluation of alternatives, rather than function as a stormwater pond. It is acknowledged that some filtration benefits (ecological goods and services) will arise by establishing these wetlands; however, that is not the primary purpose. |
| MOE | March 30, 2012 | Ensure that the quality of the fill is maintained. | The soil will meet the MOE's "Fill Quality Guide and Good Management Practices for Shore Infilling in Ontario, March 2011, Table C-1 Confined Fill Guide Parameter List." Source testing and spot testing will be conducted as it arrives to ensure the soil meets the standard quality for disposal. |
| City of Mississauga Environmental Advisory Committee | April 27, 2012 | It is recommended that the deputation by TRCA and CVC entitled "Lakeview Waterfront Connection: Environmental Assessment" be received. | This recommendation was approved by the City of Mississauga General Committee on April 18, 2012 and subsequently adopted by City Council on April 25, 2012. |
| MOE | April 13, 2012 | With regards to the changes to the federal CEAA legislation, issues that may slow down the review and/or approval of the ToR are not anticipated over the next few months. | Noted. |
| MOE | April 13, 2012 | Reference current policy documents to strengthen the | Within the Project Study Area there is a well-documented |

**Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Project goal and objectives. | lack of ecological linkages (as discussed in the Binational Biodiversity Strategy for Lake Ontario and CVC's LOISS) and public linkages (as discussed as part of Inspiration Lakeview, Future Directions, City of Mississauga Waterfront Parks Strategy, and the Marie Curtis Park/Arsenal Lands Master Plans). |
| MOE | April 13, 2012 | Will there be any problems in adding the OPG lands, in whole or in part, should the opportunity arise? | The addition of the OPG lands would benefit the Project by facilitating a logical western connection point. |
| MOE | April 13, 2012 | Present the consultation plan for the EA stage. | The full consultation plan for the ToR and EA stages of the LWC Project were presented during the first round of public consultation for the ToR, and will also be discussed as part of the second CLC, TAC, and PIC meetings. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | The Project goal statement looks good. | Noted. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | Clarify what is meant by the "compatibility" objective. | The compatibility objective refers to the relationship between the Project and the local infrastructure, such as the water intake and outfall pipes. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | It is critical that any options do not impact the Water Filtration Plant and G.E. Booth WWTP. | The Project objectives will guide the development and evaluation of alternatives. An alternative would not be selected if it was not compatible with the local infrastructure. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | If the land currently occupied by the G.E. Booth WWTP ash lagoons becomes available in the future for public use, the need for lakefill may not be required. | The Region of Peel currently has no plans to discontinue the use of the ash lagoons. Even in absence of these lagoons, plant operations to the east extends to the shoreline, restricting ecological and public connections along the waterfront, unless land is created in front of the WWTP. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | Clarify the reason the Project objectives have been revised to emphasize the ecological and social benefits of the Project. | The need for ecological habitat and public linkages along the eastern Mississauga waterfront has long been established and is well-documented in a number of publications, such as the Binational Biodiversity Strategy for Lake Ontario and the City of Mississauga Waterfront Parks Strategy. The availability of fill from the Region of Peel provides an opportunity to create ecological habitat and public linkages along a section of the eastern Mississauga waterfront where these linkages either do not exist or are |

**Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | degraded. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | Consider the effects of lakefilling on water quality, sedimentation, and wildlife species. | Once the orientation and dimensions of the footprint are determined, a regional water quality model will be used to determine if the footprint is likely to affect water quality. As water quality is the most sensitive parameter, it is being used as a benchmark to determine the effects of the alternatives on the local and regional environment. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | Clarify what type of Public Access the Project seeks to provide along the waterfront (i.e., multi-purpose trail, narrow trail). Residents are seeking a substantial trail to allow for a number of recreational opportunities. | During the comparative evaluation of alternatives, the balance between the amount of habitat and public access created will be examined. The Preferred Alternative will best meet the objectives. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | Consider cost as part of the Project objectives. | Cost will be considered as part of the comparative evaluation of the alternatives, as component of the *Resource Optimization* objective. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | Consider the potential for increased odour complaints as a result of public access in close proximity to the G.E. Booth WWTP. | This will be considered during the detailed design phase. The EA will only be selecting the Preferred Alternative. Regardless of the alternative selected, the G.E. Booth WWTP will be there. However, many upgrades have been completed on the WWTP, which have helped with the odour complaints. It is also an opportunity to consider the educational and interpretive aspects this Project presents, such as providing residents with an opportunity to learn more about their neighbourhood. |
| TAC #2 | April 26, 2012 | Work is underway to upgrade the Serson Creek and Applewood Creek culverts at Lakeshore Road East in the City of Mississauga. | Noted. There are opportunities to coordinate technical studies, particularly in terms of LOISS, to avoid duplication of efforts. |
| Ministry of Transportation | May 2, 2012 | Due to the anticipated changes to the *CEAA* under the Budget Implementation Bill, Transport Canada will hold off on any involvement with the LWC Project. | Noted. |
| DFO | May 4, 2012 | EA should seek to maximize in-situ habitat compensation. Recommend running a preliminary HAAT model once the framework for 'alternative methods' is established in order to determine degree of fish habitat | Noted. |

**Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | self-compensation each alternative offers. | |
| DFO | May 4, 2012 | Overall support for the ToR and approach. | Noted. |
| MNR | May 7, 2012 | MNR is interested in the LWC Project, but limited by staff capacity. Will take on a greater role as the EA proceeds and are interested in having a representative on the TAC. | An open invitation has always been extended to MNR to participate on the TAC and on our bi-weekly Project Team meetings. The Project Team will continue to provide updates to MNR and would be pleased to have a representative on the TAC. |
| MNR | May 7, 2012 | Original position during the meeting was to carry the 'Do Nothing' alternative forward for analysis in the EA, rather than being screened out in the ToR. By the end of the meeting, MNR asked for some time to consider their position. | The EA ToR is seeking to focus the development of alternatives on options that can meet the Project goal of habitat creation and public access on the eastern Mississauga waterfront. Two 'Alternatives To' were considered: meeting the Project goal with or without lakefill. The EA ToR proposes to screen-out the "without lakefill" alternative by conducting a high-level evaluation illustrating how the Project goal cannot be met unless lakefill is utilized. |
| MNR | May 7, 2012 | Establish the minimum/maximum footprints based on ecological benefits. | Noted. |
| MNR | May 7, 2012 | Cheltenham site is a possible disposal site for fill with implications for the LWC project. | The Cheltenham site provides for receipt of fill from Brampton, Caledon, and Mississauga. With respect to the LWC, it would not be cost effective to transport fill from further north to the Lakeview site. The Cheltenham site also provides for long-term storage of fill beyond the next few years. |
| MNR | May 7, 2012 | Prior to disposition of waterlots, require legal assurances that land will be kept for conservation purposes in perpetuity. | Concerns about the future potential for developing the fill for economic gain can be readily addressed in any legal agreement for the waterlots. Long-term leases of the waterlots would be an appropriate approach for a long-term focus on conservation. The Province would retain ownership of the lots, and control of the types of uses that are allowable. |
| MNR | May 7, 2012 | Concerns that the Project may be perceived as a cheap method to dispose of fill. | The purpose of the LWC Project is not for providing a cheap place to put fill, but creating a beneficial use of fill that otherwise would have been treated as a waste and hauled away long-distance. Site selection was based on sound |

**Table 4-9 Summary of Agency Comments (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | municipal and environmental planning. There needs to be a stated need and long-term commitment to maintain the park and ensure compliance with EA requirements. Costs associated with maintaining this park will be a substantive long-term investment. Though it will add significant value to the adjacent lands as a desirable destination, it will not be a significant money generator in and of itself. The park will provide passive recreation opportunities and provide a place for fish and bird wildlife and vegetation to establish. Furthermore, armourstone and rubble, as well as landscaping, are all purchases materials that must be factored into tipping fees. |

# 5.0 FEASIBILITY STUDY CONSULTATION

Prior to the ToR, the Project Team consulted with members of the public, First Nations and Métis communities, and government agencies as part of the development of the LWC Feasibility Study. The Feasibility Study provided the basis for and informed the LWC Project. Consultation which was undertaken as part of the Feasibility Study is described in the following sections.

## 5.1 PUBLIC CONSULTATION

### 5.1.1 Public Stakeholder Workshop

On August 16th, 2011, CVC and the Region of Peel held a meeting for non-governmental organization (NGO) stakeholders in the Lakeview/Port Credit community in order to assess their priorities and ideally incorporate these priorities into the Feasibility Study. He group was the precursor to the CLC established for the LWC EA ToR. The meeting also served to generate interest in involvement in the consultation that would take place for the LWC ToR and EA.

Representatives from the following organizations participated in the meeting:

- Mississauga Ratepayers' Network;
- Rattray Marsh Protection Association;
- Port Credit Salmon Association;
- Credit River Anglers Association;
- Sierra Club: Peel Region; and
- Port Credit Salmon and Trout Association.

After giving a presentation on the LWC Project, CVC and Region of Peel facilitated a discussion to address questions and concerns and identify functional priorities, Project objectives, and other considerations that are important to these organizations. Please refer to Table 5-1 for an overview of comments and Appendix C1 for the more detailed meeting summary notes.

### 5.1.2 Meeting with Lake Ontario Waterkeeper (LOW)

The Project Team met with LOW (who were unable to attend the stakeholder workshop) on September 15, 2011 to present the LWC Project and elicit input for the purposes of the Feasibility Study. An overview of LOW's comments are provided in Table 5-1, and full meeting summary notes can be found in Appendix C1.3.

### 5.1.3 Summary of NGO Comments as they related to the Project

The following table summarizes the comments received from NGO stakeholders as part of consultation for the Feasibility Study.

**Table 5-1 Summary of NGO Comments as they related to the LWC Project**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| **Current Community Priorities** | | |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | The following were identified as key issues by stakeholders:<br>- Cycling<br>- Dog walking<br>- Seeing and experiencing nature<br>- Passive recreation<br>- Fishing (shore and boat based)<br>- Boating (power and non-power)<br>- Children recreation (splash pad etc.)<br>- Photography<br>- Community Involvement / Stewardship / Outdoor Education<br>- Observation Platform / interpretive opportunities<br>- Educational Opportunities (Lorenzo Institute use and research)<br>- Contribution to quality of life<br>- Family friendly<br>- Access to waterfront<br>- Less constructed environment | All have been echoed in PICs and CLCs and noted as community priorities. |
| **Concerns with LWC Project** | | |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Recreational facilities located in the Project Study Area should be maintained, or should be contingency plan. | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Siltation or stagnation resulting from Project design and coastal processes. | Water quality, sediment transport and coastal design would be key considerations of any EA process. |

**Table 5-1 Summary of NGO Comments as they related to the LWC Project (Cont'd)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | The view of the lake will be compromised. | Viewscape considerations will be one component of any EA process. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Accessibility and ease of access is important. | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Attraction nuisance wildlife (beavers, Canada geese, Cormorants). | Identification of likely nuisance wildlife and possible mitigation approaches will be considered through any EA process. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Potential impact on how coastal processes affect shoreline east and west of the Project Study Area. | Consideration of coastal processes would be a key consideration of any EA process. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Navigable backwater area. | Noted. |
| **Footprint** | | |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop Aug. 16 2011 | Quality of fill is important | We will only accept clean fill that can be reused for the Project. The soil will meet the MOE's "Fill Quality Guide and Good Management Practices for Shore Infilling in Ontario, March 2011, Table C-1 Confined Fill Guide Parameter List," and fill will be tested prior to use. In addition, spot site checks will be conducted to ensure the fill is clean and meets all required standards. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Availability of stone might be an issue (armour/cobble) | Consideration of materials for coastal and fluvial processes will be a key consideration of any EA process. |
| **Habitat Components of the Plan** | | |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Suggest providing a mix of habitat including protective trees for canopy coverage | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Would be great to restore original watershed topography and drainage (Serson Creek) | The alignment of Serson Creek will likely need to be considered through any EA process. |
| **Recreational Features and Functions** | | |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Outfalls could act as stepped fountains / waterfalls – irrigation and aeration opportunities. | Stormwater and water circulation will need to be considered as part of any EA process. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Preference for passive recreation features | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Maintain what's there, but improving on it | Noted. |

**Table 5-1 Summary of NGO Comments as they related to the LWC Project (Cont'd)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| **Other components that should be considered in concept** | | |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Connectivity to inland areas important | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Incorporating current and future Peel water infrastructure | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Should be noted that there will be amenities available close by at Inspiration Lakeview | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Public transit access | Any potential EA would consider how the public would access the site; however, any such EA would not be used to provide for more transit to the area. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Launch fees would be a deterrent | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Parking | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Recreational numbers anticipated | Noted. |
| Public Stakeholder Workshop August 16, 2011 | Back water areas – non power boats only | Noted. |
| Lake Ontario Waterkeeper September 15, 2011 | What quality of fill will be used for the project? | We will only accept clean fill that can be reused for the Project. The soil will meet the MOE's "Fill Quality Guide and Good Management Practices for Shore Infilling in Ontario, March 2011, Table C-1 Confined Fill Guide Parameter List," and fill will be tested prior to use. In addition, spot site checks will be conducted to ensure the fill is clean and meets all required standards. |
| Lake Ontario Waterkeeper September 15, 2011 | Construction rubble will be included? | Concrete, brick, etc. will be used as the containment material. Foundation will be used for access roads. Once containment areas have been established, we will remove any fish that are trapped, and the glacial tills and shales can be placed behind the rubble. This also helps to control sediment during construction. |
| Lake Ontario Waterkeeper September 15, 2011 | What is the main direction of sediment drift in the area? | There are complex coastal processes; our understanding is that it is a smaller littoral cell within a larger cell. However, it is highly sediment starved along the shore. A coastal engineer will be retained as part of any EA. |

**Table 5-1 Summary of NGO Comments as they related to the LWC Project (Cont'd)**

| Event | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Lake Ontario Waterkeeper September 15, 2011 | What sort of fisheries are there? | Fisheries data have been collected since 2008. Aquatic communities include mainly introduced, invasive or generalist species, though there was recent sampling of American Eel in 2011. Sampling has employed electrofishing and seining. River and embayment records longer period of time than open coast area. Generally the habitat is degraded, and there is a poor number of species and occurrence of species. There are a lot of gobies in the area, but a better understanding of their distribution across shoreline is anticipated with initiation of seining in 2011. |
| Lake Ontario Waterkeeper September 15, 2011 | What EA triggers at the provincial level? | Conservation Authorities are provincial agencies. The proposed works do not fall under the CA Class EA process, nor the Municipal Class EA process. |

## 5.2 FIRST NATIONS AND MÉTIS CONSULTATION

First Nations and Métis communities were contacted early in the Feasibility Study regarding the LWC Project. The contact list described in Section 3.2 above was obtained during this stage and all of the First Nations and Métis Communities listed in that section were contacted throughout the Feasibility Study. Materials sent to communities during the Feasibility Study included a Letter of Intent regarding the Feasibility Study (sent July 13, 2011) and a follow-up letter and Project update (sent October 4, 2011).

### 5.2.1 Summary of First Nations and Métis Community Response

The Project Team received responses from the communities listed in Table 5-2 indicating a desire to be kept apprised of the Project.

**Table 5-2 Responses from First Nations and Métis Communities with an Interest in the LWC Project**

| Community | Method of Communication | Date |
|---|---|---|
| Alderville First Nation | Mail | February 28, 2012 |
| Curve Lake First Nation | Mail | July 10, 2011 |
| Chippewas of Mnjikaning/ Chippewas of Rama | Mail | July 13, 2011 |
| Hiawatha First Nation | Mail | July 19th, 2011 |

CVC and Region of Peel met with Carolyn King of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (MNCFN) twice during the development of the Feasibility Study (August 18 and October 17, 2011) and provided a slideshow presentation outlining the LWC concept and approach. The MNCFN emphasized the importance of water, and informed CVC and Region of Peel that they were considering pursuing claims to riparian rights, one mile on each side of Credit River and on the Lake Ontario Shoreline.

MNCFN stated an interest in being kept informed on all initiatives and in being actively engaged in the EA process as it proceeds. According to Ms. King, projects such as the LWC should seek to:

- Improve access to water;
- Celebrate water, and include possible locations for ceremonies (with fire) along the shorelines; and
- Better communicate current and past history of MNCFN through outreach, plaques, etc.

CVC and TRCA committed to include MNCFN in EA consultation and consider their priorities in the design of the LWC. Full meeting notes can be found in Appendix F6.

## 5.3 AGENCY CONSULTATION

### 5.3.1 Core Steering Committee

The Core Steering Committee was established as part of the LWC Feasibility Study to provide a forum for Project Team updates and agency consultation. Preliminary consultation with key agencies and stakeholders was a critical process that shaped and assessed the feasibility of the LWC. Representatives from the following agencies participated on the Core Steering Committee:

- City of Mississauga;
- CVC;
- MNR;
- OPG;
- Region of Peel; and
- TRCA.

The Core Steering Committee met a total of four times during the Feasibility Study: June 15, July 27, August 9, and September 20, 2011. Appendix G1 documents the Core Steering Committee meeting minutes.

The Core Steering Committee became the Project Team at the onset of the LWC EA.

### 5.3.2 Agency Meetings

#### *5.3.2.1 Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR)*

Throughout the development of the LWC Feasibility Study, MNR provided input into a number of LWC preliminary design concepts in order to ensure that the Project would meet the Province of Ontario's long-term habitat enhancement objectives for Lake Ontario. In addition to the consultation activities as part of the Core Steering Committee, Table 5-3 provides an overview of meetings held with MNR as part of the Feasibility Study. Appendices G3.1-G3.5 document the meeting summaries, minutes, and presentations.

**Table 5-3 Overview of meetings and correspondence with MNR**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| June 6, 2011 | Introduce the LWC Project and discuss key issues and comments. |
| June 9, 2011 | Clarify key issues; identify contacts; and provide an overview of the project and anticipated EA timelines. |
| June 14, 2011 | Obtain input regarding historical wetland conditions within the Project Study Area; discuss habitat compensation requirements; and discuss current aquatic habitat conditions. |
| August 3, 2011<br>Interagency Briefing and Update | Provide an update on the LWC project. |
| August 10, 2011<br>CVC's Monthly DFO/MNR Meeting | Provide an overview of historical and existing conditions; seek input into the preliminary Concept Plan; and discuss the proposed habitat functions and targets. |

#### *5.3.2.2 Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO)*

Throughout the Feasibility Study, DFO provided extensive advice on the preferred locations, orientation, and species specific habitat functions of offshore shoals to be considered in any design process. DFO's HAAT model was also used to assess the potential impacts of the Feasibility Study concept. In addition to discussions held as part of the Feasibility Study Core Steering Committee, Project staff provided regular updates as part of Aquatic Habitat Toronto meetings, and through individual meetings with DFO, as outlined in Table 5-4. Appendices G4.1-G4.3 document the meeting summaries, minutes, and presentations.

**Table 5-4 Summary of Consultation Activities Held with DFO Outside of the Feasibility Study Core Steering Committee**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| June 2, 2011<br>Aquatic Habitat Toronto Meeting | Introduce the LWC Project and seek agency input and comment. |
| June 6, 2011 | Provide an overview of the LWC Project and discuss key issues and comments. |
| August 10, 2011<br>CVC's Monthly DFO/MNR Meeting | Provide an overview of historical and existing conditions; seek input into the preliminary Concept Plan; and discuss the proposed habitat functions and targets. |

#### *5.3.2.3 Ministry of the Environment (MOE)*

The Project Team initiated communication with the MOE regarding the LWC Project at the beginning of the Feasibility Study. Consultation activities included in-person meetings, a site visit, and e-mail status updates. Table 5-5 provides an overview of consultation activities held with MOE.

**Table 5-5 Overview of meetings held with MOE**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| May 24, 2011 | Introduce the LWC Feasibility Study and discuss opportunities to expedite the EA process. |
| July 13, 2011 | Provide an update on the progress of the LWC Feasibility Study; discuss results of the consultation activities undertaken to date; and present the projected EA timeline. |
| July 27, 2011 | Site visit to view the existing conditions within the Project Study Area. |

#### *5.3.2.4 Ontario Power Generation (OPG)*

The Project Team initiated consultation with OPG at the beginning of the Feasibility Study. In addition to OPG's participation on the Core Steering Committee, the Project Team met with representatives of OPG on a number of occasions to provide updates regarding the LWC Project, and to discuss potential access to OPG waterlots. Table 5-6 provides an overview of consultation activities completed with OPG outside of the Core Steering Committee.

**Table 5-6 Overview of consultation activities with OPG**

| Date | Purpose |
|---|---|
| July 19, 2011 | Provide an overview of the Feasibility Study objectives; discuss results of consultation activities to date; and summarize EA timelines. |
| August 5, 2011 | Memo from CVC requesting permission to undertake surveys on OPG property and waterlots. |
| August 31, 2011 | Provide an update regarding the LWC Feasibility Study. |
| September 19, 2011 | Memo to CVC regarding the proposed survey protocol for OPG lands and waterlots. |

#### *5.3.2.5 City of Mississauga*

CVC and Region of Peel kept the City of Mississauga appraised of Project developments from the initiation of the Feasibility Study, and the City was also a member of the Core Steering Committee. The City provided coordination between the Inspiration Lakeview process and relevant City of Mississauga departments. During the Core Steering Committee meetings, representatives from the City provided updates from the various City departments and Council.

### 5.3.3 Summary of Agency Comments

The following table outlines the comments received from agencies during the development of the LWC Feasibility Study.

**Table 5-7 Summary of Agency Comments Related to the LWC Feasibility Study**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| MOE | May 24, 2011 | Class EA is not appropriate, and Individual EA must be undertaken. | Noted. |
| MOE | May 24, 2011 | Stakeholder consultation for the Feasibility Study can be used for the EA Terms of Reference process. | Noted. |
| MOE | May 24, 2011 | Significant risks are associated with an accelerated EA approach. | Noted. The Region of Peel is willing to assume the associated risks and to proceed with the EA. |
| Aquatic Habitat Toronto | June 2, 2011 | Run the HAAT model for the Feasibility Study concept. | Noted. DFO's HAAT model has been used to assess the potential impacts of the Feasibility Study concept and it was determined that the equivalent of approximately 4.3 ha of open coast habitat would require compensation. This amount is likely to change with the revised Project Study Area for the LWC EA, and the HAAT model will be run on the 'Alternative Methods'. |
| Aquatic Habitat Toronto | June 2, 2011 | CEAA is the initial coordinator. | Noted. |
| Aquatic Habitat Toronto | June 2, 2011 | May be potential to introduce some core habitat for cold water fish, as well as wetlands, especially creating offshore shoals, while taking into consideration the submerged historical river valleys, based on NOAA generated bathymetric data. | Noted. |
| Aquatic Habitat Toronto | June 2, 2011 | Great opportunity to take an area that has been degraded and improve it, particularly in terms of fish habitat. | Noted. |
| MNR | June 6, 2011 | Identified opportunities to scope EA to obtain land use approvals in parallel under *Planning Act* (with Inspiration Lakeview). Makes sense to integrate both planning approaches to ensure streamlined approach. | Inspiration Lakeview currently has no status under the *Planning Act*. The community planning framework is a separate, but integrated, process from the proposed LWC Project. |

**Table 5-7 Summary of Agency Comments Related to the LWC Project (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| MNR | June 6, 2011 | Consider the removal of the OPG piers. | With the revised Project Study Area, the EA is only considering the area from Etobicoke Creek to the western edge of the G.E. Booth WWTP. The City of Mississauga has also noted that the piers represent an important design element which should be retained. |
| MNR | June 6, 2011 | Identified the offshore shelf south of the OPG piers where shallow water conditions seem to extend along what might have been a historical valley crest when lake levels were significantly lower in Lake Ontario. Opportunities to create offshore, coldwater shoals as part of the plan for such species as Lake Trout. | Noted. |
| MNR | June 6, 2011 | Recommended water sediment samples be analyzed on the LWC site to ensure there is no contamination that would render the site inappropriate for habitat creation. | Noted. Water sediment sampling will occur as part of the EA. |
| DFO | June 6, 2011 | Consider the use of mechanisms to prevent undesirable species from occupying and proliferating in the created habitats (i.e., round gobies and cormorants). | Difficult to exclude such species other than providing a diverse range of habitats to encourage native species recruitment to maximize their ability to compete, and to ensure that terrestrial habitats that may be suitable for such species as cormorants, are easily and readily accessible by people to discourage the establishment of colonies. |
| MNR | June 6, 2011 | Habitats should be targeted to specific fish communities that are appropriate to this portion of the waterfront, given historical context and current conditions. | Historical wetland and shoreline conditions (air photos) were obtained, as well as historical summaries of fish data from OPG. These data, and any additional relevant information, will be incorporated into the LWC Project. |
| MNR | June 6, 2011 | Identified that any options for fill would need to be specifically targeted to existing and future fish species targets, and bird habitat targets set by LAMP and Lake Ontario Biodiversity Conservation Strategy, as well as CVC's LOISS. Current target species would include Lake Trout, Lake Herring, Lake Sturgeon, American Eel, etc. Habitats should also target recovery species. | Noted. |
| MNR | June 6, 2011 | The location may be protected if it provides Bobolink | Bobolink were observed in the meadow-like habitat |

**Table 5-7 Summary of Agency Comments Related to the LWC Project (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | habitat. | around the ash lagoon on the WWTP site. The paucity of ideal meadow habitat in the region resulted in this degraded habitat being used as a stop-over for this and several other migratory species. The ash (mud-flat) around the ash lagoons also provided habitat for dabbling birds, while an ash pile was being used by bank swallows. If these conditions could be imitated as part of the Project in more favourable conditions, it is apparent that these birds are available to make use of the created habitats. |
| DFO | June 6, 2011 | If the provincial EA follows the Individual EA process, CEAA will be the lead agency and author of any *CEAA* Screening. If a Class EA, DFO will take the lead. | Noted. |
| MNR | June 9, 2011 | Concerns with the condensed EA timelines. | Much of the work for the EA ToR and EA will be undertaken concurrently with the Feasibility study (applicable data, preliminary concept development, preliminary consultation, etc.). |
| MNR | June 9, 2011 | Concern that the impetus behind the LWC Project is to facilitate development. | The LWC Project is primarily designed to enhance habitat opportunities and provide a major public amenity along the eastern Mississauga waterfront. The availability of fill from the Region provides an opportunity for the Project in a way which treats clean, locally excavated fill materials as a resource rather than a waste. |
| MNR | June 14, 2011 | Refer to Tom Whillans' work for information on historic wetlands. Noted that Toronto to Hamilton is an erosion zone so not likely a lot of wetlands to begin with, other than at the mouth of watercourses. | Noted. |
| MNR | June 14, 2011 | Recommend fall fish surveys be undertaken and suggested gill netting as a supplement to electrofishing. | CVC and TRCA expressed an interest in partnering with MNR when they complete gill netting within the LWC Project Study Area in 2012. |
| City of Mississauga (Core Steering Committee Meeting) | June 15, 2011 | Priority for materials sourced from capital projects within the City of Mississauga. | Noted. No materials will be accepted from the City of Toronto or the City of Brampton unless compilation of anticipated fill volumes by the City of Mississauga and the Region of Peel determine that there will be supply |

**Table 5-7 Summary of Agency Comments Related to the LWC Project (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | gaps in the near future. |
| Region of Peel (Core Steering Committee Meeting) | June 15, 2011 | Interest in using state of the art sediment controls (floating curtains, etc.) in this Project, in part to raise the bar but also to protect intake pipe from siltation. | Noted. The alternatives will be selected based on compatibility with existing infrastructure (i.e., no impacts to the water intake pipes within the Project Study Area). |
| City of Mississauga (Core Steering Committee Meeting) | June 15, 2011 | Consider the use of creating confined disposal cells similar to TTP along the Phase 2 Study Area, instead of an island. | Not desirable from fill quality and length of time for infilling.<br>**UPDATE**: The revised Project Study Area is only considering the Eastern sector. |
| City of Mississauga (Core Steering Committee Meeting) | June 15, 2011 | Advised that having a western access point would be a good way to establish cost-efficiencies between the Inspiration Lakeview municipal infrastructure needs and construction logistics for the LWC. | Noted. |
| City of Mississauga (Core Steering Committee Meeting) | June 15, 2011 | Requested that the LWC concept model impacts on circulation as it pertains to water treatment plant intakes and outfalls. | Noted. During the EA, modelling will be used to assess the alternative configurations of proposed lakefill on water quality, particularly as it pertains to the water intake pipes. |
| MOE | July 27, 2011 Site Visit | Expressed interest in the Project and support for the benefits provided. | Noted. |
| MOE | July 27, 2011 Site Visit | Would like to be kept involved throughout the Feasibility Study and advised when the EA commences. | Noted. |
| MNR | August 3, 2011 | Recommend opportunities to augment creek flows. Consider flow and water level control structures. | Noted. |
| MNR | August 3, 2011 | Targeting cold water lake habitat, rather than creating large amounts of coastal wetlands that may not have historically been abundant in the area. | The concept provides opportunities to augment cold water habitat by providing structure lost through historical stone-hooking activities. The EA will also be looking to create wetland habitats based on what makes sense given the available contributing flows from riverine sources, and the proximity to the lake. However, given the extent of historical losses of wetland habitat regionally, Aquatic Habitat Toronto suggested that it is appropriate to maximize the amount of created diverse wetland habitat to the extent practical given the existing conditions. |

**Table 5-7 Summary of Agency Comments Related to the LWC Project (Cont'd)**

| Agency / Event | Date | Issues and Comments Received | Consideration of Issues and Comments |
|---|---|---|---|
| MNR | August 3, 2011 | Indicated that habitat targets for species such as Lake Chub and White Suckers are appropriate for these areas, rather than Smallmouth Bass. May be opportunities for Round Whitefish. | Noted. |
| MNR | August 3, 2011 | Recommends incorporating wave direction and fetch into design in order to maximize circulation to back water wetlands. | Noted. This will be examined in greater detail in the EA phase. |
| MNR | August 10, 2011 | Incorporate alternative materials in the construction of the headlands to provide more fish habitat than armourstone. | As part of the EA, a coastal engineer will be retained who will look at different options to stabilize the proposed beaches. At a minimum, the design will consider a rubble apron around the armourstone headlands. |
| MNR | August 10, 2011 | Enhance aquatic habitat along the nearshore and in the deeper offshore areas within the Project Study Area. | Noted. |
| MNR | August 10, 2011 | Recommend that the study reference the following reports:<br>• Lake Superior RAP Thunder Bay;<br>• Jason Dietric synthesis of e-fishing 1988-2010; and<br>• Richard Strouss TO RAP mid 90's historical lake trout. | Noted. |
| MNR | August 10, 2011 | Recommend using sand for the Bank Swallow habitat. | Bank Swallows use till as well as sand, but fundamentally, this is a structural berm for the WWTP that needs to be stable. The LWC Project is seeking to enhance a structural element to provide additional ecological function. During the EA process, the LWC Project can look at maximizing grain size distributions for the berm material that will retain a stable vertical face, while still encouraging bank swallow habitat. |
| OPG | August 31, 2011 | A site access agreement is required to allow access to the site to undertake surveys in support of the LWC Project and LOISS. In support of this, information regarding the survey protocols is requested. | Noted. Correspondence has been provided to OPG in response to this request, access to the site was requested and general associated survey protocols were provided. |

# 6.0 NEXT STEPS

As described in the preceding section, a combination of public, First Nations and Métis and agency input was used to assist the Project Team in preparing the ToR for the LWC EA. The ToR, which was submitted on July X, 2012, will be reviewed by the MOE during a formal 30-day review period. During this time, the ToR will be available for public review both electronically on the Project website, and in hard copy at local library branches.

If the ToR is approved by the MOE (anticipated in October, 2012), the Project Team will proceed with the Individual EA. The Consultation Plan for the EA is provided in the ToR.